APPENDIX 1

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Strategic Policies			
Policy ST1: Health and Wellbeing	The way places are planned, designed and built can have a significant influence over health and wellbeing. All development should be designed to provide opportunities for healthy lifestyles and contribute to the creation of healthier and inclusive communities and help to reduce health inequalities for people of all ages and abilities through placemaking. The Council will continue to work with partners and health providers to improve and promote healthier and active lifestyles for our residents and communities. Health and wellbeing outcomes are embedded throughout the policies in the Plan. To achieve healthy and inclusive communities, all new development should: a) Promote healthy neighbourhood design, providing opportunities for healthy lifestyles for all by creating well-designed, safe and accessible places. b) Provide healthy and affordable homes that meet the needs of the community. c) Provide easy access to natural environments including green and blue infrastructure and open spaces. d) Promote active and sustainable environments and encourage active travel. e) Promote a healthy food environment. f) Provide opportunities for all to access health facilities and services, a range of employment opportunities, and community, sport and recreation facilities. Where appropriate new development will be expected to deliver and/or contribute to the provision of new or improved facilities. g) Seek environmental improvements, minimising exposure to potential sources of environmental harm including pollutants and noise and improving air quality. h) Minimise, manage and mitigate against the effects of climate change. In addition, and where appropriate, new development should support the provision of healthcare infrastructure to accommodate needs, in accessible locations, in line with the requirements outlined in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and set out in Place policies. A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required for all residential development of 50 dwellings or more, non-residential development of 1,000sqm or more, all development in C2	Direct	Appropriate allowances have been accounted for in the professional fee allowance. Any negative impacts and cost for mitigation required should be reflected in the land price.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	use class (residential institutions) and hot food takeaways and fast food outlets in accordance with Policy PC1, in order to demonstrate that the development would have an acceptable impact on health and wellbeing. The scope and detail of the HIA should be proportionate to the size of development and should be agreed prior to commencement of the assessment with development management and public health officers. The Council will require Health Impact Assessments to be prepared having regard to the most up to date advice and best practice for such assessments, responding to the latest local public health data and insight from the community. The purpose of the Health Impact Assessment will be to identify the potential health consequences of a proposal and should be undertaken at an early stage of the development process, with evidence that the assessment has informed the design of the proposal The assessment should include recommendations on how positive health benefits can be maximised and how negative impacts on health and inequalities can be avoided or mitigated. Where a development has a significant adverse impact on health and wellbeing, the Council will require applicants to provide for the mitigation of such impacts. Developments which will have an unacceptable significant adverse impact on health and wellbeing which cannot be mitigated, or that fail to offer reasonable provisions, will not be permitted.		
Policy ST2: Environment and the Green Network and Waterways	All proposals must conserve and enhance Colchester's natural and historic environment, including the protection and enhancement of sites of international, national, regional, and local importance. Development should protect and respond positively to the landscape character of Colchester informed by its biodiversity, geology, green network and waterways, history, archaeology and settlement identity, including sense of separation. The Council will support the use of Natural England's Environmental Benefits from Nature tool. Proposals must have regard to the strategic aims and objectives of the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy, including habitat creation in strategic opportunity areas and enhancement of ecological connectivity, and the Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS) or any relevant successor documents. Strategic areas with enhanced potential for habitat creation and ecological connectivity are shown on the policies maps as 'strategic biodiversity areas'. These strategic biodiversity areas	Direct	This is a strategic policy – we have allowed for BNG in accordance with DEFRA Impact Assessment Biodiversity Net Gain and Local Nature Recovery Strategies Impact Assessment in our study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	will be safeguarded from inappropriate development having regard to the policy context of the local plan and opportunities to strengthen and enhance habitat connectivity will be supported. Detailed requirements relating to biodiversity net gain, ecological assessment and mitigation, green network provision, open space standards, and long-term management and maintenance are set out in Policies EN2, EN3 and GN1, and relevant Place policies.		
Policy ST3: Spatial Strategy	Development will be directed to the most sustainable locations in Colchester district in accordance with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy to deliver the scale of growth identified in Policies ST5 and ST6. Growth will be infrastructure-led, ensuring that development is aligned with the timely provision of infrastructure necessary to support sustainable communities. Proposals for development will be supported where they are located in accordance with the following sequential approach: • Colchester Urban Area (including City Centre) as the principal focus of growth through redevelopment of previously developed land, high density development and regeneration. • Growth and Opportunity Areas to deliver strategic scale growth, regeneration and supporting infrastructure in accordance with Place Policies and any adopted masterplans and DPDs. • Large Settlements where development will be supported at a scale proportionate to their role, services and environmental constraints. • Medium Settlements where development will be supported at a scale proportionate to the size and function of the settlement and its connectivity and supports local services and responds positively to infrastructure constraints. • Small Settlements where small scale and infill development will be supported where it is proportionate and appropriate to the settlement, and respects local character and constraints. • Areas outside of defined settlements are classed as countryside and development will be restricted to uses appropriate to a rural location.	Indirect	This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no direct impact on this study. This policy aims to provide an overall vision for other detailed policies.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Development in locations well related to key transport corridors, particularly with access to the rail network, will be supported where it maximises sustainable travel opportunities and there is, or can be, sufficient capacity on the network and/or appropriate mitigation to support any enhancement required. The re-use of previously developed land and higher density development (particularly in the Urban Area of Colchester) will be supported where it accords with design, character and infrastructure capacity considerations. Proposals will be assessed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy below and relevant Place and development management policies. Proposals will be supported where they are consistent with the nature, role and function of the settlement having regard to cumulative impacts and the scale of growth over the plan period.		
Policy ST4: Development in the Countryside	Proposals in the countryside must demonstrate functional and locational justification for a countryside setting while supporting the vitality of rural communities. This will be balanced against ensuring development does not have an adverse impact on the different roles and relationships between settlements and their separate identities, valued landscapes, the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and visual amenity. The intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside will be recognised and assessed, and development will only be permitted where it would not adversely affect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Proposals must consider the role the landscape plays as an open buffer between settlements or areas of a settlement, and the resulting sense of separation and distinctive identity. Within valued landscapes, development will only be permitted where it would not impact adversely and would protect and enhance the factors that contribute to valued landscapes. Proposals for sustainable rural businesses will be supported if they are of an appropriate scale, meet a local employment need, minimise negative environmental impacts, and harmonise with the local character and surrounding countryside where they are being proposed.	Indirect	Colchester through planning and development decisions, will work with partners to proactively preserve and protect the character and beauty of the countryside.

<table>
<tr><th>Policy</th><th>Policy Contents</th><th>Impact on Viability</th><th>Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Proposals for the delivery and operation of essential utilities infrastructure, where there is a proven need and a countryside location is essential for the delivery of those utilities, will be supported where they accord with other policies in the development plan.

Where residential proposals are located outside defined settlement boundaries, there should be consideration of the physical and functional connection to the defined settlement in the first instance. The scale of development should be proportionate to the size and function of the settlement and avoid cumulative impacts on local infrastructure, landscape character, and biodiversity. Residential proposals in the countryside should conserve and enhance the character and quality of the landscape, and it must be proven that they will protect and reinforce the rural character of the areas where development is proposed. Proposals will need to demonstrate that the scheme respects the character and appearance of landscapes and the built environment and preserves or enhances the historic environment and biodiversity in line with policies in this Plan. Proposals should demonstrate how they contribute to sustainable development, including access to services, active travel and public transport options, where available.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Policy ST5: Colchester's Housing Need</td><td>The Council will plan, monitor and manage the delivery of at least 21,692 new homes in Colchester City between 2026 and 2043.

The annual housing requirement for Colchester is 1,276, as identified by the Standard Methodology.

Table ST5.1: Housing Supply
<table>
<tr><th>Housing Supply as at 31 March 2026</th><th>Net New Homes</th></tr>
<tr><td>Existing Commitments (sites with planning permission)</td><td>5,435</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community</td><td>1,875</td></tr>
<tr><td>Windfall Allowance</td><td>2,929</td></tr>
<tr><td>Local Plan Allocations</td><td>12,188</td></tr>
<tr><td>TOTAL SUPPLY</td><td>22,357</td></tr>
</table></td><td>Direct</td><td>This policy has direct impact as the Local Plan Viability Assessment will demonstrate the ability of the proposals to deliver the identified housing needed through viability testing.</td></tr>
</table>

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	The Council will maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable sites to provide for at least five years' worth of housing on a rolling basis, plus an appropriate buffer in accordance with national policy. The overall distribution of new housing across Colchester is guided by Spatial Strategy (Policy ST3).		
Policy ST6: Colchester's Employment Need	The Council will plan, monitor and manage the delivery of at least 49.8ha of employment land in Colchester City to meet the projected demand up to 2043. Employment uses will be provided on a range of sites including allocations, sites with planning permission and through intensification / redevelopment within existing employment areas, including but not limited to, the sites identified in Table ST6.1 below, to ensure jobs are accessible to new and existing communities across Colchester. Proposals for new employment uses within existing and defined employment areas will be supported. Employment uses for the purposes of this policy are defined as Use Classes E(g), B2, and B8. Alternative economic class uses and 'sui generis' uses may contribute to the provision of jobs providing flexibility and securing delivery of additional jobs. Suitable alternative economic and 'sui generis' uses will be supported within existing and defined areas where they are in accordance with all relevant policies in the plan, including impact assessments where these alternative uses are for town centre uses and the threshold applies. Lorry parking facilities and associated overnight layover facilities in appropriate locations within close proximity to the strategic road network will be supported where they are in accordance with relevant national and local guidance and all relevant policies in this Plan.	Indirect	This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no impact for this study. The implementation of this policy will impact the real estate market through the quality of the environment and the strength of the economy created. This will impact real estate values over time through the price mechanism.
Policy ST7: Infrastructure Delivery and Impact Mitigation	All development must be supported by infrastructure, services and facilities that are identified as being needed to serve the needs arising from the development. Permission will only be granted if it can be demonstrated that there is sufficient and appropriate infrastructure capacity to support the development or that such capacity will be delivered by the proposal. It must further be demonstrated that all necessary infrastructure will be delivered at an appropriate time to meet the requirements of the development, and that such capacity will prove sustainable over time in physical and financial terms.	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on viability as relevant infrastructure will be secured through agreements with the council, as required. Where possible, the

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Where a development proposal requires additional infrastructure capacity to be deemed acceptable, mitigation measures must be agreed with the Council and the appropriate infrastructure provider. Such measures may include: Financial contributions towards new or expanded facilities and the maintenance thereof; • on-site provision of new facilities (which may include building works); • off-site capacity improvement works; and/or • the provision of land. Developers will be expected to contribute towards the delivery of relevant infrastructure as required and supported by up-to-date evidence from appropriate sources including the Infrastructure Audit & Delivery Plan (IADP) and any subsequent updated evidence, along with information from local sources including parish and town councils. All development will be required to either make direct provision or to contribute towards the provision of local and strategic infrastructure required by the development which will include (but not be limited to) contributions to the following where relevant; • Transport Infrastructure / Highways improvements • Active Travel, Public Transport, , Electric Vehicle infrastructure, Park&Ride/Choose • Education Secondary, Primary, Early Years and Childcare, • Sport and Leisure, Open Spaces, • Community Facilities • Primary Healthcare • Police, Fire and Rescue and Ambulance Services) • Green Infrastructure /SANG • Utilities In addition there are a number of strategic infrastructure requirements that all new development will be expected to contribute to; • Upgrades to the strategic road network • Traffic management measures which improve the Colchester wide traffic flow across the local and strategic network including dynamic traffic management. Specific projects to mitigate wider impacts include;		necessary infrastructure will be informed by the IADP. We have included an infrastructure allowance of £5,000 per unit across the residential typologies. We have allowed for additional infrastructure costs in the strategic site viability appraisals.

<table>
<tr><th>Policy</th><th>Policy Contents</th><th>Impact on Viability</th><th>Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>

Maldon Road/Warren Lane junction
Improvements at A12/A120 Junction 29
Improvements / alterations A12/A120(W) Junction 25 including Marks Tey Roundabout and Prince of Wales Roundabout
Improvements at A12 Junction 26
Improvements to A133 including Clingoe Hill Greenstead Roundabout, Lower Harwich /Ipswich Roads
Aldham and Eight Ash Green Halstead Road Junction Improvements
Improvements to Colchester hospital
Enlarged swimming pool provision
New emergency services hub

This policy will apply to all development proposals. Location specific infrastructure requirements are also contained within the relevant site allocation policies. Where the mitigation requires onsite delivery the Place Policies identify site specific requirements which includes the provision of sufficient land where appropriate.
Land is safeguarded for education use that forms part of extant planning permissions.
New streets should seek to be built to adoptable design standards in adherence with current guidance and standards. Where streets are not built to an adoptable standard, there must be a substantive place making benefit.
At the time of adoption, every allocation will be considered to be viable, based on information provided to the Council. Where an applicant/developer is seeking an exception to this policy later in the plan period, it will only be considered when all of the following criterion are met:
a) A fully transparent open book viability assessment has proven that full mitigation cannot be afforded, allowing only for the minimum level of developer profit and landowner receipt necessary for the development to proceed; and
b) It is proven that the public benefit of the development proceeding without full mitigation outweighs the collective harm; and
</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	c) Full and thorough investigation has been undertaken to find innovative solutions to issues and all possible steps have been taken to minimise the residual level of unmitigated impacts; and d) Obligations are entered into by the developer that provide for appropriate mitigation in the event that viability improves prior to completion of the development. In such cases the Council may seek a staged review of the viability of a scheme with the aim of achieving policy compliance over time. This may include securing a review mechanism by legal agreement specifying trigger points for undertaking a review such as later phases of a scheme or reserved matters applications. The Council is intending to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and will implement such for areas and/or development types where a viable charging schedule would best mitigate the impacts of growth. Section 106 will operate alongside CIL and will remain the appropriate mechanism for securing land and works, affordable housing and financial contributions where a sum for the necessary infrastructure is not secured via CIL.		
Policy ST7a: Sustainable Transport and Connectivity	To achieve the vision to create well connected communities and increase sustainable and active travel, development will be required to focus on delivering connectivity and providing better access to sustainable transport to provide a genuine choice of travel options. New development must be planned and designed to promote the use of sustainable travel, through a vision led approach, creating places that maximise opportunities for sustainable travel for all and support healthy and active lifestyles. Proposals for development should support the provision of infrastructure to encourage sustainable and active modes of travel in line with other policies in this Plan. Development should seek to connect to and enhance strategic active travel routes, including the Colchester Orbital, where these are relevant to the site and its context. Developers will be required to submit a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, in line with thresholds set out in the latest guidance to assess the potential transport impacts of the development. The Transport Statement or Assessment must demonstrate how the development will encourage active and sustainable transport, demonstrating how opportunities for active and sustainable measures have been maximised and how a modal shift	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on viability as sustainable transport and connectivity links will be secured through the delivery of site-wide infrastructure, both on-site and off-site.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	to active and sustainable modes of travel will be achieved, and mitigate traffic impacts in terms of capacity and safety, to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. Development proposals will be required to produce a Travel Plan in line with thresholds and guidelines set out in the latest published guidance. Any Travel Plan should include an Action Plan setting out specific actions, timelines and targets to be monitored and reviewed. All development proposals should demonstrate safe and suitable access to required highway design standards. The point of vehicle access should be agreed with the Highway Authority and demonstrate that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway capacity or safety.		
Policy ST8: Place Shaping Principles	All new development must meet high standards of urban and architectural design. Development frameworks, masterplans, design codes and other design guidance documents will be prepared in consultation with stakeholders where they are needed to support this objective. Any adopted design documents must be taken into account and will be a material consideration in decision making, including the National Design Guide and the Essex Design Guide. All new development should reflect the following placemaking principles, where relevant: a) Protect and enhance the natural environment and secure net gains for biodiversity. b) Provide integrated green and blue infrastructure. c) Support climate change mitigation and adaptation, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions while ensuring development is safe and resilient to risk and supporting opportunities for renewable and low carbon energy including decentralised energy and heating systems. d) Include measures to support water management, including water efficiency and flood mitigation. e) Provide high quality design that responds to local character and context, contributing to the quality of existing places and their environs. f) Protect and, where appropriate, enhance assets of historical value. g) Create well-connected and sustainable patterns of movement prioritising walking, cycling and public transport. h) Provide mixed and well-designed neighbourhoods with a balance of uses, densities and spaces.	Direct	This policy outlines design principles that new developments must follow to preserve Colchester's characteristics and qualities. Costs associated with scheme design have been allowed for within the professional fee allowance. Costs associated with the construction of the houses and wider site works are included within the BCIS build cost and external works allowance, respectively.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	i) Enhance the quality of the public realm and sense of place. j) Ensure development is well located and supports access to public transport and key interchanges/connections. k) Provide safe, accessible and active streets and shared spaces. l) Include parking facilities that are well integrated and are adaptable over time. m) Protect the amenity of existing and future residents.		
Policy ST9: The Tendering Colchester Borders Garden Community	The Development Plan Document (DPD) allocates and protects the land for the following uses: • C.7,500 homes with a range of shops, jobs, services and community facilities including education provisions • Salary Brook Country Park • Wivenhoe Strategic Green Gap • Elmstead Strategic Green Gap • Sport and leisure facilities • 25 ha of employment land • Provision for the Rapid Transit System • 18-pitch Gypsy and Traveller Site • Park and Choose Facility Proposals within the development boundary will be determined in line with the policies and requirements set out in the DPD. Policies SP8 and SP9 of the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Section One Plan (Adopted February 2021) appended to this Plan will be saved and continue to apply to the Garden Community where appropriate. All other policies are replaced.	Indirect	This policy will not have a direct impact at this stage as this strategic site will have significant impact on delivery trajectory and targets but no cost implication at this stage of the study.
Environment Policies			
Policy EN1: Nature Conservation Designated Sites	Development proposals that would be likely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of a habitats site, either alone or in combination, will only be permitted where the requirements of the Habitats Regulations are met.	Direct	For the viability assessment, it is assumed that the cost of professional reports and studies is included in the professional fee

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Development likely to cause an adverse effect on a Site of Special Scientific Interest will not be supported unless the benefits of the proposal clearly outweigh the impacts and any necessary mitigation is secured. Contributions will be secured from qualifying residential development, within the Zones of Influence as defined in the adopted Essex Coast Recreational disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS, or brand name Bird Aware Essex Coast), towards avoidance and mitigation measures identified in the adopted strategy and any updates to the strategy or successor strategy. If an applicant pursues an alternative approach to mitigation, information to support the Council in preparing a Habitats Regulations Assessment will be required, including support from Natural England on the effectiveness of the proposed bespoke mitigation. Reference to Bird Aware Essex Coast must be included on any signage or interpretation that relates to a Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) required in accordance with the Habitats Regulations Assessment. Signage and interpretation boards should explain the natural features of the open space and include places to rest within and throughout the SANG. Nature-based welcome packs will be required for new homeowners for schemes of 100 or more dwellings where identified as necessary to mitigate recreational impacts on designated sites.		allowance. Additionally, the cost of required mitigation measures is expected to be covered within the net-to-gross site area assumption, external works cost, and net-biodiversity gain costs. If there are significant nature conservation concerns at sensitive development sites, developers are expected to be aware of these from due diligence, and the mitigation costs should be incorporated into the land price.
Policy EN2: Biodiversity Net Gain and Environmental Net Gain	Development proposals must deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain (BNG) in accordance with national legislation. Proposals seeking to deliver above this statutory minimum will be supported where appropriate, in the context of the wider planning balance. Proposals for habitat creation, enhancement and BNG should have regard to the Colchester City Strategic Biodiversity Assessment. Following the biodiversity gain hierarchy, priority will be given to achieving BNG onsite where practical and where this would deliver meaningful ecological outcomes. Where onsite delivery would be significantly constrained, offsite delivery will be supported, with preference for delivery in strategically significant locations identified in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) in close proximity to the development site. BNG proposals should consider	Direct	There will be a direct impact on viability given the financial cost associated with delivering BNG within a development. 2019 Defra figures for east of England BNG cost estimate are:

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	opportunities to enhance connectivity and access to green spaces through links to the PRoW network where appropriate, subject to ensuring the primary aim of biodiversity and ecological benefits are not compromised. The Essex LNRS contains strategic opportunity maps, which show the habitats and locations which have been identified as having 'strategic significance'. Only the LNRS strategic opportunities can be assigned a score of high in the strategic significance category in the Biodiversity Metric where the proposed habitat intervention is consistent with the mapped potential measure in the LNRS. The Council will support development proposals that seek to demonstrate environmental net gain.		Greenfield – £1,349 per unit Brownfield – £361 per unit
Policy EN3: Biodiversity and Geodiversity	For all proposals, development will only be supported where it: a) In the case of major applications, is submitted with a completed Essex biodiversity validation checklist where proportionate to the nature, scale and location of development. b) Is supported, where necessary, with appropriate ecological surveys by a suitably qualified person. Where a preliminary ecological appraisal indicates the need for further surveys, these must be completed and submitted prior to determination, including details of any mitigation measures. c) Where there is reason to suspect the presence of a protected species (and impact to), or Species/Habitats of Principal Importance, or locally important Species/Habitats, surveys must be carried out at the appropriate time of year and taking into account appropriate weather conditions, assessing their presence and, if present, the proposal must make provision for mitigation measures. d) Demonstrates, through the design of the proposal, that the mitigation hierarchy has been followed with respect to ecological impacts. Where impacts on habitats and species cannot be avoided, a clear explanation of why alternative sites are not feasible and what proposed mitigation measures are necessary to address all likely significant effects.	Direct	Impact to arise from the cost of professional fees for the relevant Biodiversity Action Plans (BAPs) and Geodiversity Action Plans (GAPs) included in overall fee budget for developments. For development sites with significant nature conservation concerns, developers should be aware of these issues during site due diligence. The cost of necessary mitigation measures should be incorporated into the land purchase price.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	e) Responds appropriately to the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy by avoiding harm to identified priority habitats, species and ecological networks, and by informing mitigation and compensation measures where ecological impacts are identified. f) Demonstrates that significant harm to brownfield sites of high biodiversity value is avoided and fragmentation of habitats is minimised. g) Focuses habitat creation and enhancement measures on the habitats that are already present in the area and retaining existing communities and species populations that have been recognised as having significance and having regard to species selection that considers future climate projections. h) Where development is proposed adjacent to, or including, a LoWS, the creation of new habitat to buffer it should be a priority of design and masterplanning. In accordance with relevant national policy and legislation, proposals for development that would cause significant direct or indirect adverse harm to nationally designated sites or other designated areas, protected species, Habitats and Species of Principal Importance and local importance, will not be permitted unless: a) They cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less harm; and b) The benefits of the development clearly outweigh the impacts on the features of the site and the wider network of natural habitats; and c) Satisfactory mitigation, or as a last resort, compensation measures are provided. The Council will take a precautionary approach where insufficient information is provided about avoidance, mitigation and compensation measures and will require that this information is submitted prior to determination. Mitigation and compensation measures will be secured through planning conditions/obligations where necessary. A Construction Environment Management Plan, which includes details of all necessary ecological mitigation measures including protection of retained habitats and requirements for ecological supervision during works on site using a suitably experienced Ecological Clerk of Works, will be required by condition where necessary and proportionate.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy EN4: Irreplaceable Habitats	Proposals that would result in the loss of irreplaceable habitats [as defined in The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024] will not be permitted unless there are wholly exceptional reasons. Where exceptional reasons are demonstrated, a suitable compensation strategy, to the satisfaction of the Council, after consultation with relevant stakeholders, will be required. Proposals predicted to result in adverse impacts upon irreplaceable habitats must be accompanied by detailed survey information and clear evidence to support the exceptional reasons that justify such a loss. The compensation strategy must include contribution to the enhancement and management of the habitat and consider future climate projections. Proposals close to ancient woodland must include a buffer zone informed by the most up to date Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland and be proportionate to the nature, scale, and potential impacts of the development. Where surveys show that additional impacts to root damage are likely, a larger buffer zone will be required.	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability as suitable compensation will be required if proposals result in the loss of irreplaceable habitat. This will have a direct impact on development costs.
Policy EN5: Canopy Cover and New and Existing Trees	A Tree Canopy Cover Assessment will be required for all major applications. Development proposals should seek, where appropriate, to increase the level of canopy cover on site by a minimum of 10%. For sites where the baseline canopy cover is below 10% of the total site area, applicants must secure a minimum canopy coverage of 10% across the site area. In circumstances where the tree canopy cover requirement is not possible or desirable, having regard to site constraints, viability and design considerations, compensatory provision should be identified and secured through a legal obligation. Compensatory provision will need to be discussed with the case officer on a case-by-case basis and could include provision of an additional or larger open space or tree planting elsewhere. Proposals for major development must consider the opportunities for new tree planting, including street trees, alongside and in addition to the requirement for an increase in tree canopy cover. Proposals should consider planting trees that, upon maturity, would be of a scale and form that have the potential to form positive focal points or a landmark. The Council will support proposals that create pocket forests (also called Miyawaki forests) by planting native trees and shrubs together, to create a compact, biodiversity rich, and ultra-dense environment, where appropriate.	Direct	This has a direct impact on the viability as an Arboricultural Impact Assessment will be required to support the planning application. The cost of this is allowed for in the professional fee allowance.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Consideration must be given to the possible conflict between new trees and built form and be compatible with highway considerations, parking areas and underground utilities. Tree species must reflect local conditions and management objectives of the specific site. Native planting should be used but consideration given to the inclusion of some non-native non-invasive species that could be suited to changing, warmer conditions. The maintenance of new trees must be included within any landscape management plan and landscape maintenance schedule for the site for an agreed period to ensure establishment. Proposals should ensure that existing trees are not damaged and are retained wherever possible. Consideration must be given to the potential for future pressure to prune or fell existing trees and the design of development must mitigate this. Tree survey information proportionate to the scale and nature of development must be submitted where trees are present on site and could be affected by development. The tree survey information must include protection, mitigation, management and maintenance measures. In some instances, trees can cause damage to property or infrastructure requiring significant pruning or even removal. In these cases, a fair and balanced judgement will be made based on the suitability and benefits of retaining a tree against the potential risks it may pose. Where the loss of trees is essential to allow for appropriate development, an appropriate species and number of replacement trees must be provided. Any replacement trees should be provided as close as possible to the new development and should be supported by a suitable management and maintenance scheme.		
Policy EN6: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment	Development that will lead to harm to the significance of a heritage asset (including its setting) will be assessed having regard to whether the asset is designated or non-designated. Great weight will be given to the conservation of heritage assets. Any harm must be clearly and convincingly justified. For designated heritage assets, substantial harm to or total loss of significance will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances, or wholly exceptional circumstances where the asset is of highest significance (Grade I, II* and Scheduled Monuments) and where it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh	Direct	Colchester will seek to protect and enhance (where possible) existing historical buildings and environment through the implementation of

NEWMARK

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	that harm. Where a proposal would result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, this harm will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. For non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be applied, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the asset. Development proposals should seek to avoid or minimise harm to heritage assets through site layout, design, scale, massing and orientation, including the use of buffers, open space, landscaping and the retention of key features. Development affecting the historic environment should conserve and enhance the significance of the heritage asset and any features of specific historic, archaeological, architectural or artistic interest. There should be importance attributed to preserving the setting of the heritage assets acknowledging the relationship between the asset and its surroundings. In all cases there will be an expectation that any new development will enhance the historic environment or better reveal the significance of the heritage asset unless there are no identifiable opportunities available. Within designated Conservation Areas, proposals must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area in accordance with the statutory duty to consider these aspects under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Development should complement the form, materials, and architectural style of existing buildings and spaces. Demolition of unlisted buildings or structures within a Conservation Area will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the building or structure harms or contributes little to the character or appearance of the area. In all cases, detailed justification, including an assessment of alternatives, will be required. Applicants for proposals within Conservation Areas should engage with the local community and stakeholders, including local historical societies, to ensure that the local significance of the area is recognised and respected in any proposed development. The adaptive reuse of heritage assets, including listed buildings, non-designated heritage assets, and buildings within Conservation Areas, is encouraged, provided that the proposed changes do not harm the significance of the asset. The preservation of key features, materials,		various mechanisms listed in the policy. Current costs taken from the latest BCIS have been rebased to ensure they are Colchester-specific, taking into account typical development across Colchester. Construction costs are likely to be higher in relation to designated heritage assets, with values also likely to be higher for this reason. Site specific assessments for each development of a heritage asset will also account for additional cost.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	and architectural elements should be a priority, and any alterations should be sympathetic to the asset's character. In assessing proposals for development affecting heritage assets, consideration will be given to the broader public benefits that the development may bring, including providing access to heritage sites, educational opportunities, and enhancing public understanding of Colchester's historic environment. All development proposals should promote the adaptive reuse of buildings and the role of heritage in sustainable development (such as retrofitting for energy efficiency or considering climate change in heritage management). Heritage Impact Assessments will be required for proposals related to or impacting on the setting of heritage assets so that sufficient information is provided to understand the significance of the heritage assets and to assess the impacts of development on historic assets, together with any proposed mitigation measures. The cumulative impact of development on the historic environment, including effects on settlement pattern, landscape character and the setting of heritage assets, will be taken into account.		
Policy EN7: Archaeology	All development proposals that may affect archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential must include a desk-based study and, where necessary, an archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact on below-ground heritage assets. The level of assessment should be proportionate to the significance of any heritage assets affected and the scale and nature of the proposal and should take into account the potential for previously unidentified archaeological remains. Where appropriate, a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) will be required to outline the methodology for archaeological investigation, excavation, or preservation in situ, as appropriate. The results of the archaeological assessments and evaluations should inform the design, layout and mitigation strategy of development proposals. Development proposals should seek to avoid harm to archaeological remains through site design and layout wherever possible.	Direct	This policy has a direct impact which shall arise from the site-specific assessment recommended to assess the nuances of the historic environment associated to the development.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	In cases where archaeological remains are likely to be impacted, the preferred approach, particularly where remains are of high significance, is to preserve the remains in situ. However, where this is not feasible, and where the significance of the remains justifies such an approach, appropriate recording, excavation and publication will be required before any development can proceed. Results of such investigations should be appropriately analysed, reported and disseminated, including deposition with the Historic Environment Record (HER) and made publicly available.		
Policy EN8: Flood Risk	Development should be directed away from land at risk of flooding in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Planning permission will only be granted where it has been demonstrated that: a) The site will remain safe from all types of flooding throughout the lifetime of the development and provides a safe means of escape or can suitably manage risk to occupants/users through other means; b) The most vulnerable development is located in areas of the site at lowest flood risk unless there are overriding reasons for not doing so; c) Flood risk will not increase on or off site as a result of the development; and d) The site has passed the Sequential Test and Exception test (where applicable). The sequential and exception tests will be applied to all proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Development will be avoided in Flood Zone 3b. Proposals which have to be located in areas of flood risk, either now or in future, must include measures to enhance their flood resistance and resilience so that they can be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment in the event of a flood. This is a requirement for both new or renovated buildings whether in areas with a history of local flooding or in areas shown by the Colchester Level 1 or 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to be at risk of flooding, either now or in future. Where buildings have been demolished within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) for more than 1 year the land should be reverted back to functional floodplain and consequently, development should be avoided within these areas. Where a building(s) is already located in	Direct	Impact to arise from the cost of professional fees for the relevant flood risk assessments and drainage reports included in overall professional fee budget for developments. This policy will direct development to land that has a low risk of flooding and that the new development will remain safe from all types of flooding and flood risk will not increase on or off-site as a result of the development. Developers must include sustainable urban drainage systems to mitigate against flooding risk.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	the functional floodplain, any proposals to regenerate or replace such building(s) must not increase the existing footprint of the building. Development must conserve and enhance the natural flood storage value of the water environment, including watercourse corridors and catchments. Proposals that open up culverted watercourses, where it is safe and practicable, will be supported. In order to ensure access to repair and maintain watercourses and flood management infrastructure, development proposals must: a) Not build within 8m from the edge of the bank of any Ordinary Watercourse. b) Not build within 8m from the edge of the bank of any Main River in accordance with the Environmental Permitting Regulations (2016). c) Not build within 16m of the foot of the landward side of any sea defences or between the low water mark of medium tides and the seaward side of any sea defence. d) Seek opportunities on a site-by-site basis to increase these buffer distances to 'make space for water', allowing additional capacity to accommodate climate change and enhance the natural flood storage value of the water environment. The Colchester Surface Water Management Plan identifies Critical Drainage Areas. New developments within Critical Drainage Areas will be required to provide or contribute towards the provision of flood mitigation options via CIL/S106 contributions, as identified in the Colchester Surface Water Management Plan (and its successor). This is to reduce or mitigate the risk of flooding to existing properties located within the Critical Drainage Area and to accommodate the drainage needs of new developments. Where a site specific flood risk assessment is required in accordance with national policy this should be prepared in accordance with the Colchester Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and in a format that reflects the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) template guidance provided on the planning portal. A Sustainable Drainage Strategy should also be submitted as part of a planning application where a site specific flood risk assessment is required. Any Sustainable Drainage Strategy should be developed having regard to the latest guidance including the CIRIA SuDS Manual, Environment Agency's approach to groundwater protection, Government National standards for sustainable drainage systems, Essex SuDS Design Guide, Essex Green		The cost of such measures is accounted for in the net to gross site areas and external work allowance.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Infrastructure Strategy and Colchester's Green Network and Waterways Guiding Principles (and their successors). Where sites are at risk of groundwater flooding, the Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the planning application should include a commitment to conduct construction phase groundwater monitoring during periods of high groundwater (October – March) to inform the design and any mitigation measures, unless adequate justification can be provided by the applicant to exempt the proposed development from this requirement. All new development will be required to incorporate water management measures to reduce surface water run-off and adverse impact to water quality, to ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Nature-based solutions are a priority for flood and water management. Surface water should be managed in accordance with the drainage hierarchy and be managed close to its source, at the surface and mimic natural drainage as much as possible.		
Policy EN8a: Sustainable Drainage Systems	All surface and foul water flows should be separated. No surface water is to be discharged to a foul sewer or a combined sewer via a new connection. Existing connections to a combined sewer through redevelopment of a brownfield site, should provide betterment in terms of reduced flows to the combined sewer network. All development proposals should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and consider a range of measures as appropriate such as: a) Natural flood management at a catchment scale, including watercourses and coastal areas, and nature-based solutions; b) Existing drainage features such as ditches and ponds to be retained and incorporated into developments proposals where possible; c) Developments close to rivers should consider the opportunity to improve and enhance the river environment; d) Prioritisation for soft landscaped features; e) Inclusion of grey and rainwater reuse systems; f) Inclusion of multifunctional Sustainable Drainage Systems that enhance biodiversity and provide aesthetic and amenity value, and safe public access to be incorporated into site landscape strategies; g) Inclusion of permeable paving for driveways, paths and roads;	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on developments with the requirement for separating out surface and foul sewers, and the provision of SuDS. The cost of such measures is accounted for in the net to gross site areas and external work allowance.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	h) The management and maintenance of all Sustainable Drainage Systems for the lifetime of the development including responsibility and that these remain economically proportionate. SuDS should be designed to be multifunctional, however this should not undermine their function, and these features should not be considered as making a site's entire contribution for open space as required by Policy GN1. They should only be classified as part of open space, if they meet standards for open space and mitigating flood risk. SuDS can also contribute to delivering BNG, and where they do so they must do so in line with Policy EN2.		
Policy EN9: Pollution and Contaminated Land	Proposals must not result in an unacceptable risk to public health or safety, the environment, general amenity, or existing uses due to the potential of air pollution, light pollution, noise nuisance, surface / ground water sources or land pollution. High quality open spaces that meet the Council's Guiding Principles for the green network and waterways must be incorporated into development proposals to minimise environmental impacts and contribute to improved environmental quality through the consideration of the selection of species (e.g. trees) and planting design to address air quality, soil erosion, noise and light pollution. Proposals that include outdoor lighting must follow best practice design principles to reduce light pollution and its impact on dark skies. Where a Lighting Plan is submitted in support of an application, it should contain information to show how the lighting is justified, what luminaires are used and where, how it complies with relevant standards and how it considers wider landscape and biodiversity considerations. Proposals for developments within designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) or where development within a nearby locality may impact on an AQMA are required, firstly, to be located in such a way as to reduce emissions overall, and secondly to reduce the direct impacts of those developments. Applicants shall, prepare and submit with their application a relevant assessment, taking into account guidance current at the time of the application, which must be to the satisfaction of the Council. Permission will only be granted where the Council is satisfied that after selection of appropriate mitigation the development will not have an unacceptable significant adverse impact on air quality and health and wellbeing. Proposals for developments emitting air pollutants which would impact habitats sites and SSSIs should consider measures to avoid and minimise air pollution impacts within the design	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability through the developer submitting an assessment for Air Quality or a contamination assessment, if required. We have made a further allowance for site clearance / demolition / remediation works of £100,000 per gross acre on brownfield sites.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	of the development, including during construction and once occupied. This could include considering the development location, layout, distribution of buildings, on-site activities, location of amenity spaces and infrastructure, sustainable travel infrastructure, vehicle access and levels of congestion on roads nearby to the protected sites. Development proposals adjacent to contaminated land, or where there is reason to suspect contamination, must include a contamination risk assessment of the extent of contamination and any possible risks. Where necessary this should provide any additional environmental protection and mitigation measures, such as landfill gas and leachate migration management, post remediation and management regimes for former landfill sites. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate that there is no likely risk to health or the environment due to contamination. Where planning permission is granted, conditions may be imposed requiring the execution of any necessary remedial works. Where a site is affected by land contamination, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner, who will be required to carry out the above. After remediation, as a minimum, land should not be capable of being designated as contaminated land under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Development proposals on contaminated land provides an opportunity to improve sites through remediation and preventing ongoing contamination. Developers should consider materials management at an early stage. Excavated materials recovered on a development site via a treatment operation can be re-used on-site under the CL:AIRE Definition of Waste Development Industry Code of Practice (DoWCoP) subject to certain conditions being met. For sites that include watercourses or waterbodies, construction activities must be managed to minimise pollution risks from runoff and other pathways. Development proposals located adjacent to existing businesses or community facilities will need to demonstrate that the proposal provides suitable mitigation against any adverse effects produced from the existing uses (e.g. lighting, noise, odour) and does not impact on the continued operation of these uses, in line with the agent of change principle.		

<table>
<tr><th>Policy</th><th>Policy Contents</th><th>Impact on Viability</th><th>Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Green Network and Waterways</td></tr>
<tr><td>Policy GN1: Open Space and Green Network and Waterways Principles</td><td>Major residential development proposals must demonstrate, in a Green Network and Waterways Plan, that new multifunctional open space(s) constituting at least 10% of the gross site area is included in the proposals, subject to site characteristics and design. The open space(s) must meet any relevant criteria in Place policies, be informed by an appraisal of local context and have regard to the following guiding principles for open spaces:

a) They will be multifunctional and help to create greener, beautiful, healthier, and more prosperous neighbourhoods, with a thriving nature network.
b) Support sustainable drainage and help places adapt to climate change;
c) Address gaps in provision to create a coherent green network.
d) Include a varied mix of types and sizes that can provide a range of functions and benefits and, where appropriate, include ‘play on the way’ features/trails.
e) Enable people to experience and connect with nature, and seek to offer access to good quality parks, green spaces, recreational, walking and cycling routes, including the Colchester Orbital where appropriate, that are inclusive, safe, welcoming, well-managed, accessible and encourage active travel.
f) Are designed to be accessible and inclusive to a wide range of ages and abilities appropriate to the nature and status of the site.
g) Respond to the area’s character so that it contributes to the conservation, enhancement and/or restoration of the historic environment and landscapes and creates new high-quality landscapes and a strong place identity to which local people feel connected.
h) Where appropriate, support physical activity through the provision of supporting infrastructure such as seating, toilets and cycle parking etc.
i) Demonstrate how the green space will be managed, maintained and monitored for a minimum of 30 years.

Where residential allocations are identified to provide for 'Enhanced Open Space' as indicated in the Place Policies (and shown on the Policies Map), substantively in excess of 10% of the allocation area must be provided as open space. This should include at least one area of strategic open space and multiple areas of less formal and more incidental open space.</td><td>Direct</td><td>This policy is to promote the retention of, safeguarding of and improving open space.

The policy outlines the need for a contribution from major residential development proposals towards the provision of open space. This has a direct impact on the net to gross areas assumed in the viability study. This has been captured in the net to gross ratios of the sites based on size.</td></tr>
</table>

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy GN2: Strategic Green Spaces and Nature Recovery	The Council will support the delivery of large scale strategic open spaces, habitat creation and restoration of wildlife rich habitats that deliver the strategic opportunities outlined in the Essex Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS). The Council will work with landowners and other stakeholders to support the delivery of the Essex LNRS. All proposals should have regard to achieving the Essex LNRS principles for restoring and enhancing biodiverse and well-functioning ecological networks designed to deliver multiple benefits based on identified need and contribute towards creating and restoring habitats in strategic opportunity areas. Within the LNRS strategic opportunity areas, proposals should demonstrate a positive contribution to LNRS priorities. Proposals for a Roman River corridor nature recovery area, as shown on the policies map, will be supported. Any proposals within this area that are not principally related to nature recovery must demonstrate that they will not prevent nature recovery coming forward in the strategic opportunity areas identified in the Essex LNRS and how they will contribute to delivering habitat creation in accordance with the Essex LNRS.	Indirect	This is a policy related to supporting the delivery of large scale strategic open spaces. This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no impact for this study.
Policy GN3: Local Green Spaces	The following areas, which are shown on the policies map, are designated as Local Green Space. These are green spaces that are demonstrably special to the local community and hold a particular local significance. a) Land at Middlewick Ranges b) Mount Bures village green Local Green Spaces are also designated in neighbourhood plans and are shown on the policies map. Neighbourhood Plan Local Green Space designations have the same policy status as Local Plan policies once the Neighbourhood Plan is made. Development within Local Green Spaces will be assessed in a manner consistent with Green Belt policy in the NPPF. Development will not be approved except in very exceptional circumstances.	Indirect	This is a policy related to development within Local Green Space. This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no direct impact for this study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy GN5: Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) must be provided where a Habitats Regulations Assessment identifies a need for it to provide alternative greenspace to divert visitors from visiting sensitive sites such as the Colne and Blackwater Estuaries Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and Essex Estuaries Special Area of Conservation (SAC). All SANGs that are required should meet the Natural England standard of a minimum of 8 hectares per 1,000 head of new population and comply with the latest Natural England or local SANG guidance.	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on viability through the additional need for SANGs where the Habitat Regulation Assessment identifies a need for alternative space. This will have a direct impact on costs for the developer.
Policy GN6: Retention of Open Space	Policy GN6 applies solely to proposals involving the loss, reduction or change of use of existing open space. Requirements for the provision, quality and management of new open space are set out in Policy GN1. Development, including change of use, of any existing or proposed open space (regardless of whether it is in private or public ownership), including allotments, will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that: a) Alternative and improved provision will be created in a location well related to the functional requirements of the relocated use and accessible to its existing and future users; and b) The proposal would not result in the loss of an area important for its amenity or contribution to the green network or to the character of the area in general. Development proposals resulting in a loss of open space must additionally demonstrate that: c) There is an identified excess provision within the catchment of the facility, and no likely shortfall is expected within the plan period; or d) Alternative and improved provision will be supplied in a location well related to the functional requirements of the relocated use and its existing and future users and will be delivered within an acceptable timeframe to be agreed with the Council.	Indirect	Assessing costs typically involves examining the financial impact of implementing policy requirements. This includes calculating expenses for retaining or replacing existing playing fields, developing new sports facilities, or making financial contributions. A detailed cost assessment should consider construction expenses, land acquisition costs, ongoing management and maintenance fees, and potential revenue

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	In all cases, development will not be permitted that would result in any deficiencies in open space requirements or increase existing deficiencies in the area either at the time of the proposal or be likely to result in a shortfall within the plan period. Additionally, development that would result in the loss of any small incidental areas of open space, not specifically identified on the policies map but which contribute to amenity value and the character of existing residential neighbourhoods, and any registered common, heathland or village green, which contribute to Colchester's green network will not be permitted.		from the facilities. This assessment must be comprehensive and transparent, taking into account both short- and long-term financial effects on the local plan. To accurately determine the direct cost, it should be evaluated on a site-specific basis, so we have not applied any generic cost in our appraisals.
Landscape and Coast			
Policy LC1: Landscape	All proposals and associated land use change or land management must demonstrate that they are informed by, and are sympathetic to, the landscape character and qualities of the locality through evidence-based assessment. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) or proportionate Landscape Appraisal will be required where appropriate, having regard to the scale, nature and sensitivity of the proposal. A LVIA is required for major applications and development in sensitive landscapes and must be prepared in accordance with Landscape Institute guidelines. In considering development proposals, the Council will take every opportunity to reinforce, restore, conserve, strengthen or enhance, as appropriate, the landscape character of the area in which development is proposed. Development must comply with all the following criteria: a) Development must demonstrate, through proportionate landscape evidence, that it safeguards or strengthens, key features, patterns and important views that contribute to the landscape character and local distinctiveness of the area. Proposals should also	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on the construction costs as it sets out principles that new developments should follow in order to ensure that Colchester's characteristics are maintained. Costs may include expenses related to architectural design, quality materials

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	protect rural openness and sense of place, including settlement edge character and the relationship between settlements and the countryside, where these contribute to the identified landscape character and are supported by the Colchester Landscape Character Assessment (2024) or other relevant evidence. Natural landscape features should be protected where they contribute to the historic environment. b) The scale, design, materials (including colour and finish), lighting and landscaping measures are appropriate and would seek to conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the character of the landscape including protection of skylines, visual receptors and key public views. c) Proposals must consider ecological and geological features, identifying areas suitable for habitat creation, and incorporate measures in the landscape plan with details of management and maintenance. d) Development must assess and mitigate cumulative and indirect effects on landscape character, including visual coalescence, incremental change, infrastructure impacts, and effects on the water and coastal environment where relevant. All development should take into account the sensitivity of the particular landscape to accommodate change demonstrated through recognised landscape assessment methodologies. Development proposals will be assessed having regard to their effects on landscape character, with priority given to avoiding significant adverse impacts and appropriately mitigating any residual harm. The creation of new character will only be supported where it is justified by the context of the site, such as within allocated development areas, and where it demonstrably responds to and integrates with the surrounding landscape and settlement pattern. Development must have regard to National Character Area Profiles and the Colchester Landscape Character Assessment (2024) to identify the character areas and features of the affected landscape. Development must take into account the general guidelines and landscape character area specific guidelines. Areas identified through the Colchester Landscape Character Assessment (2024) as having higher sensitivity or particular landscape qualities will be afforded appropriate weight in decision-making. Development proposals must demonstrate how they respond positively to the identified character, qualities and sensitivities of the landscape. Where a landscape is		additional amenity provisions and access.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	demonstrably valued based on its physical attributes and supported by evidence, development proposals should protect and enhance the characteristics which contribute to that value. Development should avoid reduction of and encourage traditional farming practices (including traditional orchards), retaining and enhancing sense of place whilst recognising the need to adapt to and mitigate against the effects of climate change.		
Policy LC2: Dedham Vale National Landscape	Development proposals within the Dedham Vale National Landscape must conserve and enhance its natural beauty, special qualities and statutory purpose. Development proposals within the setting of the National Landscape must be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on its natural beauty, special qualities, accessibility and setting. To achieve this, development proposals must demonstrate that they: a) Conserve and enhance the natural beauty, special qualities, and statutory purpose of the National Landscape, demonstrating a positive contribution through proportionate and evidence-based assessment; and b) Avoid significant adverse effects on the tranquillity of the National Landscape and good quality night/dark skies, taking account of guidance in the Dedham Vale National Landscape Lighting Design Guide (2023) and avoiding unnecessary artificial lighting; and c) Avoid significant adverse effects on the character, quality of views within, into and out of the National Landscape, and distinctiveness of the National Landscape or threaten public enjoyment of these areas, including by increased motorised vehicle movement and adverse impacts to water resources or through cumulative effects of development; and d) Support the wider environmental, social and economic objectives as set out in the relevant adopted Management Plan for the Dedham Vale National Landscape and Stour Valley (including successor management plans), and associated guidance; and e) Meet the statutory duty to further the purpose of the National Landscape, as defined by Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023. Where Policy LC2 applies, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) or other proportionate landscape assessment must be provided, having regard to the nature and sensitivity of the proposal, and evidence provided by that assessment and any evidence and/or	Indirect	This policy seeks to protect land within the setting of Dedham Vale National Landscape. Although this policy will may have an impact of costs for developments located within the area, we have not specifically tested the schemes is this specific area. We recommend that if there are specific costs that arise due to this national landscape area that impact viability of a scheme, then a site-specific viability assessment should be submitted.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	advice provided by the Dedham Vale National Landscape Partnership in determining whether the development meets the requirement of criteria (a)-(e). Applications for major development within the boundary of, or affecting the setting of, with regards to visual, landscape and experiential impacts, the Dedham Vale National Landscape, will be refused other than in exceptional circumstances, as set out in national policy. Where such circumstances are demonstrated, the proposal must be shown to be in the public interest. This includes consideration of the need for the development, alternative options, and the extent of any detrimental impacts on the landscape and its setting, including visual, landscape and experiential effects. Where exceptional development is suitable, all reasonable steps must be taken to avoid harm. Where this is not possible, impacts must be minimised and mitigated. Compensation will only be considered as a last resort where residual impacts remain and must demonstrably contribute to the conservation and enhancement of the National Landscape. Proposals within the setting of the National Landscape should incorporate sensitive siting and design of infrastructure, including undergrounding of new electrical and communication equipment to conserve and enhance the natural beauty and special qualities of the area.		
Policy LC3: Coastal Areas	Planning proposals within Colchester's coastal, estuarine, intertidal and tidal environment, should be informed by the South East Inshore Marine Plan (June 2021) and successor documents as well as relevant shoreline management approaches, including the South Suffolk and Essex Shoreline Management Plan. Within the Coastal Protection Belt, an integrated approach to coastal management will be promoted and development (with the exception of householder applications) will only be supported where it can be demonstrated that it: a) Will be safe from flooding and coastal erosion over its planned lifetime, including allowing for climate change, sea level rise and coastal change, follows a sequential approach by directing development away from areas at highest risk where possible and will not have an unacceptable impact on coastal processes; and b) Will be compatible with the surroundings in terms of use, location, scale and design, and not have a significant adverse impact on the landscape and seascape character of	Indirect	This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no impact for this study. The policy is intended to promote protection of the Coastal belt and to reduce unnecessary development along the coastline unless the requirement for development can be demonstrated.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	the coast, nature conservation designations, heritage assets, and maritime uses including through cumulative effects; and c) Will deliver or sustain social and economic sustainability benefits considered important to the wellbeing of the coastal communities, including the provision of appropriate infrastructure and facilities to support residents and visitors; and d) Will not hinder access to and the maintenance of the King Charles III England Coast Path and, where appropriate, will enhance public access and connectivity. Houseboats: Proposals for new moorings for permanent residential houseboats will not be permitted in coastal areas, including Coast Road West Mersea, because of their landscape and environmental impact on habitats sites. Houseboat proposals for new moorings on historical vacant sites or houseboats of historical maritime significance, may be acceptable, subject to: a) Detailed method statement demonstrating no adverse impacts on designated habitats (including saltmarsh, mudflats and oysterbeds); and b) Compliance with all other policy criteria. Applications for infrastructure to support existing houseboats including jetties, sheds, platforms and fences, and for replacement houseboats or houseboat alterations considered to result in material alterations will be considered on the basis of their scale and impact on surrounding amenity, environment and landscape.		
Policy LC4: Islands	a) All proposals for major development on Mersea Island must demonstrate how the design of the proposal recognises the uniqueness of the island location and island constraints such as access and environmental designations. b) Proposals must demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved and maintained having regard to the island's tidal access constraints, including the potential for isolation during high tides. Proposals should set out appropriate emergency access arrangements and consider the implications for residents, emergency services and service delivery. c) Proposals must demonstrate how they respond to the island's heightened vulnerability to flood risk and climate change, including safe evacuation where appropriate, and residual risk associated with tidal flooding, in accordance with Policy EN8.	Indirect	This policy looks to ensure that all developments provide appropriate mitigation measures. This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no impact for this study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	d) Proposals must demonstrate that recreational and environmental impacts arising from the island location, including on habitats sites, can be avoided or adequately mitigated in accordance with Policies EN1 and GN5. e) Development proposals within, adjacent to, or with potential pathways of impact with the Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) (i.e. how a proposed development could physically or functionally affect the MCZ) must undertake a MCZ screening assessment and, where indicated, a Stage 1 or Stage 2 MCZ Assessment in line with Marine Management Organisation (MMO) guidance. Where impacts cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, development will not be supported, consistent with national policy and the wider objective of sustaining an ecologically coherent UK Marine Protected Area network that protects marine biodiversity and ecosystem processes. Assessments must take into account the cumulative effects of any development proposals. f) Proposals for new or extended holiday parks on Mersea Island must comply with Policy PP23a (Mersea Island Caravan Parks) and demonstrate that proposals will not harm the EU designated coastal bathing water quality. g) Proposals for the removal of touring caravan/camping sites to be replaced with static caravan sites will only be supported where the proposal can demonstrate landscape enhancement and a material reduction in the intensity of the use. h) Planning applications in West Mersea that would result in the conversion of single storey or 1½ storey dwellings to two or more storey dwellings will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated, through proportionate evidence, that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the vicinity and the amenity of nearby residents by way of overlooking and loss of light. i) Proposals that support the retention of the fishing and oyster industries, sailing and boating activities around Coast Road, the waterside and harbour in West Mersea will be supported subject to compliance with other relevant policies.		
Net Zero Homes and Buildings, Renewable Energy and Water			
Policy NZ1: Operational Energy and	All proposals for new residential development should aim to be built to net zero standards, focussing on a fabric first approach to design that delivers high levels of energy efficiency before maximising renewable energy provision on site.	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on viability through the

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Carbon in Homes and Buildings	However, proposals for all development that accord with national Building Regulations will be supported, provided that they demonstrate how building design has incorporated considerations for how heating and cooling demand can be reduced through orientation of the building, the location of windows, thermal mass and shading to provide adequate light, heat and ventilation to the building. Development designed to Passivhaus Classic or Higher standards are also encouraged.		cost of achieving Future Homes Standards and Building Regulations Part L (conservation of fuel and power) and F (ventilation) on new build dwellings. We have made the following allowance in our study: Future Homes Standard (2025 Uplift) – £7,500 per unit.
Policy NZ2: Embodied Carbon and Circular Economy in Homes and Buildings	All development proposals must demonstrate the measures taken to minimise embodied carbon (subject to meeting Policy NZ1 requirements first) and how circular economy principles have been embedded into the design. In doing so: a) Priority should be given to re-using, renovating or retrofitting existing buildings and/or structures on a site. Any demolition will only be acceptable where justified to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. b) Proposals for all new residential and non-residential buildings must demonstrate that upfront embodied carbon* has been considered and reduced as far as possible through lean design, sustainable material procurement and waste minimisation. c) Proposals for major residential and non-residential development are required to achieve the following set limits for upfront embodied carbon. This must be demonstrated through an embodied carbon assessment using a RICS and/or nationally recognised methodology which should be submitted at the same time as the full or reserved matters planning application (and with the outline planning application for residential schemes of 100 dwellings or more, and non-residential schemes of 5000m2 or more): - Low rise residential (up to 11m): ≤500 kgCO2e/m2 (GIA**) or subsequent update;	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on the viability study through costs associated with the design process and the costs associated with the construction of the properties. The costs will be captured within BICS, Net Zero Carbon and Future Homes allowances.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	- Mid and high rise residential (over 11m) - ≤500 kgCO2e/m2 (GIA) or follow NZCBS*** limits when available; - Non-domestic buildings: offices ≤600 kgCO2e/m2 (GIA); education ≤500 kgCO2e/m2 (GIA); and retail ≤550 kgCO2e/m2 (GIA) or follow NZCBS limits when available; and - For building services, meet the global warming potential refrigerant limits set out in NZCBS when available. *Upfront Embodied Carbon = emissions associated with the Building Life Cycle Stages A1-A5 and RIBA stages 2/3, 4 and 6) **GIA = Gross internal floor area ***NZCBS = UK Net Zero Carbon Building Standards (pilot launched September 2024).		
Policy NZ3: Wastewater and Water Supply	The Council will work with Anglian Water Services, Affinity Water, the Environment Agency and developers to ensure that there is sufficient capacity in the water supply and wastewater infrastructure to serve new development. Where necessary, improvements to water supply infrastructure, wastewater treatment and off-site drainage should be made ahead of the occupation of dwellings to ensure compliance with environmental legislation. Developers are required to engage early with Anglian Water Services to confirm water supply availability and wastewater capacity. Developers should safeguard suitable access for the maintenance of existing water supply and sewerage infrastructure when considering the design and layout of development proposals. <u>Water Resources and Sustainable Growth</u> Development proposals should demonstrate that a water supply connection can be provided. To achieve greater water efficiencies and support demand management, all development must demonstrate water efficient design. Residential development must be designed to utilise no more than 85 litres per person per day of mains supplied water / potable water per person per day (l/p/d). Proposals should submit a water efficiency calculator report to demonstrate compliance and include clear evidence on the approach to water conservation.	Direct	The implementation of this policy will require reports to be produced in support of the planning application (cost accounted for in professional fees) and the implementation of any strategy will be delivered through the site works (cost accounted for in external works).

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	New, extended or redeveloped non-household buildings* should aim to achieve full credits within the four water categories (WAT01, WAT02, WAT03, and WAT04) for BREAAM standard within a minimum score of 3 credits within WAT01 Water Consumption issue category, or an equivalent standard set out in any future update to BREAAM. Applicants will be required to justify and evidence why full credits is not possible/viable for the development. Major non-residential development that requires significant non-domestic water use will be required to undertake early discussions with Anglian Water Services to ascertain water availability and feasibility of the scheme and demonstrate innovative solutions to reduce water demands with a focus on rainwater harvesting as the primary source (unless it can be demonstrated that reuse is not viable). A Water Efficient Design Statement (WEDS) must be submitted with the application at the earliest stage to demonstrate how policy requirements have been met and will be maintained in relation to water efficient design. The statement shall provide, as a minimum, the following: a) baseline information relating to existing water use within a development site; and b) full calculations relating to expected water use within a proposed development (such as water efficient fixtures and fittings, rainwater/stormwater harvesting or reuse). Prior to the first occupation of development, a completion certificate shall be submitted to the Council confirming the design standard has been verified and fully implemented. If government policy or legislation relating to water efficiency standards is more stringent or at significant variance with the above policy requirements after the adoption of this plan, the most stringent standard will be adopted. <u>Wastewater management</u> Sewer network a) All development proposals that would create an increase to flows, must demonstrate that there is capacity available in the sewerage network to accommodate a new connection to it to accept wastewater flows from the site. b) A foul drainage strategy should be prepared and agreed with Anglian Water to show capacity is available and a point of connection.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Water Recycling Centres a) All development proposals that would create an increase to flows, must demonstrate that there is capacity available at the receiving Water Recycling Centre to accommodate wastewater flows from the site for treatment and discharge. b) Where insufficient treatment capacity is available to serve the full scale of development at the point of anticipated connection, then appropriate phasing triggers to support development will be considered. c) Where acceptable permanent solutions are not possible to handle wastewater flows from development, development proposals will not be supported. All development proposals must follow the drainage hierarchy for discharge of surface water as outlined in EN8 and EN8a. Land is allocated as an extension to Anglian Water Services Colchester Water Recycling Centre. Proposals must demonstrate how Hythe Lagoons LoWS has been protected and enhanced. Non-mains drainage a) Developments are expected to follow the wastewater drainage hierarchy for discharge of wastewater, with presumption in favour of connection to the public sewer in the first instance. b) Proposed developments should only include non-mains drainage if it can be demonstrated that a mains connection is not feasible, financially or practically, with a priority to be given in all cases to utilise mains drainage. *Non-household buildings mean all development except residential dwellings		
Policy NZ4: Renewable Energy	Planning applications for renewable energy schemes in appropriate locations will be supported by the Council in principle, providing that they do not cause unacceptable impacts, including cumulative and cross- boundary impacts, on: a) Landscape and sensitive views; b) Biodiversity and geodiversity, including irreplaceable habitats, protected habitats and species, and ecological networks;	Indirect	This policy will have an indirect impact on costs in the study. The policy will impact the real estate market through the quality of the environment and

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	c) Water quality and flood risk; d) The availability of grade 1 agricultural land. e) The historic environment (including archaeological remains) and the setting of heritage assets; f) Aviation apparatus and air traffic safety; g) Highways safety, and the safety of active transport infrastructure and rail movements; h) Residential amenity, including potential impacts caused by noise, vibration, dust, odour, light pollution, air quality and shadow flicker; and i) The operation of military defence assets or sites. Proposals involving the provision of solar PV panels and canopies on existing buildings or above car parks will be strongly supported where they do not conflict with other policies in the plan. All applications for renewable energy schemes should be located and designed in such a way to minimise increases in ambient noise levels. Landscape and visual impacts should be mitigated through good design, careful siting and layout and landscaping measures. Schemes should be considered in relation to impacts upon the historic environment. Transport Assessments covering the construction, operation and decommissioning of any wind farm or solar farm proposal will be required and should be produced at the pre-application stage so acceptability can be determined and mitigation measures identified. A condition will be attached to planning consents for wind turbines and solar farm proposals to ensure that the site is restored when the turbines or panels are taken out of service. The mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Statement, required for large scale renewable energy schemes, must be incorporated into the design of the scheme or secured via condition. To maximise environmental benefits, the Council encourages all solar farm proposals to deliver biodiversity net gain of at least 50% and an increase in tree canopy cover of at least 50%. <u>Community Led Energy</u> The positive benefits of community energy schemes will be a material consideration in assessing renewable energy development proposals. The preference is for schemes that are		the strength of the economy created. This will impact real estate values over time through the price mechanism.

<table>
<tr><th>Policy</th><th>Policy Contents</th><th>Impact on Viability</th><th>Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>led by and directly meet the needs of local communities, in line with the hierarchy and project attributes below:

a) Project part or fully owned by a local community group or social enterprise.
b) Local community members have a governance stake in the project or organisation e.g. with voting rights.
c) Applicants demonstrate any benefits of the project to host communities and how these will be secured and distributed.</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Homes</td></tr>
<tr><td>Policy H1: Housing Mix</td><td>New residential developments should assist in the creation of sustainable, inclusive and adaptable communities by providing an appropriate mix of dwellings in terms of size, type and tenure having regard to up-to-date evidence of housing need, site characteristics and local context.

Residential development proposals will be supported where the housing mix is informed by:

a) The most up-to-date evidence of housing need, including the Colchester Local Housing Needs Assessment reports. The housing mix set out in Table H1.1 provides an indicative guide based on current evidence and will be used as a starting point for determining planning applications.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>1- bedroom</th><th>2-bedrooms</th><th>3-bedrooms</th><th>4+-bedrooms</th></tr>
<tr><td>Market</td><td>5%</td><td>35%</td><td>40%</td><td>20%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Affordable home ownership</td><td>20%</td><td>45%</td><td>25%</td><td>10%</td></tr>
<tr><td>Affordable housing (rented)</td><td>25%</td><td>35%</td><td>30%</td><td>10%</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>Direct</td><td>This policy will have a direct impact through affecting the maximum GDV on a development site, through the tenue and dwelling numbers and the range of property type achieving different values.

This will also impact the construction costs for varying property types.</td></tr>
</table>

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	b) Existing housing stock and character of the local area to avoid over concentration of a single size of homes where this would undermine the achievement of creating mixed and balanced communities. All development proposals should provide accessible and adaptable homes in accordance with Building Regulations. In addition, development proposals should provide at least 5% of homes to meet Building Regulations Part M4(3) wheelchair user standards, subject to site-specific considerations, including the type of development and viability. Where an alternative housing mix is proposed, it must be evidenced why this is considered a more appropriate mix having regard to up-to-date evidence, site-specific circumstances and local housing needs. Viability will only be considered as a reason to vary the housing mix, where a planning application is supported by a viability assessment and independently assessed and agreed by the Council. Neighbourhood Plans may set out a different approach to housing type and mix specific to the local area, where this is clearly demonstrated and supported by up-to-date evidence and aligned with the overall strategic approach to housing delivery.		
Policy H2: Affordable Housing	The Council is committed to improving housing affordability in Colchester. 30% of new dwellings should be provided as affordable housing for developments of: a) 10 or more dwellings or a site area of 0.5 ha or more in urban areas; b) 5 dwellings or more in designated rural areas. Affordable dwellings should be delivered on site. In exceptional circumstances, off site provision or a financial contribution in lieu may be accepted where this would not undermine the creation of mixed and balanced communities. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis. Where it is considered that a site forms part of a larger development area, affordable housing will be apportioned with reference to the site area as a whole. The Colchester Local Housing Needs Assessment identifies a clear and acute need for social and affordable rented housing, this should be prioritised, while allowing flexibility to deliver a	Direct	The affordable housing rates set out in Policy H2 have informed our typologies and the appraisals that have been undertaken to test the viability of this policy. This policy has a direct impact on the unit mix and GDV of the schemes tested.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	range of affordable housing tenures, including intermediate products, in response to site-specific circumstances, delivery mechanisms and evidenced need. Proposals should be designed tenure blind, demonstrating no distinctly different design characteristics between affordable and market homes. To promote mixed and balanced communities, affordable housing should be well integrated throughout developments, with layouts and design that support this approach, unless justified by site-specific circumstances including management, delivery or operational requirements. In exceptional circumstances, where high development costs undermine the viability of housing delivery on site, developers will be expected to demonstrate an alternative affordable housing provision. For sites where an alternative level of affordable housing is proposed below the requirement, it will need to be supported by evidence in the form of a viability appraisal. Where appropriate, the Council may seek a review of viability over the lifetime of a scheme in accordance with national policy and guidance, to support the delivery of affordable housing where viability improves. This may include securing a review mechanism by legal agreement specifying trigger points for undertaking a review such as later phases of a scheme or reserved matters applications with the aim of achieving policy compliance and improving the affordable housing contributions. Such review mechanisms will be applied proportionately having regard to site circumstances. Affordable housing should meet the accessibility requirements set out in Policy H1, including provision for wheelchair user dwellings. Affordable housing proposals should incorporate appropriate measures to promote safety and security, contributing to the creation of safe and inclusive communities. <u>Rural Exception Sites</u> Affordable housing development in villages will be supported on rural exception sites where: a) adjacent or continuous to village settlement boundaries or where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities; and b) meeting a local need that is evidenced by an approved Local Housing Needs Survey by the relevant Town or Parish Council on behalf of their residents.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Where it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that a proportion of market housing is essential to cross subsidise the delivery of affordable housing on rural exception sites: a) the proportion of market housing must not exceed 50%; and b) the market and affordable housing must not be distinguishable in design quality and standards. At the scheme level, the number of open market units on the rural exception site will be strictly limited to only the number of units required to facilitate the provision of significant affordable housing units on a rural exception site. The number of affordable units and total floorspace on a site should always be greater than the number of open market units or floorspace. The actual number will be determined on local circumstances, evidence of local need and the overall viability of the scheme.		
Policy H3: Student Accommodation	Planning permission will be granted for purpose-built student accommodation where the proposal: a) Meets an identified need evidenced to the satisfaction of the Council. b) Provides a mix of cluster flats and studio accommodation that reflects the needs of the student population and supports a range of living arrangements. c) Is located in and around the University with good access to public transport. d) Will not result in an excessive concentration of student accommodation in any one locality, proposals should demonstrate, having regard to the existing balance of uses, local character and amenity, that the cumulative impact of student accommodation would not lead to an overconcentration that would harm the character of the area, residential amenity, or community cohesion. e) Provides adequate amenity space for residents. f) Incorporates appropriate measures to promote safety and security, including consideration of safe public realm design and sustainable travel routes.	Indirect	This policy relates directly to student accommodation for which a full site-specific assessment needs to be undertaken.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	A management and maintenance plan must be prepared for multi-occupancy buildings and implemented via planning conditions, which should include measures to ensure on going safety and security and effective management of the building and external areas. Purpose Built Student Accommodation should be designed to be adaptable and capable of conversion to other residential uses in the event that the need for student accommodation reduces in the future.		
Policy H4: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and Co-Living Housing	Where planning permission is required for HMOs, proposals will be supported where: a) Do not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on local character or residential amenity, including through noise, disturbance, overlooking or overconcentration of activity; b) Provide adequate internal and external amenity space, having regard to the number of occupants; c) Provide adequate refuse and recycling storage and services; d) Provide an appropriate level of vehicle and cycle parking informed by the Essex Parking Guidance; e) Incorporate appropriate measures for safety and security; f) Would not result in an overconcentration of HMOs that would demonstrably harm the character, balance or function of the area; and g) Are designed to high standard of accommodation including meeting as a minimum the Essex HMO Amenity Standards and informed by the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), achieving equivalent or improved standards where practicable. The Council will also support alternative forms of communal living providing it does not result in sub-standard accommodation creating unacceptable living conditions for future residents. Proposals should meet the criteria set out above and be clearly designed to enable and promote a communal lifestyle. Proposals should ensure private amenity space is incorporated. The Essex HMO Amenity Standards represent minimum licensing requirements. The Council will seek higher standards through the planning process to ensure good quality living environments and to avoid substandard accommodation. Given that the Nationally Described	Indirect	This policy relates directly to HMOs and col-living housing for which a full site-specific assessment needs to be undertaken.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Space Standard does not directly address shared housing formats, it will be used as a benchmark to inform appropriate internal space provision. A management and maintenance plan must be prepared for multi-occupancy buildings and implemented via planning conditions to ensure the future maintenance of the building and external spaces.		
Policy H5: Supported and Specialist Housing	The Council will support proposals for supported and specialist housing which includes the following; a) residential care homes; b) nursing homes; c) extra care housing (as defined by C2 Use Class); d) retirement living or sheltered housing (housing with support); e) supported living for people with disabilities or mental health needs); f) other housing for people with care needs (as defined as C3(b) Use Class and other vulnerable people. New development proposals for supported and specialist housing will be supported where they: a) Meet an identified need (supported by evidence including the Local Housing Needs Assessment and Essex County Council Housing Lin Study); b) Are located within settlements; c) Are close to local facilities; d) Are accessible by public transport where appropriate; e) Integrate with the existing community; f) Provide adequate amenity space; g) Can demonstrate that the development has been designed to provide the most appropriate type and level of support to its intended residents, including consideration of inclusive design, accessibility and sensory requirements where relevant; h) Have regard to the capacity of local services and infrastructure, including primary healthcare provision, and demonstrate that impacts can be appropriately mitigated where necessary;	Indirect	This policy relates to proposal for specialist and supported housing proposals for which a full site-specific assessment needs to be undertaken.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	i) Have support from the relevant public services and agencies required to support the housing provision having regard to the scale and nature of the proposal; and j) Include a business case, which demonstrates the long term viability of the business, where specific care needs are provided. All proposals for 500 dwellings or more, should seek to include a mix of housing to meet a range of needs. This should include supported and specialist housing (sheltered/retirement housing, housing with care or nursing and residential care homes) at a scale appropriate to the development and having regard to the minimum viable size of such schemes. Neighbourhood Plans should continue to identify opportunities for meeting supported and specialist housing needs and for accessible and adaptable general needs housing within the local communities. The Council will also support development proposals for hospices through expansion of existing sites or development of new sites that are located within settlements. Supported and specialist housing should meet the accessibility requirements set out in Policy H1, including provision for wheelchair user dwellings. Proposals to convert from the C3 to C2 use class, will only be supported where it is demonstrated this will not result in unacceptable or adverse harm to local amenity.		
Policy H6: Self and Custom Build	The Council will support proposals for self and custom build housing, to meet demand as indicated by registrations on the Council's self build register and other relevant evidence of need, taking a flexible and evidence-led approach to delivery allowing requirements to be adjusted based on demand identified through the Self-Build Register, monitoring of delivery, and site-specific considerations including viability. On developments of 100 dwellings or more, proposals will be expected to provide a minimum 5% of dwellings as serviced plots for self build or custom build homes, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that this would be unviable or otherwise inappropriate. Where justified by evidence of local demand, the Council may seek a higher proportion of serviced plots or alternative forms of delivery. All plots must meet the definition of a serviced plot as per national policy	Direct	The implementation of this policy has a direct impact on the viability study through the price paid for land.

<table>
<tr><th>Policy</th><th>Policy Contents</th><th>Impact on Viability</th><th>Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td> Proposals for self and custom build housing should demonstrate high quality design including consideration of inclusivity, adaptability, accessibility and safety in accordance with relevant design policies, contribute positively to the character, design quality and placemaking objectives of the wider development and provide flexibility for occupiers to influence the design and layout of their homes. This should be supported by design codes, plot passports, or parameter plans where appropriate. To ensure effective delivery, proposals must demonstrate how serviced plots will be marketed which should include being made available to households on the Self-Build Register for a period of 6 months. If after that time, plots have not been purchased or reserved by those on the Council's Self Build Register, they may remain on the open market as self-build plots for a further 6 months before being built out as market housing. </td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Policy H7: Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</td><td> The Council will identify sufficient, deliverable and developable sites to meet the established needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople. There is an overall need for 15 pitches up to 2041, this includes 6 pitches for households who meet the planning definition and 9 pitches for undetermined households. There is no current need identified for accommodation for travelling showpeople. Table H7.1: Gypsy and Travellers Housing Need 2024 to 2041 <table><tr><th></th><th>Year
2024 to 2028</th><th>2029 to 2033</th><th>2034 to 2038</th><th>2039 to 2041</th></tr><tr><td>Number of pitches</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>5</td></tr></table> The Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community will provide a total of 18 pitches which will count equally (9 pitches respectively) towards Tendring and Colchester's need for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation subject to delivery within the plan period and supported by robust phasing and infrastructure provision. The remaining need of 6 pitches to 2041 will be met through: </td><td>Indirect</td><td> This relates to the provision of pitches for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople across the plan period to ensure sufficient supply if provided to meet the expected needs of these groups. Supply of new development sites may impact indirectly on the property market. </td></tr>
</table>

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	• Expansion of the existing site at Severalls Lane. The existing site has successfully operated since 2012 and is considered a sustainable location for small scale expansion. • Strategic allocations to be finalised through masterplanning, where provision for pitches will be clearly identified within agreed masterplans or parameter plans and delivered alongside supporting infrastructure as appropriate. In the event that delivery of the pitches as outlined above is delayed, proposals for new gypsy and travellers sites will be considered on a case-by-case basis to endure a supply of deliverable sites in accordance with national policy. Proposals for new gypsy and travellers sites will be supported where they: a) Meet an identified need; b) Are located within close proximity to existing settlements and provide good access to key services, including healthcare facilities, education and shops, particularly where this would assist communities experiencing health deprivation; c) Are located outside areas identified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment or the Flood Map for Planning, as being at high risk of flooding both now and in future; d) Provide access to a range of services such as shops, education, health and community facilities; e) Provide adequate space for vehicles on site; f) Have suitable and safe highways access; g) Ensure the amenity of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the settled community is managed appropriately and that proposals are designed to achieve safe and integrated relationships with neighbouring uses; h) Have appropriate and sufficient drainage, water supply and other necessary utility services; and i) Provide a connection to a main sewer system where feasible, or otherwise demonstrate that alternative foul drainage solutions are safe, suitable and in accordance with environmental policy requirements.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Planning permission will be refused for the change of use of all Gypsy and Traveller sites pitches identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment unless acceptable replacement accommodation can be provided, or it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer required to meet any identified needs.		
Policy H8: Rural Workers Dwellings	Permanent Rural Workers Dwellings Planning permission will be granted for new rural workers' dwellings as part of existing businesses where the following criteria are satisfied: a) Evidence is provided to show that there is an essential functional need for a permanent dwelling, including a requirement for a worker to be present at or near the site at most times; b) The need is related to a full-time worker who is primarily employed in a rural based business and a temporary rural workers dwelling has previously been granted or evidence is provided to justify why a temporary rural workers dwelling has not been required; c) The proposed dwelling is sensitively designed, landscaped and located to fit in with its surroundings and of a scale that reflects its functional role to support the rural business; d) The business has been established for at least 3 years, has been profitable for at least one of them, is financially viable and is likely to remain so in the future; e) The functional need cannot be met by another suitable and available dwelling in the local area, having regard to the nature of the business, the need for on-site or nearby presence, and the availability of suitable accommodation; f) Evidence is provided to show the reuse, extension or conversion of an existing building on site has been considered; and g) The proposed development is not located in an area of high flood risk. Temporary Rural Workers Dwellings Where a new dwelling is essential to support a new business, temporary accommodation in the form of a caravan/mobile home will be supported for a period of up to three years where all the following information is provided:	Assumed no impact	This is a specific policy to rural dwellings which sits outside the parameters of our study which considers 5 dwellings or more.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	a) Evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the business; b) Demonstration that the business can sustain a full-time worker; c) Evidence that the proposed business has been planned on a sound financial basis. The evidence should include a business plan of at least 3 years duration, which provides sufficient detail on the proposed enterprise, including financial forecasts, labour requirements, and how the business will be established and sustained; d) Evidence to show that there is an essential functional need for a rural worker dwelling; e) The functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling, reuse, extension or conversion on an existing building on site or any other existing accommodation in the local area; and f) The proposed temporary accommodation is not located in an area of high flood risk unless it can be demonstrated that the accommodation would be safe for its lifetime and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. If permission for temporary accommodation is granted, permission for a permanent dwelling is unlikely to be granted within 3 years. If after 3 years, a permanent dwelling is approved, the temporary dwelling must be removed from the site. Conditions will be attached to all permissions granted for new rural workers dwellings (permanent or temporary) to remove permitted development rights and restrict the occupancy to that required for the rural business concerned or other agricultural/rural uses nearby. <u>Existing Rural Workers Dwellings</u> Where a rural workers dwelling is no longer needed to support a rural business, applications to remove the occupancy restrictions will need to submit evidence demonstrating that an essential functional need no longer exists for the property and is unlikely to in the foreseeable future supported by evidence such as changes in the nature of the business, long-term business trends, or lack of demand for such accommodation in the locality. The applicant will be expected to provide evidence demonstrating that: a) The property has been continuously marketed for rent and sale for at least 12 months to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and advertised in that period at a price reflecting the occupancy condition; b) Confirmation of a lack of interest from marketing efforts; and		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	c) The property has been offered both for sale and to rent on the same basis to all farmers, horticulturalists and other rural businesses in the local area where a functional need for such accommodation could reasonably arise.		
Economy			
Policy E1: Protection of Employment	Land and premises currently in employment use, and employment provision as defined on the policies maps and listed in policy ST6, will be safeguarded primarily for E(g), B2 and B8 Use Classes where appropriate to provide, protect and enhance employment provision in a range of locations across the Colchester area to enable balanced job and housing growth. Planning permission will be granted for the redevelopment or change of use where: a) It can be demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of the site concerned being used for Class B2, B8 or E(g) purposes. Evidence of marketing of the site / premises for at least 12 months will need to be submitted with the planning application which demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Council, that genuine attempts to sell / let the site / premises for employment use and no alternative business / occupier has been found; and b) The supply, availability and variety of B or E(g) use class employment land is sufficient to meet identified needs for Colchester; and c) It can be demonstrated that the alternative use cannot be reasonably located elsewhere within the area it serves; and d) The proposal does not generate potential conflict with the existing proposed B or E(g) class uses / activities on the site; and e) The use will not give rise to unacceptable traffic generation, noise, smells or vehicle parking; and f) The proposal provides the opportunity to maximise the sites potential for economic growth and support the continued operation of existing employment uses within the economic area. Proposals which promote development or reuse of vacant sites located within existing employment areas for employment uses will be supported subject to compliance with other relevant policies in the Plan. Opportunities to enhance and renew more dated buildings within employment areas, will be supported when proposals are promoted for improvements to	Indirect	The implementation of this policy will affect the quality of environment created across the borough to enable mixed and balanced job and housing growth. This policy has an indirect impact on the viability study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	existing operations or for new operations where the use and scale is appropriate and they comply with other relevant policies in the plan.		
Policy E2: Economic Development in Rural Areas and the Countryside	The Council will protect existing and proposed Employment Areas in rural Colchester that provide an economic function both on allocated sites shown on the policies maps and at other rural locations that provide a similar function. Sites and premises currently used or allocated for employment purposes in rural parts of Colchester and rural sites providing an economic function will be safeguarded for appropriate economic uses to ensure local residents have access to local job opportunities to reduce the need to travel. Proposals for alternative uses will be supported where they comply with other relevant policies in the plan. Within allocated rural Employment Areas and on rural sites providing an economic function, the following uses are considered appropriate in principle: a) Offices to carry out any operational or administrative functions - E(g)(i); Research and development of products or processes - E(g)(ii); Industrial processes - E(g)(iii), general industrial (B2), storage and distribution (B8); b) Repair and storage of vehicles and vehicle parts, including cars, boats and caravans; and c) Other employment-generating uses, such as those related to rural recreation and tourism, which meet local needs and/or promote rural enterprise. Development should be prioritised on brownfield and/or areas with dilapidated buildings. Where appropriate, development will be required to remediate any previous contamination where found. Proposals should demonstrate how they support sustainable transport objectives, including access by walking, cycling or public transport, ensuring opportunities for improving safety are delivered, where feasible. Proposals which would result in large numbers of visitors may not be considered appropriate in rural areas, especially when there are few options for sustainable travel. Conditions will be used where necessary to restrict changes of use and ensure uses remain appropriate to their surroundings.	Indirect	This policy intends to protect the economic environment in rural areas. This has an indirect impact on our viability study but a direct impact on the attractiveness of living in rural areas.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	The following additional considerations will also be taken into account where relevant: (A) Conversion and re-use of existing rural buildings: Proposals for acceptable uses, as detailed above, will only be supported where the building is capable of re-use without significant rebuilding, and the building is deemed to be desirable for retention. In the case of former agricultural or forestry buildings of recent construction (less than 10 years), it will also need to be demonstrated that the original need for the building was genuine and that it is no longer required for agricultural or forestry purposes. (B) Extension of existing rural employment buildings: Proposals for extensions will be supported where they are demonstrated to be beneficial to the operation of an established business. All extensions shall be accommodated satisfactorily in terms of design, scale and appearance within the existing employment site boundary. (C) Replacement rural employment buildings: Replacement buildings will only be supported where the existing development is visually intrusive or otherwise inappropriate in its context and/or a substantial improvement in the landscape and surroundings will be secured through replacement. New buildings should be of sympathetic design and not significantly increase the scale, height and built form of the original building. There is a presumption that heritage assets will be retained rather than replaced. (D) New rural employment buildings: Proposals will be supported where they are of an acceptable scale and meet a local employment need and a business need has been adequately demonstrated through submission of a business case or similar. The applicant will need to submit evidence, with the planning application, which demonstrates that there are no appropriate existing buildings, or employment land available in the locality of site/area. Proposals must minimise negative environmental impacts and harmonise with the local character and surrounding countryside where they are being proposed.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	(E) Expansion of an existing business: Proposals to expand an existing employment use into the countryside will be supported where there is no space for the required use on the existing site, the need has been adequately demonstrated, and the proposals are essential to the operation of an established business on the site. Consideration must be given to the relocation of the business to available land within an allocated or established Employment Area with available suitable vacant land. In all cases, any new development will be expected to have adequate landscape mitigation to compensate for any additional impact upon the surrounding countryside. Proposals in close proximity to a habitats site must demonstrate through HRA screening that the scheme will not lead to likely significant effects to the integrity of the habitats site. Where this cannot be ruled out a full appropriate assessment will be required to be undertaken. Additionally, any planning application within 400 metres of a habitats site must provide mechanisms to prevent the introduction of invasive species. Proposals should also ensure existing systems and processes for protecting the environment and limiting pollution are upgraded or replaced to support the proposed use where required.		
Policy E3: Agricultural Development and Diversification	The Council will support and encourage appropriate farm diversification proposals where they help support the rural economy, are compatible with the rural environment and help to sustain the existing agricultural enterprise. All proposals must be accompanied by a satisfactory diversification plan according to the scale of proposals, which describes how it will assist in retaining the viability of the farm and how it links with any other short or long-term business plans for the farm. Proposals for farm shops as part of a farm diversification scheme must identify the products produced on site or locally and demonstrate that the location of farm-based retailing is necessary to assure farm income where their needs cannot be met within a nearby settlement or district or local centre.	Indirect	This policy intends to support rural environments through diversification opportunities. This has an indirect impact on our viability study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Proposals, that are likely to have an adverse impact on the integrity of habitats sites, Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or the Dedham Vale National Landscape will not be supported. Proposals for renewable energy generation will be supported unless it has a materially negative impact on, or reduces the availability of, Grade 1 land. Proposals for other uses should avoid impacts on land used for food growing where possible, unless it can be demonstrated that there is a justified need and a landscape strategy, which would compensate for the loss or harm, is secured or where there are overriding public benefits arising from the development. Proposals for farm diversification schemes will be supported where they meet the following criteria: a) Existing buildings are re-used wherever possible. Schemes involving the re-use of historic farm buildings shall maintain and enhance the historic environment; including the character of the built heritage; or b) The development is well-related to existing buildings if no suitable buildings are available for re-use; and c) The development is secondary to the main agricultural use of the farm (secondary use will be assessed based on the proportion of land, buildings, and operational activity dedicated to the agricultural enterprise relative to the diversified use); and d) The applicant can confirm in writing that the proposal will not be likely to require new dwellings within the rural area to support the enterprise either at the time of first submission or at any future date. Where new buildings are proposed, the development should incorporate the removal of any redundant, under-used, unsightly or otherwise harmful buildings elsewhere within a site as part of the compensatory mitigation for the additional development being proposed. In all cases, any new development will be expected to have adequate landscape mitigation to compensate for any additional impact upon the surrounding countryside in accordance with policy LC1. New agricultural buildings requiring planning permission will be responsive to their setting and guided to locations on the farm where any impacts are capable of mitigation.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy E4: Retail and Centres	Hierarchy of Centres The Council will continue to promote the role and function of its town, district and local centres to positively contribute towards their viability and vitality. In accordance with the NPPF, the hierarchy of centres in Colchester is defined below: • City Centre: Colchester City Centre is at the top of the hierarchy, reflecting its role as the principal focus for shopping, services, culture, leisure and other commercial activity in Colchester. • District Centres: provide an important role principally serving the convenience-based needs of their local catchments. - Highwoods - Tollgate - Turner Rise - Tiptree - West Mersea - Wivenhoe • Local Centres: provide an essential role providing a range of small shops and services to meet the basic needs of local communities, serving a small catchment. - Local centres defined on the Policies Map City Centres, District Centres and Primary Shopping Areas The Colchester City Centre boundary is defined on the Policies Map and reflects the core city centre area defined in the Colchester City Centre Masterplan. To help strengthen its position at the top of the hierarchy, a mix of appropriate and complementary main town centre uses and residential development will be supported in the city centre, subject to compliance with other policies in the plan. . Policy CC1 requires development proposals within the City Centre to make a positive contribution to levels of footfall, activity and vibrancy and support the City Centre's role and function as the cultural epicentre of Colchester. The District Centres identified in the hierarchy, and as defined on the Policies Map, each have their own characteristics and functions serving the day-to-day needs of the local community as	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability through community facilities associated with development schemes being funded through Section 106 contributions costed into viability appraisals.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	well as providing access to shops and services for neighbouring areas, but not to a comparable level with Colchester City Centre. Primary Shopping Areas are defined and shown on the Policies Map for: • Colchester City Centre • Highwoods District Centre • Tollgate District Centre • Turner Rise District Centre • Tiptree District Centre • West Mersea District Centre • Wivenhoe District Centre To ensure the vitality and viability of the centres identified in the hierarchy, these will be the preferred location for main town centre uses (as defined in the NPPF) as appropriate to their role and function. . Within the defined Primary Shopping Area boundary, support will be given to proposals for retail and other main town centre uses, and commercial, business and service uses falling within Use Class E. A balance between retail and complimentary town centre uses such as upper floor residential areas will be sought where appropriate to secure the vitality and viability of the Primary Shopping Areas. Proposals which make a positive contribution to footfall and levels of activity at various times of the day will be supported. Support will be given for proposals that seek to promote urban greening within centres, recognising that this can contribute to creating attractive, climate-resilient and healthy environments which in turn support creating vibrant retail environments. <u>Sequential Test</u> Proposals for main town centre uses that are not within a defined centre and are not in accordance with this Plan, including proposals for a change or intensification of use, or variation of a planning condition, will need to demonstrate that a sequential approach has been undertaken to site selection as required by national policy. A 'town centre first' approach will be applied to retail and other main town centre uses, to continue to strengthen the role of Colchester City Centre and other centres in accordance with the hierarchy.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Applicants should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale. Only when in-centre sites are not suitable and available, should edge and then out of centre sites be considered. The scope of the sequential assessment should be agreed with the Council. In cases where the Council is satisfied that the sequential test has been met, proposals will be supported where they also comply with each of the requirements set out in criteria a - c below. a) Proposals for main town centre uses on the edge of centres are of a type, proportion and scale appropriate to the role and function of the centre and would not threaten the primacy of Colchester City Centre at the apex of the centre hierarchy, either individually or cumulatively with other committed proposals; and b) Proposals for main town centre uses on the edge of centres are suitable to the town/district centre function and maintains or adds to its vitality and enhances the diversity of the centre without changing the provision of the centre within the overall hierarchy; and c) Proposals would not give rise to a detrimental effect, individually or cumulatively, on the character or amenity of the area through smell, litter, noise or traffic problems. <u>Impact Assessment</u> Proposals for retail and leisure development within edge-of-centre or out-of-centre locations which are not in accordance with this plan will require an impact assessment if the development is over 280sqm (or 350sqm gross). The impact assessment will need to demonstrate that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact on: a) the vitality and viability of Colchester City Centre and/or any other defined centre individually or cumulatively with other proposals; and b) committed and/or planned public or private investment in Colchester City Centre and/or any other defined centre either individually or cumulatively with other committed proposals. Impact assessments should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the retail and/or leisure development proposed. The scope of the assessment should be agreed with the Council.		

NEWMARK

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Local Centres Local Centres, identified on the Policies Map, will be protected to provide shops and community services and facilities. Proposals for change of use or new development within designated local centres will need to demonstrate that it will support the retail offer, leisure or service role in providing for the day-to-day needs of the area and local community and improve the centres' vitality and viability. Proposals to expand a local centre will be considered favourably where it can be demonstrated that the use is small scale, proportionate to the role and function of such centres and will serve the basic needs of local communities. Proposals outside of local centres will be assessed in accordance with the sequential test. Proposals will be required to demonstrate that they will not adversely affect residential amenity, particularly in terms of car parking, noise and hours of operation. Proposals should take every opportunity to promote active and sustainable travel. New strategic residential sites should incorporate local centres at accessible locations within the site where appropriate to provide for the needs of new communities.		
Policy E5: Colchester Zoo	The Council recognises the importance of Colchester Zoo as a visitor attraction and as a contributor to the local economy. The Council will work in partnership with the Zoo to maximise the social and economic benefits associated with its operation and development while ensuring any development proposals have regard to the environmentally sensitive location. The area shown on the policies map defined as the core zoo and expansion area will be safeguarded for potential further expansion of Colchester Zoo to provide additional facilities associated with the Zoo's vision for growth. Development for zoo purposes outside of the area defined will not ordinarily be supported. A comprehensive masterplanned approach to growth at the Zoo is required to ensure the Zoo's Vision for growth can be delivered with appropriate consideration and mitigation having regard to key considerations including: a) Impacts on the Scheduled Ancient Monument and archaeological resource within the site;	Assumed no impact	This policy focuses on the importance of Colchester Zoo as a visitor attraction and how it impacts the economy. We have assumed no impact on this study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	b) Impacts on the landscape character and setting. Any application will need to demonstrate that the proposal will conserve and restore the wooded river valley landscape by managing and protecting ancient woodland, promoting natural regeneration to extend woodland areas where appropriate, and protecting and extending areas of lowland meadow on the valley floor; c) Impacts on biodiversity including Local Wildlife Sites. Any application will require a site-wide and site-specific ecological strategy that specifies protection, enhancement and restoration of the river corridor; d) Impacts on the Highway network including the wider strategic and local network. A comprehensive transport assessment will be required and proposals will need to ensure any necessary highway improvements are secured and delivered before expansion takes place. Contributions towards improvements at the Maldon Road/Warren Lane junction will be required; e) Provision for safe access to the site via Maldon Road, existing public rights of way and accessibility by sustainable transport modes; f) Provision of a linked off-road /multi-user route should be provided linking the Zoo with Gosbecks Archaeological Park to facilitate sustainable modes of travel; g) Provision for an appropriate SuDS for managing surface water runoff within the overall design and layout of the site; h) The extent of any development ancillary to the zoo, such as additional retail, hotel, and food and drink outlets (defined as town centre uses) will need to be proportionate and related to the function of the zoo and assessed against potential cumulative impacts on the defined Centres where relevant thresholds are met (as defined in Policy E4). All proposals for new development within the area defined on the policies map for Zoo expansion will need to be considered in the context of the Zoo's wider vision for growth to ensure possible cumulative impacts are appropriately considered and mitigated. Any proposals must comply with and not prejudice the delivery of an agreed masterplan. It will need to be demonstrated in sufficient detail that any proposals, when considered both alone and in combination with other planned development for the Zoo (whether such proposals currently benefit from planning consent or not), will not give rise to unacceptable impacts, including, but not necessarily limited to, the key considerations outlined above. Where possible		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	adverse impacts are identified when considering any proposal, either alone or in combination with other planned development for the Zoo, adequate mitigation will need to be provided. Any proposals must comply with the Essex Minerals Local Plan and the developer will be required to submit a Minerals Resource Assessment as part of any planning application. Should the viability of minerals extraction be proven at any time, the Council has no in principle objections to minerals workings in the area defined for zoo expansion, subject to adequate consideration of relevant impacts. Any such proposals would, however, be required to satisfactorily evidence that any minerals workings will not prejudice the future expansion of the Zoo. Before granting planning consent for masterplanned growth, wintering bird surveys will be undertaken to identify any offsite functional habitat. Wintering bird surveys should comprise two winter seasons, and both diurnal and nocturnal surveys. Natural England should be contacted for advice on how to determine whether mitigation is required based on the strength of the functional link. In the unlikely event that significant numbers are identified, development must firstly avoid impacts. Where this is not possible, development must be phased to deliver habitat creation and management either on or off-site to mitigate any significant impacts. Any such habitat must be provided and fully functional before any development takes place which would affect significant numbers of SPA birds.		
Community and Social Infrastructure			
Policy CS1: Retention of Community Facilities	The Council will seek the retention of all existing community and social infrastructure and will support proposals for such uses where they meet, or will meet, an identified local need. Any proposal that would result in the loss of a site or building currently or last used for, or allocated for, the provision of community or social infrastructure including community facilities, services, leisure or cultural activities that benefit the community, will only be supported in cases where the Council is satisfied that: a) An alternative, equivalent community facility to meet local needs and serve existing and future communities is, or will be, provided in an equally or more accessible location; or	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability through community facilities associated with development schemes being funded through Section 106 contributions costed into viability appraisals.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	b) It has been proven to the satisfaction of the Council that there is no longer a proven need for the community facility; and c) It has been proven to the satisfaction of the Council based on written evidence including marketing, submitted with the planning application, that it would not be economically viable and that there is no interest to retain the site/building for the existing or an alternative community use either by the current occupier or by any alternative occupier. Where healthcare facilities are formally declared surplus to the operational healthcare requirements of the NHS or identified as part of a published estates strategy or service transformation plan, the requirements listed under (a) to (c) above will not apply. To satisfy the requirements for (b) and (c) above, the applicant must provide: a) evidence that it has been offered on the open market as a whole (parts having not been identified for separate sale) and at a realistic market value, reflective of the current use. This should be for a period of not less than six months by a competent agent; b) Evidence should include sales literature, details of approaches, and details of offers; and c) Evidence that the local community has been notified in writing of the intention to close the facility and has not, within a period of six months come forward with a realistic proposal to assume operation of the facility, including its proposals to finance and operate the facility. Applicants proposing to redevelop or convert social and community facilities serving local communities will be expected to consult with those communities about the relative importance of the facilities which could be lost and submit evidence of that engagement with a planning application. This should also show evidence of consideration as to whether remaining community facilities could satisfactorily meet the needs of the local community, including any potential for combining or rationalising facilities where appropriate. This must be informed by the most up to date relevant evidence and include anticipated levels of population growth.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy CS2: Enhancement of and Provision for Community Facilities	The provision and enhancement of community facilities and services will be supported where they contribute to the quality of community life and the maintenance of cohesive and sustainable communities. Where necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development, the Council will require developers of residential schemes to provide or contribute towards the provision or enhancement of community facilities including education, to meet the needs of new and expanded communities and mitigate impacts on existing communities. These will be secured through the use of planning conditions and by Section 106 contributions or CIL/equivalent infrastructure levy. Contributions may be pooled towards larger community infrastructure projects to cumulatively contribute towards provision on a larger scale where a need has been identified. Where existing facilities can be enhanced to serve new development, the Council will work with developers and local partners to audit existing facilities and deliver any requirements for such facilities to deliver comprehensive provision of services to serve these extended communities. All new or enhanced community facilities must demonstrate safe, inclusive access by active and sustainable modes of travel in line with other relevant policies in this Plan.	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability through community facilities associated with development schemes being funded through Section 106 contributions costed into viability appraisals.
Policy CS3: Education Provision	Sites that are in private or public education use or have recently ceased to be used for education purposes will be protected for that use. Where in whole or in part educational use of a site is demonstrated to be redundant (supported by appropriate evidence which confirms the facility or site is genuinely redundant) or proposals for alternative use are put forward, re-development of buildings and/or the grounds will be supported where the local community is and will remain adequately served by alternative provision and receipts from the sale of land will be invested in improved or expanded education facilities. Proposals should be considered in relation to the scale and quality of any replacement facility and its location and accessibility within the area. Where the proposal involves a state funded school which is seeking to relocate into new buildings or sell assets to fund improved education this will be supported in principle subject to meeting other relevant requirements of this plan.	Direct	This policy has a direct impact on viability through community facilities associated with development schemes being funded through Section 106 contributions costed into viability appraisals.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Proposals for alternative uses affecting sports facilities on education sites will also need to meet the requirements of Policy CS4. The Council will respond positively to appropriate and well-designed applications regarding the creation of new school and education facilities. As expressed in the NPPF, the Council will use a presumption in favour of the development of schools and educational uses including early years and post 16 provision. The Council will engage in pre-application discussions with promoters to develop a collaborative approach to suitable applications. New facilities should be designed to support community use outside of school hours. All new or enhanced community facilities must demonstrate safe, inclusive access by active and sustainable modes of travel in line with other relevant policies in this Plan.		
Policy CS4: Sports Provision	The Council will work proactively with the Colchester Sports Facilities Delivery Group, Sport England, Active Essex and national governing bodies with local (sports) clubs, private operators and community organisations, across the city, to plan positively for the protection, enhancement and delivery of a diverse network of indoor and outdoor sports and physical activity infrastructure, in order to support active lifestyles, increase participation and improve health and wellbeing. New developments will be expected to contribute to the enhancement of existing facilities or delivery of new facilities to meet the needs of new residents, where there is a proven need. <u>Protection of Sports Facilities and Infrastructure</u> All existing sports and recreation facilities, including indoor and outdoor sports facilities (such as playing fields, sports halls, swimming pools, artificial pitches, multi-use games areas, courts and specialist facilities), will be protected. Development resulting in the loss of such facilities will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that one of the following criteria is met: a) A carefully quantified and documented assessment has been undertaken which clearly demonstrates that the facility is surplus to requirements, having regard to current and future needs and its contribution to the quantity, quality and accessibility of provision to the satisfaction of Sport England and the Council;	Direct	This policy seeks to protect existing sporting facilities and enhance/promote new facilities, where certain criteria are met. This may influence the design of developments and generate the need for a S106 contributions which impacts viability.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	b) The proposed development is for ancillary facilities supporting the principal use of the site as a playing field and does not affect the quantity and quality of playing pitches or otherwise adversely affect their use; c) The lost provision would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility, in a suitable location and made available for use prior to the loss and commencement of development, with appropriate long-term management arrangements; or d) The proposed development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the existing facility. <u>Enhancement and Growth of Sports Facilities and Infrastructure</u> The Council will proactively support the delivery of new and improved sports and physical activity infrastructure to meet identified needs and address deficiencies in provision, that should be equitably distributed and accessible across the city by: a) Seeking to provide a wide range of formal and informal sports and physical activities, including traditional pitch sports and emerging and flexible activities (such as exercise studios, padel, and outdoor or informal exercise spaces) that are safe, inclusive and accessible; meeting the needs of all users including women and girls, disabled people and underrepresented groups; b) Enhancing, modernising and intensifying existing facilities, including improved ancillary provision and use of all-weather or multi-functional surfaces where appropriate; c) Supporting proposals from public, private, voluntary and community sector providers which expand access to sport and physical activity; d) Addressing geographical deficiencies in provision, including areas with limited access to facilities or where future demand will increase as a result of growth; e) The identification and delivery of new or enhanced facilities in areas of existing or projected deficiency, where justified by evidence; f) Maximising the use of schools, community hubs and underutilised spaces to provide multi-functional sports and activity infrastructure;		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	g) Integrating sports provision within new and existing communities, ensuring it is accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. New Development Provision All major residential development proposals must: a) Assess the demand for new sports and recreation provision arising from the development, informed by the most up to date Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy and Indoor and Built Facilities Strategy and any other relevant evidence, taking into account the planned growth; b) Provide on-site sports and physical activity infrastructure where this is justified by the scale and nature of the development; c) Where on-site provision is not appropriate, make proportionate financial contributions towards the enhancement or delivery of off-site facilities that are accessible to future residents. Discussions should take place with the Council to determine what should be provided and how it should be managed and maintained. All new sports facilities and pitches must have community use agreements in place and be supported by long-term management and maintenance arrangements to ensure sustainability; d) Ensure provision is phased appropriately alongside the development to meet the needs of new communities. Smaller scale developments will also be expected to contribute to the expansion or provision of sport facilities where existing provision cannot meet the increased demand arising from new additional residents.		
Policy CS5: Tourism, Leisure, Arts, Culture and Heritage	A) Development of new and extended visitor attractions, leisure, cultural and heritage facilities along with visitor accommodation (including hotels, bed and breakfast accommodation, self-catering accommodation, holiday lodges, static and touring caravans and camping sites) will be supported in suitable locations subject to meeting other policy requirements and minimising their impact on, and demonstrating how the development will make a positive contribution to neighbouring areas, respect the settings of heritage assets and incorporate biodiversity enhancements and wider environmental improvements, which complement mandatory BNG requirements, where appropriate. Proposals will be supported in locations consistent with the spatial	Indirect	This policy relates to enhancing the tourist economy, therefore has no direct impact on plan viability. However, an increased number of tourists and an improving visitor

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	strategy and settlement hierarchy, with preference given to sites within or adjacent to existing settlements or existing tourism and leisure facilities. Any new visitor attractions of a scale likely to generate significant visitor movements should be in line with the spatial strategy. B) Proposals for tourism, leisure, arts, culture and heritage facilities should be appropriate in scale and function to the surrounding area and existing uses in the immediate vicinity; be accessible by a choice of means of transport proportionate to the scale and location of the proposal and promote active travel; and not cause significant harm to the amenity of people living and working nearby. C) Proposals in the countryside should help to support existing communities and facilities. Proposals must be compatible with the landscape character of the surrounding area and avoid harm to the open nature of the countryside and biodiversity. Where accessibility is poor, proposals should be small scale and/or involve the change of use of existing buildings or small-scale extension to existing tourist facilities. D) In locations where residential use would be inappropriate, developments of visitor accommodation, where supported, will be limited by condition or legal agreement to holiday use only and/or certain periods of the year in order to prevent permanent or long-term occupation.		economy will, in turn, improve the attractiveness of Colchester to work, live and visit, and therefore will have an indirect impact attractiveness to Colchester as a place to live.
Place and Connectivity			
Policy PC1: Healthier Food Environments	The Council will support development that contributes to a healthier food environment and improves access to healthy, affordable and sustainably produced food. This will contribute to promoting healthy lifestyles by providing access to, healthy, fresh and locally produced food, food growing opportunities and for exercise and recreation. Access to food growing a) Development proposals must safeguard existing allotments, orchards, community gardens, food growing spaces and food markets unless it can be demonstrated that: i. the facility is no longer required; or ii. equivalent or better provision will be secured in an accessible location.	Assumed no impact	This policy is intended to promote healthy lifestyles with sustainable access arrangements for all. This is an overarching policy in which we have assumed no impact for this study.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	b) Major development should, where appropriate and proportionate to the scale and nature of development, incorporate new or enhanced opportunities for food growing, including allotments, orchards, community gardens, edible landscaping and spaces for local food markets. c) Allotments and other food growing spaces must be located so they are accessible to the communities they are intended to serve, including by walking, wheeling and cycling, and should provide inclusive access for all users. Hot Food takeaways and Fast-Food Outlets Some locations are more suited than others for fast food outlets and takeaways. All proposals for these uses need to consider the following factors, and should reflect the relevant evidence, to inform the planning decision: Impact on children and young people: d) The Council will refuse proposals for new hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets within 400m walking distance of the main entrance or exist of i. nurseries; ii. primary schools; iii. secondary school and colleges; iv. playgrounds; v. youth facilities; and vi. other places where children and young people frequent unless the location is within a designated centre e) Within designated centres, proposals for hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets will be supported unless there is evidence that the impacts of clustering or cumulative impact resulting from an over concentration of such uses is having an adverse impact on: i. public health and wellbeing; ii. amenity; iii. air quality and pollution; iv. crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour;		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Concentration of takeaways f) To avoid excessive concentrations of hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets, proposals for these uses that fall within sui generis use class will be supported where the applicant can demonstrate that the following thresholds are not exceeded: i. Within local centres comprising nine units or less, no more than 15% of the existing shop units (or more than one unit) comprise hot food takeaways and fast food outlets; ii. Within local or district centres comprising ten units or above, no more than 10% of the existing shop units comprise hot food takeaways and fast food outlets; and g) All proposals for hot food takeaways and fast-food outlets will require a proportionate Health Impact Assessment in order to appropriately consider the impacts of such uses on local health, pollution or anti-social behaviour, either individually or cumulatively. Proposals will be refused where impacts are shown as having an adverse impact, on communities / catchments they are intended to serve, unless they can be satisfactorily mitigated. In considering proposals applying to criteria (e) and (g), evidence will need to include indicators such as: i. local obesity and healthy weight data; ii. levels of deprivation; iii. local health indicators associated with diet-related ill health; iv. concentration and accessibility of existing hot food takeaways and fast food outlets; v. evidence relating to air quality and pollution; vi. evidence of crime, disorder or anti-social behaviour; Where necessary to make development acceptable, conditions may be used to regulate opening hours where this is appropriate and supported by relevant evidence.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy PC2: Active and Sustainable Travel	To create places that maximise opportunities for active and sustainable travel for all and support healthy lifestyles, development should be planned around a network of safe and accessible active travel routes, appropriate to the scale of development and its location. Proposals for development are required to: a) Give priority to the movement of people walking and cycling. b) Create safe, secure, convenient, well designed and attractive layouts that are permeable for active travel modes, prioritise desire lines and are inclusive and accessible for all. c) Ensure that cycling infrastructure is designed having regard to the latest best practice (LTN 1/20 or subsequent updated guidance). d) Protect, and where appropriate take opportunities to enhance. existing pedestrian and cycle routes, Public Rights of Way, and sustainable travel infrastructure. e) Link the development to the surrounding walking, cycling and public transport networks, having regard to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, and improve connectivity to adjoining areas and key destinations. f) Where appropriate, facilitate access to high quality public transport. g) Where appropriate, facilitate direct safe routes for active travel to appropriate local education and childcare provision; and include school frontages, streets and zones around new education and childcare facilities so that the external spaces they front onto are car free, having regard to the latest guidance. h) Promote the use of car clubs and provide the required infrastructure where appropriate. i) Promote the use of shared micromobility and proved the required infrastructure where appropriate. j) Where relevant, and in accordance with latest best practice and guidance, development should incorporate mobility hubs of appropriate scale and in accessible locations, into designs at an early stage. k) Incorporate infrastructure provision for charging electric vehicles in line with the latest guidance and standards. l) Accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and services.	Direct	This is an overarching policy that will have an impact on the location of development and the design layout aiming to ensure that there are, where appropriate, safe and accessible active travel routes. With regard to this study, we have assumed that EV charging will be captured within BCIS costs, as it is now mandatory.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy PC3: Parking Standards	The Council will have regard to the parking standards set out in the Essex Planning Officers Association Parking Guidance and any locally set parking guidance or subsequent updated guidance, when determining planning applications. The amount of car parking should take account of the following factors: a) Levels of local accessibility. b) The size, type, tenure and location of any dwellings. c) The appropriate mix of parking types including opportunities for car sharing (e.g. unallocated, on-street, visitor, and car club parking). A more flexible approach to the parking standards will only be considered if supported by evidence detailing the local circumstances that justify the approach. Infrastructure provision for charging electric vehicles should be incorporated in line with the latest guidance and standards. Parking for staff, visitors and operational uses on non-residential development should be managed as part of a Travel Plan. Where opportunities arise, for example on mixed use sites, shared parking and car sharing will be encouraged as part of an agreed Travel Plan, to make efficient use of land and to support place making. Secure cycle parking should be incorporated into all development proposals and should be accessible, convenient to use, well laid out and used exclusively for cycle parking. In the case of flats and shared accommodation, secure cycle parking should be incorporated into development proposals and located near the entrance to the building. All cycle parking should be designed in accordance with LTN 1/20 and the Essex Parking Guidance or subsequent updated guidance. Applications for new or expanded car parking provision will be considered on an individual basis in relation to evidence and need. The existing car parking availability, current usage and, where appropriate, the existence of a Travel Plan and the current use of non-car modes, should all be demonstrated. New car parks should include electric charging points and provision of accessible parking bays for disabled users, in accordance with relevant guidance / standards. Where possible, large car parks, for example serving both city centres and out of town retail, leisure and business parks, should be stacked and/or underground to facilitate improved place	Direct	This is a broad policy setting out the approach to parking when determining planning applications. This policy will have an impact on the parking provisions for all developments. We have accounted for the cost of parking within our external works allowance in our appraisal.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	making, provide town centre equality, and result in more compact forms of development which use less land and prioritise sustainable transport. Redevelopment of existing car parking will also be considered to make efficient use of land, improve townscape and support regeneration. The use of Park and Ride and Rapid Transit System will be encouraged for trips in the city centre and other major destinations along the route of the service.		
Policy PC4: Development Density	The Council will support development densities that make efficient use of land, are design-led and respond to the specific opportunities and constraints of proposed development sites. The suitability of a development's density will be considered in the context of potential impacts on residential amenity in the surrounding areas. Sites located in the City Centre, the urban and the larger site allocations (including allocations in North East Colchester, Berechurch Hall Road, Great Horkesley and Langham) should be mindful their context and the opportunity to provide higher densities and compact forms of development that ensure an efficient use of land. Proposals with development densities that encourage sustainable transport and help sustain local amenities will be supported. All residential development will need to be at an appropriate density and massing, having regard to: a) The character of the site and its immediate surroundings, as well as the wider locality, including where applicable the setting of designated heritage assets; b) The adequacy of the access and the local road network to accommodate the traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development (supported by evidence) as well as the scope to enhance walking and cycling access to local amenities and public transport; c) The existing landscaping, trees and hedgerows on the site and the need for further landscaping; d) The provision of appropriate on-site amenities to serve the development in accordance with Policy PC6 and any relevant adopted guidance including the provision of open space and sustainable drainage facilities where suitable; e) Ensuring that development achieves an appropriate balance between private and publicly accessible space. Where higher net densities are proposed, particularly in accessible locations, priority should be given to the provision of high-quality, publicly	Direct	This is a broad policy where we have assumed will be a direct impact on costs as a result of residential development density. The relevant assumptions regarding density and unit mix are detailed in the Typologies Matrix.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	accessible spaces over excessive private space, provided this results in a high standard of residential amenity, parking provision and place-making; f) An adequate standard of residential accommodation being provided for future occupants in accordance with policy PC5; g) An appropriate mix, size and type of housing as informed by the various housing policies. Higher density development that exceeds surrounding densities will be supported where it is appropriately located, makes efficient use of land and demonstrates a high standard of design and placemaking. Any adverse impacts arising from the increased density should be adequately mitigated.		
Policy PC5: Domestic Development	Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings will be permitted, provided the proposal meets all the following criteria: a) The proposal is compatible with the scale, appearance and character of the original dwelling including taking into account the cumulative impact of such development; b) The proposal does not result in harmful over-development of the site, and demonstrates design in scale with its surroundings, taking into account the footprint of the existing dwelling and the relationship to neighbouring site boundaries; c) Proposals for extensions and outbuildings result in an appropriate composition, achieving a high standard of design and retaining the legibility of the original dwelling in terms of design and setting; d) The proposal will not result in unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, including on privacy, overbearing impact, overshadowing or loss of light; and e) The proposal will not result in adverse impact to the appearance of the street scene and character of the area.	Indirect	This is a policy related to domestic development which has no impact on this viability study that considers developments of 5 units or more.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	<u>Residential annexes</u> Residential annexes will be supported where the need for additional space cannot be met within an existing dwelling, an extension to the dwelling or a building conversion within the site, provided the proposal meets all of the following criteria: a) The proposal is physically attached or closely related to the main dwelling so that it cannot be subdivided from the main dwelling; b) The proposal retains some form of demonstrable dependence on the main dwelling, such as shared access (including both vehicular access and doorways) and communal amenity spaces (the use of annexes as a separate dwelling will not be permitted and the desire for annexed occupants to be independent from existing residents will not be considered as adequate justification to allow self-contained dwellings in annexes); c) The proposal respects and enhances both the character of the original dwelling and the context of the surrounding area through high quality design; and d) The proposal does not result in the loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. <u>Flat conversions</u> Proposals for the conversion and sub-division of existing residential premises into flats and other self-contained residential units will be considered having regard to the intensity of the use proposed and the sustainability of the location in respect of the proximity of the site to key services and public transport provision. In addition, proposals for the conversion and sub-division of existing residential premises and, conversions of non-residential buildings where planning permission is required, will only be supported where they meet the following criteria: a) The proposal does not result in detrimental effects to the appearance of the building by reason of unsympathetic additions or alterations, either in isolation or due to cumulative impact; b) Opportunities are taken for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions; c) Appropriate provision is made for parking, private amenity space, cycle storage and refuse storage facilities, in a visually acceptable manner;		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	d) The internal layout minimises possible noise disturbance and/or overlooking to the immediate neighbours; and e) Overall, the proposal will not result in an unsatisfactory living environment for prospective occupiers. <u>Replacement dwellings in the countryside</u> Replacement dwellings in the countryside within existing curtilages will be supported, provided the proposal meets the following criteria: a) It is on a one-for-one basis and the property to be demolished is a permanent lawful dwelling; b) It is of a high quality design that is appropriate to the rural area in scale and character and preserves or enhances access, siting and dwelling orientation; c) It is of a scale appropriate to the size of the existing plot; d) It provides high quality landscaping, where necessary, to integrate the new dwelling into the wider rural context with no greater adverse impacts than the existing dwelling; e) There is a presumption against the demolition of properties considered to be heritage assets and/or properties which positively contribute to the character of a rural conservation area. Note: there is a presumption in favour of retaining properties considered to be heritage assets and/or properties which positively contribute to the character of a rural conservation area; and f) The flood risk sequential test will have to be applied.		
Policy PC6: Design and Amenity	All development, where relevant and proportionate including new build, extensions and alterations, must be designed to a high standard, positively respond to its context, achieve good standards of amenity and demonstrate social, economic and environmental sustainability. Development proposals should be design-led, reflect the local distinctiveness of Colchester and the immediate locality, contribute to placemaking and support the transition to a low-carbon, inclusive and climate resilient future. Great weight will be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area. Poor design will be refused including that which fails to take the opportunity for good design or improving the local area.	Direct	This policy will have a direct impact on viability through the additional build costs associated with design codes and building regulations. We have adopted BCIS build costs rebased to Essex within the last 5

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	The Council will use and/or promote a range of planning processes and tools to help achieve high quality design, including design review and design codes. In addition to the requirements of Policy ST8, development proposals must demonstrate that they and any ancillary activities associated with them will, where relevant and proportionate: a) Respect and, wherever possible, enhance the character of the site, its context and surroundings in terms of its layout, architectural approach, height, scale, form, massing, density, proportions, materials, townscape and/or landscape qualities and detailed design features. Wherever possible development should positively enhance and integrate the existing built environment and other, heritage, biodiversity, arboricultural and landscape assets, including trees, hedgerows and watercourses, removing problems or barriers as part of the overall development process; b) Promote visually attractive, functional, coherent and distinctive environments and encourage the co-location of community facilities to establish a strong sense of place for living, working and visiting, supported by high quality architecture and landscaping; c) Promote and sustain an appropriate mix and density of uses which are well located and integrated, optimise the efficient use of land (including sharing of land), contribute to inclusive communities, and support retail centres and active and sustainable transport networks; d) Provide attractive, well connected and legible streets and public spaces, which prioritise walking, cycling, public transport and community vitality, whilst adequately integrating safe vehicle access and encouraging vibrant community activity; e) Safeguard public and residential amenity, particularly with regard to privacy, overlooking, security, noise and disturbance, pollution (including light and odour pollution), and access to daylight and sunlight in all habitable rooms with no single aspect north-facing homes; f) Create a safe, resilient and secure environment, which supports community cohesion, resilience and pride of place, whilst reducing vulnerability to neglect or crime; g) Provide functional, robust and adaptable designs, which contribute to the long-term quality of the area and as appropriate, can facilitate alternative activities, alterations and can accommodate evolving community needs and possible future development; h) Minimise carbon emissions and energy use through sustainable design solutions such as orientation, massing, natural ventilation, heat resilient materials and tree planting.		years. Our build costs have regard to costs within the locality (reflecting the distinctiveness of the area) and recent Building Regulation standards. Wider design and amenity is accounted for in our external works allowance.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Incorporate water efficiency measures, sustainable drainage systems and biodiversity enhancements to contribute to climate resilience; i) Incorporate an accessible refuse and recycling storage area, external drying areas and any necessary infrastructure and services including utilities, recycling and waste facilities to meet current collection requirements, highways and parking. This should be sensitively integrated to promote successful placemaking; j) Demonstrate an appreciation of the views of those directly affected and explain the design response adopted. Proposals that can demonstrate this inclusive approach will be looked on more favourably; k) Integrate principles of Active Design to encourage physical activity through layout, design and access to open spaces by providing facilities for walking, cycling, play and outdoor recreation; l) Incorporate a network of multifunctional green infrastructure, open space and landscape as part of the design of the development to reflect the importance of these networks to biodiversity, climate change mitigation, healthy living and creating beautiful places. For the purpose of this policy, ancillary activities associated with development will be considered to include vehicle movement; m) All major developments should integrate full-fibre and 5G-ready infrastructure to support digital inclusion and smart mobility; n) Consider flood risk at an early stage when deciding the layout and design of a site and take opportunities to make space for water; o) All new build will be expected to comply with internal space standards demonstrated to be in accordance with the National Described Space Standards (DCLG, 2015) or any future replacement of this. The only exceptions are likely to be housing used for a temporary period, i.e. student accommodation; p) All new applications for accommodation, with a top storey above 11m (about 4 storeys) in height, are required in accordance with Building Regulations to provide sprinkler systems. Consideration should also be given to the inclusion of sprinklers in houses in multiple occupation (HMOs), care homes and sheltered accommodation; q) For applications relating to 'relevant buildings' as defined by Development Management Procedure Order 2015 and associated regulations, a Fire Statement must be submitted demonstrating how fire safety has been considered and integrated into		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	the design of the development, including access for fire and rescue services and evacuation arrangements. Development proposals must demonstrate that they, and any ancillary activities associated with them will be in accordance with submitted Masterplans and Design Codes for specific sites and areas, ensuring coordinated, high quality design outcomes. The Council may also implement Design Briefs and Design Codes for smaller developments. These documents along with existing guidance on Backland and Infill, External Materials, Landscaping, and Public Realm, should be taken into account in preparing plans for submission.		
Policy PC7: Residential Schemes on Greenfield Sites	Major residential developments on greenfield sites must comply with the following requirements: a) The primary public open space should be positioned so as to optimise accessibility and usability for future residents. This space should not be dominated by large water attenuation infrastructure, adjacent parking provision or vehicular movement. b) Include informal areas of incidental public open space within the built up areas of the site, in addition to areas of more strategic or larger public open space. These areas should include both multifunctional green and blue infrastructure, which should consist of a network of integrated features. c) Areas of public open space should be fronted by units in order to ensure good levels of activity and natural surveillance. Similarly, units should front boundaries with existing adjacent roads and countryside edges to avoid domination of the streetscape and wider landscape views by rear boundary treatments. The layout should also avoid these sensitive edges being dominated by parking and vehicular movements. d) Built form should establish a site wide positive and coherent identity. This identity should respond to the sites context and reinforce or enhance the local vernacular. This can be achieved through a historic/traditional approach or through the adoption of a contemporary design solution; both options are valid, but whichever approach is adopted, the detailing must be of a high quality. e) The layout of the development and positioning of elements of landscape and built environment should create a series of distinct spaces and take the opportunity to create character areas within the development. Character areas can be established through the hierarchy of streets, the grain of the development, the spatial enclosure of	Direct	This is a broad policy where we have assumed there will be a direct impact on costs and revenue as a result of residential development. The improvement in design will increase costs but this will also have an impact on the end sales revenues.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	the street, the definition between the public and private domain as well as through landscaping, materials, and the design of the buildings. Distinct and legible character areas within the site should contribute to an overall distinct sense of place for the wider site. f) A variety of vehicular parking treatments should be adopted across the site. Vehicular parking must be well-designed, landscaped and sensitively integrated into the built form so that it does not dominate the development or the street scene. Car parking areas should incorporate green infrastructure, including trees, to soften the visual impact of cars, help improve air quality and contribute to biodiversity enhancement. Car parking areas must be secure and overlooked. g) A clear and legible street hierarchy should be established and reinforced utilising materiality, landscaping and spatial treatments appropriate to their function and movement role. h) Sites should support modal shift, incorporating prioritised routes and enhanced connectivity, both within and beyond the site for active travel modes, including, where appropriate through filtered permeability for vehicular movements. i) Back-to-back distances should comply with adopted guidance to ensure appropriate levels of amenity for existing and future occupants. Where reduced provision is proposed this should be weighed against subsequent placemaking enhancements within the wider scheme. j) Focal/nodal buildings should be included where appropriate to enhance legibility and wayfinding within the site. k) Brick walls should be used to enclose boundaries that address public/semi-public realm, including parking courts. l) Design features should be applied consistently across all elevations of built environment, variations in materiality, fenestration of detailing should respond to the composition of the architecture. m) Meter housing and service intakes, and rainwater goods, should be located out of public view or should be purposefully designed into the treatment of the building's façade, so as to not cause detriment to the standard of design achieved.		

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
Policy PC8: Private Amenity Space	All residential proposals must provide direct and convenient access from the dwelling to an area of private amenity space, provided either individually or communally. The level and typology of private amenity space provision should be informed by its context and the needs of its intended users. Private amenity space must be designed to a high standard for day-to-day domestic use to optimise its use, to meet the recreational needs of intended users and promote health and wellbeing. The siting, orientation, size and layout must create a secure and usable space that functions well, which has an inviting appearance for residents and is appropriate to the surrounding context. Environmental factors that may affect its usability such as sunlight and shade, noise, pollution and drainage must be considered, see Environment policies EN8, EN8a and EN9. All private amenity spaces must be designed to achieve an appropriate degree of privacy. Some degree of overlooking may be acceptable in higher density areas, where this does not result in material harm The following standards shall apply: All new residential development shall provide adequate outdoor amenity space at a minimum standard of 25m2 per bedroom for houses and maisonettes, or 25m2 per flat, with a minimum of 50m2 for any individual or shared private amenity space. This may be delivered either as private amenity space or shared communal provision or combination of the two (where balconies are provided the space provided may be taken off the communal requirement). The minimum standards above should normally be met. In exceptional cases a reduced quantum may be acceptable where the proposal demonstrates high levels of accessibility to an area of strategic open space and facilitates high quality and enhanced design outcomes. A larger amount of private amenity space may be required for small infill (including backland) schemes to reflect the character of the surrounding area. Proposals for infill development will not be permitted if they unacceptably reduce the level of existing private amenity space provision for existing dwellings. For proposals in highly accessible and sustainable locations such as the city centre, where higher densities may be appropriate, reduced private amenity space for houses and flats may be acceptable where this reflects the sites context, facilitates appropriate densities and delivers high quality and enhanced design	Direct	This is a broad policy where we have assumed there will be a direct impact on costs and revenue as a result of residential development. The provision of private amenity space will increase costs but this will also have an impact on the end sales revenues.

Policy	Policy Contents	Impact on Viability	Implications for Local Plan and Delivery Assessment
	Communal private amenity space should have regard to the design criteria for private communal space included in the Essex Design Guide.		
Policy PC9: Play and Child-Friendly Places	All major development should contribute to the creation of healthy, inclusive and safe places for play, providing a variety of play opportunities that support the needs of all children and young people. Development proposals will be supported where they incorporate the following principles in the design of play where appropriate and as proportionate to the size of the development: a) Provide opportunities for play as an integral part of the design and layout of development, including formal, informal and natural play, and are not reliant solely on designated equipped play areas; b) Incorporate opportunities for incidental play within streets, routes and public realm, supporting a ‘play on the way’ approach and enabling play as part of everyday movement and activity; c) Provide a range of play opportunities appropriate to different ages and abilities, including opportunities for physical activity, social interaction and informal recreation, and where appropriate include provision for older children and teenagers; d) Are safe, inclusive and accessible to all, supporting independent mobility and ensuring that play opportunities are welcoming to children and young people of all abilities and backgrounds; e) Integrate play provision within the green network and waterways, open spaces and the wider public realm, contributing to multifunctional spaces, biodiversity and sense of place; and f) Are designed as part of a comprehensive approach to placemaking, ensuring that play contributes positively to the character, function and quality of development.	Direct	This is a broad policy where we have assumed there will be a direct impact on costs and revenue as a result of residential development. The provision of suitable places for children to play will increase costs but this will also have an impact on the end sales revenue.

NEWMARK

APPENDIX 2

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
1	**Benchmark Land Values**		
a)	EUV for agricultural land could be lower (e.g. £10,000 per acre rather than £12,500). Market evidence indicates farmland commonly transacts at £7,000–£10,000 per acre excluding hope value.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 016 (Reference ID: 10-016-20190509) confirms that existing use value is the value of the land in its existing use, is not the price paid and excludes hope value, and that appropriate sources include published agricultural land value data, Land Registry and Valuation Office Agency data, auction results and agents' evidence. The £12,500 per acre adopted reflects a representative plan-wide midpoint drawn from that evidence, applying professional judgement rather than the lowest observed transactions, consistent with the use of averages for typologies endorsed by Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509). The lower figures cited sit within the same range but would not provide a representative basis for testing across the plan area. No change has been made.
b)	BLV could be set at 5x EUV rather than 10x, particularly given surplus land supply demonstrated through the call for sites.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 017 (Reference ID: 10-017-20190509) provides that the premium should provide a reasonable incentive for a landowner to bring forward their land for development. Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) sets out that the BLV should reflect the implications of abnormal costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and professional site fees. The updated study adopts a lower BLV of £62,500 for the strategic sites to reflect the larger quantum of infrastructure and abnormals associated with bringing them forward. The BLVs for the typologies remains at £100,000 per acre. Land supply evidenced through the call for sites is contextual and not determinative of the premium. The derivation will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report.
c)	Using average brownfield transaction values may not be justified if sufficient lower value sites exist. Lower quartile values could be used where land supply is adequate.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 014 (Reference ID: 10-014-20190509) requires land value to be established as a benchmark land value on an existing use value plus premium basis. Paragraph 015

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			(Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) is clear that market evidence may be used to cross-check a benchmark land value but cannot replace it, and that the evidence must relate to fully policy-compliant development or be adjusted so that historic non-compliant transactions do not inflate the benchmark. Brownfield transaction evidence is therefore used as a cross-check, applying averages and disregarding outliers consistent with Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509), rather than as the primary benchmark. Selecting lower quartile evidence would be as arbitrary as selecting upper quartile evidence. Therefore, no adjustments are proposed.
d)	Why do the appraisals double BLV to £125,000 in high value areas? This appears to acknowledge hope value which should be excluded. Farmland has much the same EUV whether it is located in a high or low value area. Doubling it is an inappropriate recognition of hope value	Cllr Sunnucks	The BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.
e)	How can we be confident that the comparables used to justify an EUV of £375,000 exclude hope value? The PPG allows a strict interpretation of existing use. For example a vacant site with redundant buildings in poor repair shouldn't be valued as hardstanding unless the owner has planning permission to demolish the buildings, erect the necessary fences and provide HGV access	Cllr Sunnucks	The EUV assumptions are informed by market evidence and professional judgement, with comparables reviewed to exclude values reflecting development potential or hope value, in line with PPG Viability, (Paragraph 012). Existing use is based on the lawful use of the site, and the study adopts a reasonable and proportionate approach across a range of site types. A strict interpretation based on minimal or alternative uses would not provide a representative plan-wide basis for viability testing. The approach is therefore considered appropriate and no change is proposed.
f)	The viability assessment adopts Benchmark Land Values as low as £62,500 per gross acre for medium and low value greenfield sites. The representation states this is significantly	Turner Morum LLP	The BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs;

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	below levels typically required to incentivise landowners to release land for development and below BLVs adopted in other Local Plan viability assessments. It is suggested that £100,000 per acre represents the minimum level typically required, with higher values expected for smaller sites.		and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.
g)	Agricultural landowners typically require land values of at least 10 times Existing Use Value, and potentially up to 20 times EUV for large strategic sites, to release land for development. Lower multiples are considered unlikely to provide sufficient incentive where land is not under pressure to be sold.	Turner Morum LLP	No multiple of existing use value is prescribed by national guidance. PPG Viability, Paragraph 017 (Reference ID: 10-017-20190509) provides that the landowner premium is the minimum return at which a reasonable landowner would reasonably be expected to sell, established iteratively through professional judgement and the best available evidence, with land transactions used only as a cross-check, and that it may reflect land quality, site scale, market performance and reasonable local landowner expectations. Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) confirms that market evidence cannot replace a benchmark land value derived on that basis, and that evidence must relate to fully policy-compliant development or be adjusted so that historic non-compliant transactions do not inflate the benchmark. The multiples suggested rest largely on unadjusted transactions. The BLVs have been adjusted during Regulation 19 and are set out within the Addendum.
h)	Previous viability testing adopted higher BLVs (e.g. £100,000 per acre) for comparable schemes, including strategic developments such as the Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community. The reduction in BLV assumptions in the latest assessment is considered inconsistent and not supported by evidence.	Turner Morum LLP	The BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.
i)	Benchmark Land Value is considered to relate primarily to land value relative to existing use rather than local residential sales values. Applying lower BLVs in lower value areas and higher	Turner Morum LLP	The BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs;

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	BLVs in higher value areas is considered inappropriate as landowners are primarily concerned with minimum land value expectations.		and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.
j)	Reducing BLV assumptions to achieve viability outcomes risks sterilising development and may not reflect realistic landowner expectations.	Turner Morum LLP	The benchmark land values have not been calibrated to produce a viable outcome. They are derived on the existing use value plus premium basis required by PPG Viability, Paragraph 014 (Reference ID: 10-014-20190509), with existing use value evidenced in accordance with Paragraph 016 (Reference ID: 10-016-20190509) and the premium established iteratively through professional judgement and the best available evidence under Paragraph 017 (Reference ID: 10-017-20190509), reflecting abnormal costs, site-specific infrastructure and professional fees as Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) requires. The assessment has been prepared objectively and impartially by a suitably qualified practitioner, consistent with Paragraph 021 (Reference ID: 10-021-20251216) and the RICS professional statement on assessing viability in planning.
k)	Benchmark Land Values of £62,500 per acre (approximately 5× Existing Use Value) are considered insufficient to incentivise land release. Reference is made to the Harman Report which suggests land values of 10–20 times EUV may be required for greenfield development.	Mersea Homes	The Harman Report is not national policy or guidance and predates the PPG on viability, which prescribes no multiple of existing use value. PPG Viability, Paragraph 017 (Reference ID: 10-017-20190509) provides that the landowner premium is the minimum return at which a reasonable landowner would reasonably be expected to sell, established iteratively through professional judgement and the best available evidence, with land transactions used only as a cross-check. Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) confirms that market evidence may cross-check but cannot replace a benchmark land value derived under the guidance, and requires evidence to relate to fully policy-compliant development or to be adjusted so that historic non-compliant transactions do not inflate the benchmark.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			The BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.
l)	The Benchmark Land Value (BLV) used in page 32 of the assessment is £0.26m. There is no reference to how large the generic 25-dwelling site is, but realistically allowing for public open space, greenspace and biodiversity net gain, it is reasonable to conclude it must be at least 1 hectare (ha) in size. Therefore the BLV can be said to be £260k per ha. However, Table 1 in the Colchester Whole Plan Viability Assessment report suggests that Existing Use Value (EUV) for greenfield sites is just below £31k per ha. This means that Newmark believes that agricultural landowner's will sell their land for development at just over eight times EUV. A minimum factor of at least 10 times EUV should be used to establish BLV and even that is widely accepted to be modest and perhaps not acceptable in many cases, with many landowners looking to achieve 20+ times EUV when selling land for residential development.	Spencer Planning	The assumed site net and gross areas and BLVs are included in our appraisals, which will be shared as pdfs as part of the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLVs have been revised for Regulation 19 and are set out within the report. The premium is set iteratively through professional judgement and the best available evidence under Paragraph 017 (Reference ID: 10-017-20190509), where land transactions serve only as a cross-check, and with abnormal costs, site-specific infrastructure and professional fees reflected as Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509) requires. That paragraph also requires evidence to relate to fully policy-compliant development, or to be adjusted so that historic non-compliant transactions do not inflate the benchmark.
m)	Newmark have adopted a Benchmark Land Value (BLV) of £62,500 per acre for greenfield land in "medium and low value" zones within their assessment. This BLV is far too low. TCBGC would be classified as greenfield land and sits within this value zone, and a £100,000 per gross acre BLV has been accepted as the appropriate level. A landowner pays no regard to the sales values of homes on his land and is only concerned	Latimer	Landowner concerns have been considered and the BLVs have been revised for the Regulation 19 Addendum. The BLV for the strategic sites remains at £62,500 to reflect the implications of abnormals costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and profession site fees required to bring these sites forward for development; PPG Viability, Paragraph 015 (Reference ID: 10-015-20190509). The BLV for the greenfield typologies is £100,000 per gross acre.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	with the price they achieve. This is therefore considered the minimum amount a willing landowner would accept to release their land for development. Anything below this level would not be appropriate and this should be reviewed in the assessment.		
2	**Gross Development Value**		
a)	Sales values have increased while average unit size has reduced to 94 sqm, below typical regional norms. A reduction in sales price assumptions may be expected.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) requires gross development value to be based on sales values of the developments, using averages for typologies and disregarding outliers, and Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) endorses the use of average values and costs for sites grouped by shared characteristics, with market evidence as a cross-check. Detailed market research has been undertaken to establish appropriate values for the differing unit types having regard to the value zones. The values applied are based on actual evidence to date, disregarding what might happen in the future.
b)	Marks Tey classified as medium value area but higher value sales prices assumed in appraisal.	Cllr Sunnucks	The assessment has been updated to ensure alignment between value area categorisation and appraisal inputs.
c)	Evidence suggests little difference between medium and high value new build markets. Large sites may not achieve premium prices due to absorption constraints and build cost assumptions.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) requires gross development value to be based on sales values of the developments, using averages for typologies and disregarding outliers, and Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) endorses the use of average values and costs for sites grouped by shared characteristics, with market evidence as a cross-check. Detailed market research has been undertaken to establish appropriate values for the differing unit types having regard to the value zones. The values applied are based on actual evidence to date, disregarding what might happen in the future.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
d)	Mersea Homes say that "there is little discernible difference between high and medium value areas in new builds according to our evidence". It seems improbable that a large site at Marks Tey will achieve premium prices given i) the bottom quartile build cost assumption and ii) the well documented absorption rate constraints on large sites.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) requires gross development value to be based on sales values of the developments, using averages for typologies and disregarding outliers, and Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) endorses the use of average values and costs for sites grouped by shared characteristics, with market evidence as a cross-check. Detailed market research has been undertaken to establish appropriate values for the differing unit types having regard to the value zones. The values applied are based on actual evidence to date, disregarding what might happen in the future.
e)	The viability assessment does not provide sufficient detail on the residential mix assumed within development typologies, including the proportion of houses and apartments. This limits the ability to understand how gross development values and build costs have been derived and whether assumptions reflect typical development patterns.	Turner Morum LLP	The residential mix for each typology, including the proportion of houses and apartments, is set out in the typologies matrix and forms the basis for the sales values and build costs applied, consistent with the typology approach in PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) and the requirement in Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) for gross development value to be derived from those values. To meet the transparency requirements of Paragraph 011 (Reference ID: 10-011-20180724) and Paragraph 022 (Reference ID: 10-022-20251216), the appraisal outputs will be published as PDFs for the Regulation 19 evidence base, and the Regulation 19 Addendum Report will summarise the mix, unit sizes and floorspace assumed for each typology.
f)	It is unclear whether apartment circulation areas are included within floorspace assumptions. This could materially affect both build cost and gross development value calculations.	Turner Morum LLP	Apartment floorspace assumptions apply a net to gross ratio of 85%, so a 15% allowance for circulation and common areas is made. Build costs are applied to gross internal area but value is derived from net internal area. Circulation areas are therefore carried as cost but not as value, which is the correct treatment and avoids overstating gross development value.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			The assumption will be stated explicitly in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report and is evident in the full appraisal outputs to be published alongside the Regulation 19 evidence base, so no change to the input is proposed.
g)	External market evidence (MCC, October 2025) identifies private sales values of approximately £389 per sq ft net (reduced from £400 per sq ft following recent price decline). Application of higher value assumptions and classification of certain locations within "high value" zones is questioned.	Mersea Homes	PPG Viability, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) requires gross development value to be based on sales values using averages for each typology and disregarding outliers, and Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) treats market evidence as a cross-check. The values in the study represent a snapshot at the date of assessment and vary across the low, medium and high value areas identified. The MCC report post dates the initial market assessment undertaken by Newmark, which considered average values across the plan area. An updated review of values across the plan area indicate a negligible increase, therefore values have remained the same for the Regulation 19 Addendum.
h)	Limited differentiation is identified between high and medium value housing markets in Colchester. It is suggested most allocations should fall within medium or low value zones rather than high value areas.	Mersea Homes	The differentiation rests on transaction evidence across the plan area, used as the cross-check envisaged by PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) and applied as typology averages disregarding outliers in accordance with Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724). The evidence reviewed identifies a spread of achieved values sufficient to support three value areas, and a single medium value assumption would understate values achieved in parts of the plan area.
3	**Affordable Housing Revenues**		
a)	Affordable housing revenues are assumed at 55% of open market value for affordable rent and 75% of open market value for intermediate housing (blending to approximately 60% OMV).	Turner Morum LLP	The PPG Viability, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724), under which gross development value comprises sales values and capitalised net rental income together with

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	These assumptions are considered high relative to current market conditions and may not reflect achievable values		grant and other external funding, states that for area-wide typology assessment at the plan-making stage, average figures can be used. The rates that have been applied are 45% of market value for social rent, 55% of market value for affordable rent and 70% of market value for intermediate housing. These assumptions are adopted to represent a plan position, rather than a spot rate at a single point in the cycle. Based on the Council's updated housing mix, these values represent a blended rate of approximately 52% of market value.
b)	Affordable values are presently an extremely important viability consideration, due to a lack of interest from Housing Associations (HA's) which has resulted in low/no offers on numerous sites which is having a considerable impact on scheme viability. I do not believe more than 45% / 65% of OMV can be justified (for the affordable rent / shared ownership dwellings), which will have an obvious bearing on any viability assessment.	Turner Morum LLP	The reduction in Registered Provider appetite, and the resulting absence of bids on some sites, is a real market condition and is acknowledged. Plan-wide testing nevertheless adopts a position for the plan period rather than prevailing short-term conditions, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509), which provides for average values across a typology with outliers disregarded. The affordable value assumptions are 45%, 55% and 70% of market value for social rent, affordable rent and intermediate housing, respectively. Based on the Council's updated housing mix, these values represent a blended rate of approximately 52% of market value.
c)	Affordable housing revenues assumed at approximately 60% of open market value are considered higher than current market evidence supports. Achievable values are identified as approximately 45–50% OMV for affordable rent and around 65% OMV for shared ownership (blended 50–55%).	Mersea Homes	The reduction in Registered Provider appetite, and the resulting absence of bids on some sites, is a real market condition and is acknowledged. Plan-wide testing nevertheless adopts a position for the plan period rather than prevailing short-term conditions, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509), which provides for average values across a typology with outliers disregarded. The affordable value assumptions are 45%, 55% and 70% of market value for social rent, affordable rent and intermediate housing, respectively. Based on the Council's updated housing mix, these values represent a blended rate of approximately 52% of market value.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
d)	The assumed tenure mix of 60% affordable rent, 25% First Homes and 15% intermediate housing is unclear and may further increase assumed GDV.	Mersea Homes	The Newmark tenure mix has been informed by the Council's policy and comprises 30% affordable housing which is split on the following basis: 40% social rent, 40% affordable rent; and 20% intermediate tenure. This is an amendment to the Regulation 18 appraisals.
e)	Prescriptive housing mix requirements under Policy H2 are considered likely to reduce scheme flexibility and may affect achievable gross development value	Mersea Homes	The housing mix has been updated for Regulation 19. The appraisals have been updated to reflect policy compliance and to assess the viability position of the new mix. The appraisals do not individually test every site, but they do test a range of typologies to provide a sample of sites across the plan area in accordance with PPG Viability, Paragraph 003 (Reference ID: 10-003-20180724).
f)	The policy is considered to place inappropriate reliance on viability assessments to justify changes to housing mix. It is argued that housing mix should instead be driven by site context, character and market demand. The approach is seen as overly restrictive and potentially harmful to delivery. Concerns are also raised that the housing mix used in the viability appraisals does not align with the policy requirements, including the inclusion of 5-bed units.	Mersea Homes	Whether housing mix should be determined by policy or by site context and market demand is a matter of policy for the Council; the viability assessment addresses only the cost and value consequences of the mix tested. The appraisals adopt a policy-compliant mix on a plan-wide basis, applied through the typology approach endorsed by PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509), with values derived in accordance with Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724). The policy on housing mix has been updated through Regulation 19 and the revised policy is reflected in the appraisals.
4	**Build Costs**		
a)	Lower quartile BCIS used for large sites and median for small sites. Market justification requested.	Cllr Sunnucks	Build costs are derived from BCIS data, which is the source expressly endorsed by PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214). Lower quartile rates are applied to the larger typologies to reflect the procurement, standardisation, plot repetition and site management efficiencies available at scale, and median rates to the smaller

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			typologies where those efficiencies are not achievable. That differentiation is a matter of professional judgement, informed by the volume housebuilder cost base observed on larger sites and by the pricing of smaller contracts. BCIS rates are then supplemented, as Paragraph 013 requires, by separate allowances for external works, abnormals, site-specific infrastructure, policy costs and an explicit contingency, so that the total cost tested is not limited to the BCIS rate alone. The evidence supporting the split will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report.
b)	Turner Morum, Morley Riches and Mersea Homes have all questioned the use of lower quartile BCIS for large sites while small sites use the median. Is there other market evidence to justify the difference	Cllr Sunnucks	Build costs are derived from BCIS data, which is the source expressly endorsed by PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214). Lower quartile rates are applied to the larger typologies to reflect the procurement, standardisation, plot repetition and site management efficiencies available at scale, and median rates to the smaller typologies where those efficiencies are not achievable. That differentiation is a matter of professional judgement, informed by the volume housebuilder cost base observed on larger sites and by the pricing of smaller contracts. BCIS rates are then supplemented, as Paragraph 013 requires, by separate allowances for external works, abnormals, site-specific infrastructure, policy costs and an explicit contingency, so that the total cost tested is not limited to the BCIS rate alone. The evidence supporting the split will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report.
c)	Building Safety Levy: the small scheme charge per unit (£23,904 per unit for 25 units) is much higher than the large scheme one (£1,135 per unit for 1500-units). Can that be corrected at Reg 19?	Cllr Sunnucks	The point is noted and the Building Safety Levy has been reviewed in the updated appraisals. The Building Safety Levy (England) Regulations 2025 (SI 2025/1236) come into force on 1 October 2026 and charge the levy per square metre of chargeable residential gross internal area measured in accordance with the RICS Code of Measuring Practice, 6th

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			edition, at rates set for each local authority in Schedule 3, with a 50% discounted rate for previously developed land. The correct Colchester rate, and the previously developed land rate where applicable, will be applied and the appraisal totals will be updated in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report.
d)	It is unclear how BCIS construction costs have been applied to different dwelling types, including whether apartment costs and associated circulation space have been appropriately included.	Turner Morum LLP	BCIS rates have been applied separately to houses and to apartments, reflecting the different cost profiles of the two products, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), which identifies BCIS as an appropriate source for build costs. For apartments, a net to gross ratio of 85% is adopted so that common circulation, plant and ancillary areas are costed even though they generate no sales revenue, with values applied to net saleable area only. External works, abnormals, site-specific infrastructure, policy costs and an explicit contingency are then added separately. A summary of the applied BCIS costs will be included in the Regulation 19 Addendum report.
e)	An apparent inconsistency is identified between the main report and appendices regarding whether lower quartile or median BCIS costs are applied to schemes of different sizes, requiring clarification.	Turner Morum LLP	BCIS rates have been applied separately to houses and to apartments, reflecting the different cost profiles of the two products, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), which identifies BCIS as an appropriate source for build costs. For apartments, a net to gross ratio of 85% is adopted so that common circulation, plant and ancillary areas are costed even though they generate no sales revenue, with values applied to net saleable area only. External works, abnormals, site-specific infrastructure, policy costs and an explicit contingency are then added separately. A summary of the applied BCIS costs will be included in the Regulation 19 Addendum report.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
f)	The appraisal refers to garage costs but does not clearly explain the assumptions applied or which units these relate to.	Turner Morum LLP	Garage costs are included within the appraisals on the basis of an assumed incidence by market house type: 50% of 3-bed units; and 75% of 4-bed units. Garages are costed at 18 sqm at £600 per sqm, equating to £10,800 per garage. The rate is below the main BCIS superstructure rate because garages are a simpler form of construction. These assumptions are applied consistently across the typologies and will be set out explicitly in the appraisal assumptions published with the Regulation 19 evidence base.
g)	A 10% allowance for external works (approximately £13,500 per dwelling) is considered insufficient to cover plot infrastructure, roads, service connections, landscaping and associated works. A higher allowance (e.g. 15%) is suggested.	Turner Morum LLP	The concern is noted and has been considered. An allowance of 15% of build cost for external works is applied in the Regulation 19 Addendum, together with an allowance of £35,000 per dwelling for site infrastructure costs for the strategic sites.
h)	Median BCIS build costs are identified as more appropriate than lower quartile assumptions given required development standards. Build costs of approximately £1,600–£1,800 per sqm are suggested.	Mersea Homes	Build costs are derived from BCIS data, which is the source expressly endorsed by PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214). The build costs have been updated to most recent evidence from the BCIS data base and will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum, along with all other policy cost requirements, which are in addition to the BCIS build cost. Therefore, we do not feel it is appropriate to apply a median BCIS build cost to all schemes given the economies of scale larger developments are able to achieve.
i)	External works allowance of 10% is considered insufficient to reflect expected standards and infrastructure requirements. A minimum allowance of 15% is suggested.	Mersea Homes	The concern is noted and has been considered. An allowance of 15% of build cost for external works is applied in the Regulation 19 Addendum, together with an allowance of £35,000 per dwelling for site infrastructure costs for the strategic sites.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
j)	Future housebuilding cost inflation forecasts (including BCIS forecasts and housebuilding inflation) should be reflected in cost assumptions. BCIS forecasts of 15% cost inflation to 2030 and 2.0% annual housebuilding inflation in Q3 2025	Mersea Homes	The study adopts a current day approach in which costs and values are both held at the same valuation date. That is the approach contemplated by PPG Viability, Paragraph 011 (Reference ID: 10-011-20180724), which requires assessment to be proportionate, simple and transparent, and Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), which points to BCIS as the cost source. Applying forecast cost inflation without a corresponding assumption on sales value growth would introduce an asymmetry that overstates the burden on viability, and forecasts of both are inherently uncertain over a plan period. Whilst the BCIS cost applied has been stated, it is recognised that this input would be updated to a present day cost if a site-specific assessment is undertaken.
5	**Future Homes Standard / Net Zero**		
a)	An allowance of £7,500 per dwelling is applied to achieve the Future Homes Standard. This is considered insufficient, particularly when accounting for building regulation requirements and associated costs. A build cost uplift of approximately 5% is assumed to achieve net zero standards. This is considered understated, with additional costs of around £10,000–£12,000 per dwelling suggested.	Turner Morum LLP	The Future Homes Standard has now been published: The Building Regulations etc. (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2026 were published on 24 March 2026 and come into force on 24 March 2027, with 24 September 2027 for certain higher-risk building provisions and a 12-month transitional period to 24 March 2028. The MHCLG Final Stage Impact Assessment published on 24 March 2026 estimates a weighted average capital cost uplift of £4,350 per dwelling at 2025 prices, with houses in the range £5,160 to £5,690. Therefore, a cost of £5,400 per dwelling has been allowed for in the appraisals, in addition to the BCIS build cost. £10,000 to £12,000 per dwelling is not supported by that evidence.
b)	The allowance of £7,500 per dwelling to achieve the Future Homes Standard is considered too low. Evidence suggests costs closer to £10,000 per dwelling including Building Regulations Part L uplifts.	Mersea Homes	The Future Homes Standard has now been published: The Building Regulations etc. (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2026 were published on 24 March 2026 and come into force on 24 March 2027, with 24 September 2027 for certain higher-

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			risk building provisions and a 12-month transitional period to 24 March 2028. The MHCLG Final Stage Impact Assessment published on 24 March 2026 estimates a weighted average capital cost uplift of £4,350 per dwelling at 2025 prices, with houses in the range £5,160 to £5,690. Therefore, a cost of £5,400 per dwelling has been allowed for in the appraisals, in addition to the BCIS build cost. £10,000 to £12,000 per dwelling is not supported by that evidence.
c)	Net Zero cost assumptions of a 5–8% uplift to build costs are considered to understate the cost and complexity of meeting national standards. Additional costs of approximately £15,000–£20,000 per dwelling are suggested.	Mersea Homes	The net zero cost assumptions are based on available evidence at the time of preparing the study and reflect a proportionate, plan-wide allowance. The representation is noted, and the assumptions will be reviewed alongside Colchester City Council evidence and the emerging Essex Planning Officers Association (EPOA) net zero model policies included in the Draft Plan to ensure alignment with the most up-to-date evidence.
d)	CCC commissioned Newmark (formally Gerald Eve) to produce an up-to-date viability assessment of the draft policies in the Draft Plan that adheres to Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). However, the assessment does not reflect the viability evidence and inputs that support the EPOA net zero model policies included in the Draft Plan. The CCC report should be reviewed to ensure that the costs used align correctly. There are also other things to consider such as including an uplift in the value of the houses built to the higher standards. This can take place as part of preparing the Pre-Submission Plan. "The review of the IDP and full plan viability assessment are key documents for ECC engagement and input following this round of consultation. The Viability Assessment will need to be reviewed following consultation to ensure it can align with the	Essex County Council	The net zero allowance of 5% of build costs has been tested in the base model scenario. A sensitivity has been run to remove this cost to understand the impact on viability given the policy goes over and above national policy requirements. On values, Paragraph 012 (Reference ID: 10-012-20180724) requires gross development value to be evidenced; no uplift for higher environmental standards has been assumed because there is at present limited transactional evidence of a sales premium. All evidence will be published in the Regulation 19 Addendum report.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	most up to date evidence relating to the EPOA net zero development policies and its viability evidence. Mention is also made in the response to specific localities and sites – notably Marks Tey and Langham – where discussion needs to take place and recommendations are made to ensure effective delivery if these proposed allocations are taken forward to the Pre-Submission Plan.		
e)	The policy approach to net zero (NZ1) is considered inconsistent with national policy, particularly the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) and the Planning and Energy Act, as it introduces energy use targets rather than aligning with nationally recognised standards. Concerns are raised that this could lead to fragmentation of building standards and is not justified. While the proposed standards are considered technically feasible, it is argued that the supporting evidence does not adequately assess impacts on viability, affordability, and delivery. In particular, higher standards may increase costs, require new skills and materials, and risk slowing housing delivery without appropriate transitional arrangements. It is suggested that further evidence and engagement with developers is required to demonstrate deliverability and ensure alignment with national policy and guidance.	HBF	Whether Policy NZ1 is consistent with national policy, including the Written Ministerial Statement and the Planning and Energy Act, is a matter for the Council; the assessment tests the cost consequences of the policy as drafted rather than its soundness. The appraisals have been run with the net zero cost of 5% of build costs and a sensitivity has been undertaken by removing this cost to ascertain the impact on viability.
f)	Policy NZ2 is considered inconsistent with national policy and should be removed if national policy remains unchanged. It is argued that the policy introduces a new technical standard without sufficient evidence on deliverability, cost, or availability of low-carbon materials. Concerns are also raised that embodied carbon costs have not been adequately accounted for in the viability assessment, and that such requirements should be addressed at a national level to avoid	HBF	Whether Policy NZ2 should be retained is a matter for the Council. The role of the assessment is to test the cost of the policy as drafted, and PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), requires all policy costs to be reflected. It is accepted that the embodied carbon requirement is not presently identified as a discrete cost line, but we have assumed it would be included in a net zero cost. The appraisals have been tested with and without this cost.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	inconsistencies and potential impacts on development delivery, particularly for SME developers.		
g)	The other policies contained in the consultation document impose significant construction, management and related costs on development, especially housing schemes. For example to comply with emerging Policy NZ1 would cost an additional circa £10,000 per house. It is acknowledged that this is an additionality for Net Zero in the Viability Assessment but this is not considered to be sufficient. The need for extensive areas of greenspace would incur a cost to both layout and establish and appropriate mechanism for funding future management. These costs are underestimated in the Viability Assessment. Other costs related to policy requirements included Biodiversity Net Gain (Policy EN2) and other construction standards (Policy NZ2 on embodied carbon and Policy NZ4 on renewable energy)	Welbeck Land	The cumulative cost of the emerging policies is properly a matter for the assessment, since PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), requires all policy costs to be reflected and Paragraph 002 (Reference ID: 10-002-20251216) requires cumulative cost not to undermine deliverability. A net zero cost at 5% of build costs has been allowed for along with BNG at £1,349
h)	In respect of build costs and meeting Part L and Part F standards, Future Homes and Net Zero Standards, assumptions have been made which fall short of the actual likely costs of meeting these requirements. A rate of £7,500 per dwelling has been assumed over the BCIS build costs in the Newmark assessment. This is insufficient. A more acceptable and appropriate rate to reflect Building Regulation and policy requirements is £15,000 per dwelling (£4k Part L-FF, £6k Future Homes and at least £5k as a further uplift to achieve Net Zero). As lower and median quartile BCIS rates have been adopted, this extra-over cost is considered the absolute minimum requirement to meet the ambitious policy requirements in Chapter 7 of the draft Local Plan (draft policies NZ1, NZ2, N23 and N24) for new residential development, and	Latimer	The Future Homes Standard has now been published: The Building Regulations etc. (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2026 were published on 24 March 2026 and come into force on 24 March 2027, with 24 September 2027 for certain higher-risk building provisions and a 12-month transitional period to 24 March 2028. The MHCLG Final Stage Impact Assessment published on 24 March 2026 estimates a weighted average capital cost uplift of £4,350 per dwelling at 2025 prices, with houses in the range £5,160 to £5,690. Therefore, a cost of £5,400 per dwelling has been allowed for in the appraisals, in addition to the BCIS build cost. £10,000 to £12,000 per dwelling is not supported by that evidence. Additionally, a net zero allowance has been tested at 5% of build costs

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	should be adopted in the assessment to better reflect these draft policy ambitions, if they are to remain as currently drafted		
6	**Environmental Policy Costs**		
a)	Biodiversity Net Gain cost assumptions of approximately £1,003 per dwelling are identified as lower than likely scheme costs.	Mersea Homes	The updated appraisals include a figure of £1,349 per dwelling for greenfield sites and £361 per dwelling for brownfield sites. These costs are taken from the DEFRA BNG Impact Assessment 2019, and indexed in accordance with the BCIS All-in TPI to Q2 2026.
b)	Water efficiency requirements (80 litres per person per day) and associated costs of £500–£1,000 per dwelling are considered inconsistent with the technical requirements implied by grey water harvesting solutions.	Mersea Homes	The water efficiency requirements are recognised, and it is acknowledged that costs may vary depending on the solution adopted (e.g. fittings versus grey water systems). The cumulative cost of the emerging policies is properly a matter for the assessment, since PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), requires all policy costs to be reflected and Paragraph 002 (Reference ID: 10-002-20251216) requires cumulative cost not to undermine deliverability. No discrete allowance has been made in the appraisals. On-site water supply and foul drainage networks, including any site-wide non-potable supply, are assumed within the site infrastructure allowance of £35,000 per unit; plot-level measures are assumed within the external works allowance; the incremental cost of achieving 85 l/p/d over the Building Regulations baseline is assumed within the base build cost and the sustainability uplift, and is in any event immaterial by reference to recently examined evidence of £350 per dwelling at 100 l/p/d; reporting requirements are assumed within professional fees. Off-site network and treatment reinforcement is assumed to be delivered and funded by the statutory undertakers.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
c)	Environmental and sustainability policy requirements are considered not fully reflected in viability testing.	Mersea Homes	Whilst not every policy cost has been identified individually within the appraisals, certain costs where there is evidence readily available have been allowed for including: BNG at £1,349 per dwelling and £361 per dwelling for greenfield and brownfield sites, respectively; FHS at £5,400 per dwelling, net zero / low carbon at 5% of build costs; BSL at £32.74 per sqm and £16.37 per sqm for greenfield and brownfield sites, respectively; SANGs at £3,500 per dwelling; and Essex Coast RAMS at £476 per dwelling. Whilst some policy costs are not explicit within the appraisals, they are assumed to be contained without other allowances in the absence of sufficient market evidence. That approach follows PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), which requires all policy costs to be included, and Paragraph 002 (Reference ID: 10-002-20251216), which requires the cumulative cost of policy not to undermine deliverability.
d)	With regard to cost of delivering BNG we note that the viability assessment use Defra Impact Assessment from 2019. This could significantly underestimate the cost of meeting BNG in Colchester as the cost of off-site credits used in that study are based on the 2019 DEFRA Impact Assessment which assumed costs of these at £11,000. However, our members are experiencing costs of over £30,000 per unit with the cost vary-ing based on the habitat type and the where the offsetting units are being delivered. Evidence on costs of off-site credits shows that in the south of England costs range from £25,000 for neural grassland of medium distinctiveness up to £190,000 for the very high distinctiveness water courses. Careful consideration will need to be given as to the type of BNG that may be required on allocated sites, the level of on-site delivery that is possible and	HBF	The updated appraisals include a figure of £1,349 per dwelling for greenfield sites and £361 per dwelling for brownfield sites. These costs are taken from the DEFRA BNG Impact Assessment 2019, and indexed in accordance with the BCIS All-in TPI to Q2 2026. The viability assessment is undertaken on a typology approach and includes average costs in accordance with PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509). We appreciate costs and mitigation measures can vary significantly from site to site and a sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to understand the impact of certain adjusts on the viability of the scheme. Our approach is set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum report.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	ensure that an viability assessments reflect the potential cost of delivering this habitat offsite.		
7	**Planning Obligations / Infrastructure Contributions**		
a)	An allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for S106 obligations is considered below levels typically experienced in development proposals in Colchester and may understate costs.	Turner Morum LLP	The Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites is derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, which is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG. That allowance should be distinguished from the total policy costs tested, which also includes affordable housing, Future Homes Standard and net zero allowance, biodiversity net gain, site infrastructure and the Building Safety Levy. Any obligation sought must in any event satisfy the tests in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, so contributions on individual schemes will vary with the mitigation required.
b)	Appropriate healthcare costs should be factored into the Local Plan Viability Assessment for relevant typologies. Such an approach means that developers are adequately informed in advance that they may be required to make contributions towards healthcare infrastructure. A separate cost input for health infrastructure in the plan viability assessment would ensure that healthcare mitigation is appropriately weighted when evaluating the potential planning obligations necessary to mitigate the full impact of a development. This is particularly important in situations where a viability assessment	NHS	The Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites is derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, which is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG. Itemised contributions have not been presented in the viability assessment and it is assumed that healthcare costs would be included within these sums.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	demonstrates that proposals are unable to fund the full range of infrastructure requirements.		
c)	Site infrastructure costs: the appraisals allow £5,000 per unit on small sites and £35,000 on large ones. Am I right in thinking that site infrastructure only includes items within the red line defining the allocation, and that the majority of the £800m funding gap relates to items outside it	Cllr Sunnucks	Site infrastructure allowances of £5,000 per unit for the non-strategic typologies and £35,000 per unit for the strategic typologies cover the infrastructure required to enable the development in question, including access works, spine roads, utilities, drainage and on-site open space. They are not confined to works within the red line boundary, but they are limited to works reasonably attributable to the development, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), which requires site-specific infrastructure costs to be reflected. A distinction should be drawn between those allowances and the wider funding requirement referred to. The viability assessment tests what development can reasonably bear; the extent of any residual funding gap, and how it is to be met, is a matter for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Council's funding strategy.
d)	S106 contributions of £10,500 per dwelling for non-strategic development are identified as lower than recent Colchester schemes, which are stated to achieve £15,000–£20,000 per dwelling and £25,000–£60,000 per dwelling for strategic sites including infrastructure delivery plan costs.	Mersea Homes	The Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites is derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, which is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG. That allowance should be distinguished from the total policy costs tested, which also includes affordable housing, Future Homes Standard and net zero allowance, biodiversity net gain, site infrastructure and the Building Safety Levy. Any obligation sought must in any event satisfy the tests in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			Regulations 2010, so contributions on individual schemes will vary with the mitigation required.
e)	Paragraph 3.67 of the Regulation 18 document confirms that the Council will continue to seek developer contributions through Section 106 and may consider the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy. Although we broadly support this approach, the Local Plan needs to provide an indication as to the level of Section 106 that may be requested for different types of development in different parts of the plan area. Without this clarification, the Council's Viability Appraisal is flawed because assumptions used in relation to Section 106 may not be accurate and therefore could be under or over stating requirements that need to meet the tests for planning obligations.	Boyer	The support for the approach is welcomed and the underlying point is accepted in principle. PPG Viability, Paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 10-001-20251216), requires plan makers to set out the contributions expected from development, and paragraph 59 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) provides that compliant applications should then be assumed viable, which places weight on the clarity of the policy requirements tested. The assessment allows £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites for Section 106, derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, together with separate allowances for affordable housing, site infrastructure and other policy costs. Whatever is sought must satisfy paragraph 58 of the Framework and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.
f)	We are concerned that the 'Newmark' figures for contributions do not cross reference to other figures in the documentation, and in policy PP34 equate to contributions being at £79k per dwelling, completely at odds with the £19k per dwelling on the 150 homes already agreed under outline planning permission 250545. We would like these figures to be re-reconciled to give us more confidence in the plan. We are however comforted that they still find the proposal viable at these contribution levels.	Tanya Riley	The Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites is derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, which is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG. That allowance should be distinguished from the total policy costs tested, which also includes affordable housing, Future Homes Standard and net zero allowance, biodiversity net gain, site infrastructure and the Building Safety Levy. Any obligation sought must in any event satisfy the tests in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			Regulations 2010, so contributions on individual schemes will vary with the mitigation required.
g)	Colchester currently raises around £7,300 per new dwelling from s106. The viability appraisals show that there is headroom to collect significantly more, but no specific mechanism is proposed	Cllr Sunnucks	The mechanism for capturing further contributions, whether through policy requirements expressed as a single figure in accordance with PPG Viability, Paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 10-001-20251216), or through a Community Infrastructure Levy, is a matter for the Council. A CIL sensitivity has been undertaken as part of the Regulation 19 appraisals.
h)	Page 32 of the Full Appraisals for Colchester Whole Plan Viability Assessment report suggests that total planning obligations (i.e. s106 costs and any CIL) for a generic 25-dwelling greenfield site, in a medium value area (such as Layer de la Haye) could total £1.55m. This equates to approximately £62k per dwelling and is a very substantial figure, far in excess of that usually experienced in Colchester or Essex. For example, the Denbury Homes site for 70 dwellings on land west of The Folley, Layer de la Haye, was approved by CCC's planning committee on 15th February 2024 with planning obligations totalling approximately £0.60m or circa £8.6k per dwelling, according to the committee report. With this in mind, how have Newmark justified a figure of approximately £62k per dwelling elsewhere in and around Layer de la Haye?	Spencer Planning	It is not clear if you are referring to just the Section 106 allowance or the full policy costs. As part of the Regulation 19 appraisals, an allowance for S106 costs in the typologies has been included at £10,500 per dwelling, derived from contributions actually secured by the Council. This is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG.
i)	Page 32 of the Full Appraisals for Colchester Whole Plan Viability Assessment report concludes that a generic 25-dwelling greenfield site, in a medium value area (such as Layer de la Haye), is viable even with planning contributions of approximately £62k per dwelling. However, this would represent an extremely high level of planning obligations and Spencer Planning is not aware of any residential development being found viable and actually delivered at or near this figure	Spencer Planning	The Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling for the typologies and £25,000 per dwelling for the strategic sites is derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, which is the evidence base available for plan-wide testing and is consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), and with the monitoring and Infrastructure Funding Statement provisions of the PPG. That allowance should be distinguished from the total policy costs tested, which also includes affordable housing, Future Homes

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	in Essex. Does CCC have any practical examples of where this has worked successfully?		Standard and net zero allowance, biodiversity net gain, site infrastructure and the Building Safety Levy. Any obligation sought must in any event satisfy the tests in paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) and regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, so contributions on individual schemes will vary with the mitigation required.
j)	The policy (on sport provision) states that all major residential development must assess the ne for new sport provision. It should not be for individual development to assess the need for sport provision on their sites. This should be set out in the local plan to ensure that there is transparency about what is needed and ensure that any provision is fully accounted for within the viability assessment.	HBF	The transparency point is supported. PPG Viability, Paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 10-001-20251216), requires plan makers to set out the contributions expected from development, and Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214), requires all policy costs to be reflected in the assessment, so it is preferable for the Plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to identify sport and recreation requirements rather than leaving them to be established scheme by scheme. Sport provision is presently captured within the Section 106 allowance of £10,500 per dwelling, derived from contributions actually secured by the Council, together with the on-site open space element of the site infrastructure allowances. The purpose of the viability assessment is to test planning policy. The need for sport provision will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
8	**Finance Costs**		
a)	Interest on land: the 1500-unit appraisal shows £4.8m which looks low for a 9 year project at 7.5% on an RLV of £55.6m. Please can we see the cash flows to understand why	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214) treats finance costs, including loans, as a development cost. Finance is therefore calculated within the appraisal cashflow rather than as a flat percentage of cost or of gross development value, applying a debit rate to the outstanding balance in each period, assuming a 100% debt financed scheme. Interest on land has been updated in the Regulation 19 Addendum and accrues only on the sums

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			actually drawn. The timing assumptions applied in the appraisals will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum.
b)	Request for clarification on appraisal totals, as the bottom lines do not appear to add up, including exclusion of land interest from RLV and potential duplication in acquisition costs (SDLT and fees), which were not issues in the February appraisals.	Cllr Sunnucks	PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214) treats finance costs, including loans, as a development cost. Finance is therefore calculated within the appraisal cashflow rather than as a flat percentage of cost or of gross development value, applying a debit rate to the outstanding balance in each period, assuming a 100% debt financed scheme. Interest on land has been updated in the Regulation 19 Addendum and accrues only on the sums actually drawn. The timing assumptions applied in the appraisals will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum.
c)	Finance costs included in the appraisal appear low relative to scheme scale, gross development value and infrastructure costs, and may not reflect typical development finance requirements. Detailed cashflow assumptions are not provided, limiting the ability to verify finance cost calculations. The finance costs within one of the appraisals for the 400-dwelling strategic allocation are only **£473k**. In my opinion, this cannot be enough for a Greenfield Net Zero development, with significant infrastructure costs, a GDV of £143m and up-front land costs of £7.4m (based on Newmark's RLV).	Turner Morum LLP	PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214) treats finance costs, including loans, as a development cost. Finance is therefore calculated within the appraisal cashflow rather than as a flat percentage of cost or of gross development value, applying a debit rate to the outstanding balance in each period, assuming a 100% debt financed scheme. Interest on land has been updated in the Regulation 19 Addendum and accrues only on the sums actually drawn. The timing assumptions applied in the appraisals will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum.
d)	Finance costs appear understated relative to scheme scale and infrastructure requirements. Example provided of a 300-dwelling scheme with approximately £21 million infrastructure cost assuming only £472,000 in finance costs.	Mersea Homes	PPG Viability, Paragraph 013 (Reference ID: 10-013-20240214) treats finance costs, including loans, as a development cost. Finance is therefore calculated within the appraisal cashflow rather than as a flat percentage of cost or of gross development value, applying a debit rate to the

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			outstanding balance in each period, assuming a 100% debt financed scheme. Interest on land has been updated in the Regulation 19 Addendum and accrues only on the sums actually drawn. The timing assumptions applied in the appraisals will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum.
e)	The 'Total Cost (exc. Finance)' of development on Page 32 of the Full Appraisals for Colchester Whole Plan Viability Assessment report is stated as £7.07m. However, the sum of the actual figures listed above this total comes to £7.34m. Circa £0.27m appears to be missing from the total, with no explanation why. Furthermore, the 'Development Value Summary' refers to a different 'Total Cost' of £7.06m which – even after 'Finance' costs are removed – does not match either of the aforementioned figures. These errors are a consistent issue throughout the Full Appraisals for Colchester Whole Plan Viability Assessment report.	Spencer Planning	The appraisals has been updated during Regulation 19 and all updated are set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum report.
9	**Profit**		
a)	Request to confirm developer profit is paid throughout the project (not only in year 9) in the 1,500-dwelling appraisal, to ensure consistent treatment of strategic sites vs organic growth, and to provide supporting cashflows.	Cllr Sunnucks	This assessment has been carried out in line with the government's recommended approach to viability testing at plank-making stage. PPG Viability, Paragraph 019 (Reference ID: 10-019-20190509) provides that risk is accounted for in the assumed return, and that a return of 15 to 20% of gross development value may be suitable for plan making, with alternatives where this can be justified by the type, scale and risk profile of the development, and a lower return where affordable housing is sold at a known value and risk is reduced. The return is accordingly applied as a fixed percentage of gross development value, consistently across all typologies including the strategic sites, and is not phased as a cost within the

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			cashflow; the timing of distributions to a developer does not alter the residual outcome.
10	**CIL**		
a)	The ICB would be supportive of the introduction of CIL. We have seen in other LPAs that it allows for greater opportunities for infrastructure delivery. CIL allows the ICB to better forecast how and what it would like to spend the CIL on and due to its nature is better for pooling funds for cumulative growth and allows for larger infrastructure projects to come forward, for example the cost of a new Ambulance Hub for Colchester is likely to be in the region of £22m and have a life span of 30 years.	Integrated Care Board	The Integrated Care Board's support for the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy is noted. Consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 001 (Reference ID: 10-001-20251216) and Paragraph 013, the cost implication of CIL is a policy cost that must be included in plan-wide testing, and the study includes sensitivity testing of the potential introduction of CIL alongside the other policy requirements so that the cumulative burden can be understood. It is also noted that the pooling restriction formerly contained in regulation 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 was removed on 1 September 2019, so contributions towards larger infrastructure projects may be pooled through planning obligations, subject to the tests in regulation 122. Setting or reviewing a charging schedule is a separate statutory process for the Council and is not determined by this assessment.
11	**Strategic Sites**		
b)	There appears to be a mismatch between the full site areas marked on the allocations maps and the land “bought” in the appraisals. For example the BLV in the 1500 unit appraisal for Marks Tey implies 74 hectares but the whole site allocated (and which needs to be purchased) is over 90 hectares. It seems appropriate for the full 90 hectares to be included in the BLV calculation OR for the allocated area to be reduced.. The same applies to Station Road Wakes Colne. The appraisal “buys” 7.0 hectares (at £125,000 per acre or £308,750 per hectare) but the whole site is 14.7 hectares. A developer will claim	Cllr Sunnucks	Newmark have updated the gross site areas as part of Regulation 19 to reflect the strategic sites.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	BLV on the higher figure but the appraisal only covers the lower one.		
c)	Concerns are raised regarding the robustness and transparency of the viability assessment, particularly the level of combined contributions (£60,000 per dwelling) assumed for strategic sites. It is stated that applying Newmark's inputs results in unviable outcomes based on an alternative appraisal, with discrepancies attributed to differences in methodology. The level of contributions is questioned, alongside the lack of clarity on how they have been derived. Concerns are also raised about the use of infrastructure cost estimates that are not yet fully defined or evidenced, and a request is made for further review, engagement, and access to the viability model to ensure confidence in deliverability.	Pomery Planning	PPG Viability, Paragraph 005 permits site-specific assessment for strategic sites that are critical to the delivery of strategic priorities; the strategic allocations have accordingly been appraised individually, using market evidence where available. The infrastructure contribution allowances of £62,000, £56,000 and £79,000 per dwelling for the respective typologies, and the combined figure of £60,000 per dwelling, are derived from market evidence and achieved contributions and are the best available information for plan making. Differences from third-party appraisals will reflect methodology, phasing and input treatment. Consistent with PPG Paragraphs 011, 021 and 022, the full appraisals and assumptions will be set out in the Regulation 19 Addendum Report.
12	**Density**		
a)	Why do we assume 30 dwellings per hectare rather than the 35dph used for the garden communities? Perhaps to make more room for BNG?	Cllr Sunnucks	The appraisals adopt 30 dwellings per hectare as a plan-wide typology assumption, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509), which provides for grouping sites by shared characteristics and using average costs and values, and with Paragraph 003, which confirms that not every site requires testing. The figure reflects the density range anticipated by the Local Plan for the relevant typologies rather than the densities assumed for the garden communities, which have a different form and infrastructure structure. The assumption is not driven by biodiversity net gain: mandatory net gain under Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is treated as a policy cost within the appraisals in accordance with PPG Paragraph 013, and is not accommodated by reducing density. The

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			strategic site appraisals are not directly calculated by density. We have established the area of each site and the anticipated number of units has been provided by the Council. For the purpose of this assessment, we have assumed an area of 60% of the gross area would be developable. When considering the number of units on each site, and the assumed 60% net developable area, the density does vary. The density shown is hypothetical for the strategic sites.
13	**Appraisal**		
a)	The appraisal adopts a bespoke structure that is difficult to interrogate and does not allow detailed review of key assumptions, including residential mix, cost inputs, finance calculations and residual land value outputs. This limits transparency and makes detailed review of the methodology difficult.	Cllr Sunnocks	The Regulation 19 Addendum sets out the updated housing mix with percentages for tenures and number of bedrooms, which we have applied to all typologies and strategic sites. The Regulation 19 Addendum report includes a table of cost inputs with a detailed breakdown of the allowances we have assumed, including policy allowances, for the purpose of this plan-wide assessment. Tables setting out the applied development programme for each typology is also included within the report, which will have an impact on the finance cost. The residual output of each scenario tested is shown on a value per acre basis, which is then compared against the BVL, as set out in Section 8, Viability Results of the Regulation 19 report. The approach adopted aligns with government's recommended approach to viability assessment for plan making; PPG Paragraph 011 (Reference ID: 10-011-20180724).

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
b)	The denial of live appraisals being made available for us to consider in detail contravenes PPG transparency and therefore causes significant concern and should be rectified.	Turner Morum LLP	Paragraph 59 of the December 2024 NPPF states: "All viability assessments, including any undertaken at the plan-making stage, should reflect the recommended approach in national planning practice guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available". Newmark have already committed to publishing the full appraisal outputs as PDFs alongside the Regulation 19 evidence base, which provides the inputs, assumptions and outputs needed for independent interrogation, which is consistent with the guidance.
c)	The viability model does not allow detailed review of residential mix, cashflows or finance assumptions, limiting the ability to verify inputs.	Mersea Homes	The Regulation 19 Addendum sets out the updated housing mix with percentages for tenures and number of bedrooms, which we have applied to all typologies and strategic sites. The Regulation 19 Addendum report includes a table of cost inputs with a detailed breakdown of the allowances we have assumed, including policy allowances, for the purpose of this plan-wide assessment. Tables setting out the applied development programme for each typology is also included within the report, which will have an impact on the finance cost. The residual output of each scenario tested is shown on a value per acre basis, which is then compared against the BVL, as set out in Section 8, Viability Results of the Regulation 19 report. The approach adopted aligns with government's recommended approach to viability assessment for plan making; PPG Paragraph 011 (Reference ID: 10-011-20180724).
14	**Cumulative Policy Burden**		
a)	The cumulative impact of multiple planning policies (including archaeology, tree requirements, SUDS, EV charging, self-build	Mersea Homes	The viability assessment incorporates policy requirements through various costs. Some of these are specific allowances such as Future Homes Standard at £7,500 per unit, Essex

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
	requirements and design standards) is considered not fully assessed within viability testing. Several policy requirements are identified as potentially misinterpreted or inadequately reflected in the appraisal, including EN1, EN8, LC1, NZ3, H1, PC6, PC7 and ST8.		Coast RAMS Partnership Tariff at £476 per unit and BNG allowances for greenfield and brownfield sites. Other policy costs are not individually costed but are assumed to be incorporated into the overall consideration of the sites through density and net developable areas, and applied rates in the appraisals such as professional fees, external works and infrastructure cost allowances. Further policies have been added since Regulation 18 and these have been accounted for in the iterative appraisals. A full list of the costs allowed for is included in the Regulation 19 Addendum. The study is undertaken on a plan-wide basis with average costs applied in accordance with paragraph 004 of the PPG, Viability.
15	**Site Specific Viability**		
a)	Infrastructure provision is not site specific, consequently there is a high risk that CCC may allocate areas for housing development that are not viable to develop. The viability of each site needs to be addressed before any area is allocated, with clear visibility of who is responsible for funding the works (on Policy ST7)	David Williams	The assessment is prepared on a high-level, plan-wide basis, consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 003 (Reference ID: 10-003-20180724), which confirms that not every site needs to be tested, while Paragraph 005 permits site-specific assessment for strategic sites critical to strategic priorities, and the strategic allocations have been appraised individually on that basis. Plan-wide viability does not guarantee that every individual site is viable. Under NPPF paragraph 59, applications complying with up-to-date policies should be assumed viable and it is for the applicant to justify any assessment at the application stage, as set out in PPG Paragraphs 008 and 009; under Paragraph 009 the decision maker may require an updated assessment which provides evidence of what has changed since the plan-wide viability, and under Paragraph 021 the Council may appoint a suitably qualified practitioner to review it at the applicant's expense.

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
			Responsibility for funding site-specific infrastructure is addressed through those applications.
b)	The Whole Plan Viability Assessment provides only generic, non-site-specific S106 assumptions, undermining deliverability and plan soundness contrary to NPPF paras 14–22 (on PP37 Langham)	Barry Hobbs	Deliverability regarding development contributions is governed by NPPF paragraph 35. Generic planning obligation assumptions applied through typologies are consistent with PPG Viability, Paragraph 004 (Reference ID: 10-004-20190509) and Paragraph 003, which confirms not every site needs testing, and the assumptions are informed by contributions actually achieved by the Council, with market evidence used as a cross-check. Plan-wide viability does not guarantee that every individual site is viable. At the decision-taking stage, NPPF paragraph 59 and PPG Paragraphs 008 and 009 place the onus on the applicant to justify any assessment, which must refer back to the plan assessment. Therefore, the approach is considered appropriate and no change proposed.
16	**Brownfield Land**		
a)	Newmark's viability methodology underpinning ST3 is flawed. It is skewed towards building on green fields and villages by attributing inflated values to commercial/brownfield city sites. Demand for office-space has collapsed, eg: policy OA4 (surplus commercial land, C2), affecting values (see William Sunnucks' submission). The underpinning evidence therefore conflicts with 3.19.	Cllr Dundas	The methodology does not favour one land type over another and applies a consistent approach across different land types, including greenfield and brownfield sites. In accordance with PPG Viability, Paragraph 016 (Reference ID: 10-016-20190509), existing use value for brownfield and commercial sites is established from market evidence of the existing use and disregards transactions where hope value is likely to have been paid, as at the time of preparing this study. This evidence is considered on a plan-wide basis. The assessment does not seek to prioritise one type of site over another but to test the viability of policies across a range of scenarios.
17	**Rural Housing**		

	Detail / Comment / Feedback	Consultee	Newmark Comments
a)	Policy H2 requires 30% affordable housing on developments of 10 or more dwellings in urban areas and 5 or more dwellings in designated rural areas. While the intention to address housing need is supported, the approach for rural areas raises significant concerns regarding viability, proportionality, and clarity. The requirement for affordable housing contributions on developments of 5 dwellings or more in designated rural areas is likely to undermine viability for smallscale schemes. Rural sites often involve higher land values, lower densities, and landscape-led layout designs, which increase per-unit costs and reduce flexibility for developers. Imposing this threshold risks making schemes financially unfeasible, discouraging applications and ultimately reducing housing delivery in rural area. Recommendations for improvement: • Consider increasing the threshold for affordable housing contributions in rural areas or adopting a more flexible approach based on site-specific viability and local need. This would encourage small-scale developments that support rural vitality Include explicit reference to viability testing for rural schemes, recognizing the unique cost implications of landscape-led layouts and lower densities	Stanfords	Rural typologies will also be included within the Regulation 19 Addendum Report to further test these scenarios.

APPENDIX 3

COLCHESTER LOCAL PLAN · WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY · REGULATION 19 BASE CASE

Strategic site allocations

Appraisal summary | Base Case- Scenario 1 | Regulation 19

DOCUMENT DETAILS

CLIENT	Colchester City Council
PROJECT	Colchester Local Plan - Whole Plan Viability Assessment
DOCUMENT	Strategic site allocations - simplified appraisal summary
PLAN STAGE	Regulation 19 pre-submission, base case
JOB REFERENCE	U0027742 / D4576400
VERSION	Simplified presentation issue, 17 August 2026
PREPARED BY	Newmark (Gerald Eve LLP)
STATUS	Draft for discussion with the Council

Strategic site allocations - viability summary

Nine strategic allocations, base case, Scenario 1

ALLOCATION	North East Colchester	Land South of Berechurch Hall Road	Land North of Oak Road	Land at East Dawes Lane	Land West of Station Road	Land North of Coach Road	Land North of Park Lane	Marks Tey	Land at Colchester Station
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Greenfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	2,000	875	650	300	200	800	850	2,500	250
Site area, gross (acres)	245.9	75.1	125.5	29.7	37.1	96.4	97.9	422.5	13.5
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	33.5	48.0	21.3	41.7	22.2	34.2	35.8	24.4	76.2
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%
Gross development value	585,081,000	275,241,890	204,465,404	101,066,628	62,912,432	251,649,728	267,377,836	786,405,400	78,640,540
Total development costs	(669,041,128)	(291,965,409)	(216,671,612)	(100,954,017)	(65,970,893)	(266,822,438)	(283,589,984)	(835,993,012)	(82,339,562)
Residual land value	(87,686,740)	(17,734,049)	(13,481,958)	(190,437)	(3,435,159)	(16,445,168)	(17,521,125)	(56,888,564)	(4,688,080)
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(356,647)	(236,081)	(107,403)	(6,422)	(92,679)	(170,648)	(179,058)	(134,634)	(346,845)
Benchmark land value	15,366,531	4,694,900	7,845,425	1,853,250	2,316,563	6,023,063	6,115,725	26,408,813	6,082,367
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	62,500	450,000
Surplus / (deficit)	**(103,053,271)**	**(22,428,949)**	**(21,327,383)**	**(2,043,687)**	**(5,751,721)**	**(22,468,230)**	**(23,636,850)**	**(83,297,377)**	**(10,770,446)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(419,147)**	**(298,581)**	**(169,903)**	**(68,922)**	**(155,179)**	**(233,148)**	**(241,558)**	**(197,134)**	**(796,845)**
Plan viability	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**	**Not Viable**

AGGREGATE ACROSS THE NINE ALLOCATIONS	
Total dwellings	8,425
Gross development value	2,612,840,858
Total development costs	(2,813,348,056)
Benchmark land value	76,706,635
Aggregate surplus / (deficit)	**(294,777,915)**

COLCHESTER LOCAL PLAN · WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY · REGULATION 19 BASE CASE

North East Colchester

Simplified one-page appraisal, live-linked to the full appraisal model

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Lower Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	2,000
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	99.5
Site area, gross (acres)	245.9
Site area, net (hectares)	59.7
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	33.5
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	20.1
Total gross internal area (sq m)	170,398

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	1,400 market units at £347,850 each	347,850	243,495	486,990,000
Affordable rent	240 units at 55% of market value	166,513	19,982	39,963,000
Social rent	240 units at 45% of market value	136,238	16,349	32,697,000
Other intermediate	120 units at 70% of market value	211,925	12,716	25,431,000
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**292,541**	**585,081,000**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £393,560 plus 3x for surveys	(787)	(787)	(1,573,560)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 132,239 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(50,000,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 59.7 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(70,000,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 150,108 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(233,568,670)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 20,290 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(39,362,372)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(5,292,000)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(40,939,656)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(2,698,000)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(1,482,000)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(2,192,900)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(10,800,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(13,646,552)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 123,419 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(4,040,740)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(7,000,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(952,000)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(20,999,108)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(25,198,929)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,210)	(6,210)	(12,419,978)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(11,796)	(11,796)	(23,591,204)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(51,642)	(51,642)	(103,283,460)
Total development costs			**(334,521)**	**(669,041,128)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(83,960,128)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (Based on BLV) (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(3,726,611)
Residual land value		**(87,686,740)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(356,647)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-15.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 245.9 acres	15,366,531
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(103,053,271)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(419,147)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	30.00	(164,209)	(204,823)	(246,416)	(289,505)	(335,032)	(384,952)	(443,225)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(189,207)	(228,974)	(269,855)	(312,450)	(357,898)	(408,661)	(467,570)
0.00	90.00	(214,398)	(253,369)	(293,609)	(335,837)	(381,455)	(433,611)	(492,176)
	120.00	(239,813)	(278,046)	(317,743)	(359,770)	(405,876)	(459,383)	(574,351)
	150.00	(265,491)	(303,062)	(342,333)	(384,371)	(431,413)	(485,425)	(673,216)
	180.00	(291,473)	(328,476)	(367,477)	(409,815)	(458,356)	(511,738)	(772,081)
	210.00	(317,824)	(354,377)	(393,311)	(436,341)	(485,909)	(586,747)	(870,946)
	240.00	(344,617)	(380,875)	(420,014)	(464,282)	(513,747)	(692,673)	(969,811)
	270.00	(371,944)	(408,109)	(447,829)	(493,431)	(541,895)	(798,600)	(1,068,676)
	300.00	(399,932)	(436,285)	(477,113)	(522,879)	(641,513)	(904,527)	(1,167,541)
	330.00	(428,749)	(465,673)	(507,870)	(552,634)	(754,501)	(1,010,454)	(1,266,406)
	360.00	(458,630)	(496,680)	(538,998)	(618,599)	(867,490)	(1,116,380)	(1,365,271)
	390.00	(489,908)	(529,203)	(570,464)	(738,650)	(980,478)	(1,222,307)	(1,464,136)
	420.00	(523,068)	(562,079)	(623,933)	(858,700)	(1,093,467)	(1,328,234)	(1,563,001)
	450.00	(557,431)	(595,314)	(751,045)	(978,750)	(1,206,456)	(1,434,161)	(1,661,866)
	480.00	(592,145)	(657,514)	(878,157)	(1,098,801)	(1,319,444)	(1,540,087)	(1,760,731)
	510.00	(627,208)	(791,688)	(1,005,269)	(1,218,851)	(1,432,433)	(1,646,014)	(1,859,596)
	540.00	(719,342)	(925,862)	(1,132,382)	(1,338,901)	(1,545,421)	(1,751,941)	(1,958,461)
	570.00	(860,578)	(1,060,036)	(1,259,494)	(1,458,952)	(1,658,410)	(1,857,868)	(2,057,326)
	600.00	(1,001,813)	(1,194,210)	(1,386,606)	(1,579,002)	(1,771,398)	(1,963,795)	(2,156,191)
	630.00	(1,143,049)	(1,328,384)	(1,513,718)	(1,699,052)	(1,884,387)	(2,069,721)	(2,255,056)
	660.00	(1,284,285)	(1,462,557)	(1,640,830)	(1,819,103)	(1,997,375)	(2,175,648)	(2,353,921)
	690.00	(1,425,520)	(1,596,731)	(1,767,942)	(1,939,153)	(2,110,364)	(2,281,575)	(2,452,786)
	720.00	(1,566,756)	(1,730,905)	(1,895,054)	(2,059,203)	(2,223,353)	(2,387,502)	(2,551,651)
	750.00	(1,707,992)	(1,865,079)	(2,022,166)	(2,179,254)	(2,336,341)	(2,493,428)	(2,650,516)

TABLE 2

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	63,347	26,122	(11,361)	(49,176)	(88,167)	(129,770)	(172,373)
	5,000	24,000	(13,427)	(51,168)	(90,181)	(131,609)	(173,932)	(217,629)
Site Specific S106	10,000	(15,505)	(53,175)	(92,223)	(133,493)	(175,573)	(218,866)	(264,102)
25,000	15,000	(55,198)	(94,291)	(135,418)	(177,284)	(220,229)	(264,865)	(312,364)
	20,000	(96,381)	(137,381)	(179,054)	(221,695)	(265,820)	(312,382)	(363,407)
	25,000	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	30,000	(182,749)	(224,884)	(268,186)	(313,317)	(361,549)	(415,733)	(478,557)
	35,000	(226,582)	(269,553)	(314,124)	(361,337)	(413,380)	(474,189)	(662,871)
	40,000	(271,017)	(315,110)	(361,472)	(411,830)	(470,098)	(571,230)	(904,861)
	45,000	(316,244)	(361,892)	(410,890)	(466,338)	(529,671)	(813,220)	(1,146,852)
	50,000	(362,544)	(410,432)	(463,545)	(525,243)	(721,578)	(1,055,210)	(1,388,842)
	55,000	(410,355)	(461,630)	(521,095)	(629,936)	(963,568)	(1,297,200)	(1,630,832)
	60,000	(460,386)	(517,156)	(580,796)	(871,926)	(1,205,558)	(1,539,190)	(1,872,822)
	65,000	(513,899)	(576,327)	(780,284)	(1,113,916)	(1,447,548)	(1,781,180)	(2,114,812)
	70,000	(572,098)	(688,643)	(1,022,275)	(1,355,906)	(1,689,538)	(2,023,170)	(2,356,802)

TABLE 3

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	(3,039)	(48,455)	(95,916)	(146,676)	(199,537)	(256,090)	(320,110)
	16.0%	(29,496)	(73,589)	(121,382)	(170,728)	(222,174)	(277,312)	(339,918)
Profit	17.0%	(55,953)	(100,233)	(146,849)	(194,780)	(244,811)	(298,534)	(359,725)
20.0%	18.0%	(82,785)	(127,114)	(172,315)	(218,831)	(267,448)	(319,756)	(379,532)
	19.0%	(111,082)	(153,995)	(197,782)	(242,883)	(290,085)	(340,978)	(399,339)
	20.0%	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)

TABLE 4

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	(136,271)	(177,770)	(220,142)	(263,828)	(309,615)	(359,094)	(416,040)
	70,000	(148,696)	(190,196)	(232,567)	(276,253)	(322,040)	(371,519)	(428,465)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	(161,122)	(202,621)	(244,992)	(288,679)	(334,466)	(383,944)	(440,891)
62,500	90,000	(173,547)	(215,046)	(257,418)	(301,104)	(346,891)	(396,369)	(453,316)
	100,000	(185,972)	(227,471)	(269,843)	(313,529)	(359,316)	(408,794)	(465,741)
	110,000	(198,397)	(239,896)	(282,268)	(325,954)	(371,741)	(421,220)	(478,166)
	120,000	(210,822)	(252,321)	(294,693)	(338,379)	(384,166)	(433,645)	(490,591)
	130,000	(223,247)	(264,747)	(307,118)	(350,804)	(396,591)	(446,070)	(503,016)
	140,000	(235,673)	(277,172)	(319,543)	(363,229)	(409,016)	(458,495)	(515,442)
	150,000	(248,098)	(289,597)	(331,968)	(375,655)	(421,442)	(470,920)	(527,867)
	160,000	(260,523)	(302,022)	(344,394)	(388,080)	(433,867)	(483,345)	(540,292)
	170,000	(272,948)	(314,447)	(356,819)	(400,505)	(446,292)	(495,770)	(552,717)
	180,000	(285,373)	(326,872)	(369,244)	(412,930)	(458,717)	(508,196)	(565,142)
	190,000	(297,798)	(339,297)	(381,669)	(425,355)	(471,142)	(520,621)	(577,567)
	200,000	(310,223)	(351,723)	(394,094)	(437,780)	(483,567)	(533,046)	(589,992)
	210,000	(322,649)	(364,148)	(406,519)	(450,205)	(495,992)	(545,471)	(602,418)

TABLE 5

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	20	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	25	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
Density (dph)	30	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
33.5	35	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	40	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	45	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	50	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	55	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	60	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	65	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	70	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)

TABLE 6

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	70%	308,337	270,139	231,873	193,531	155,078	116,498	77,752
	75%	235,636	197,602	159,468	121,218	82,815	44,219	5,361
Build Cost	80%	162,623	124,697	86,631	48,389	9,924	(28,851)	(68,042)
100%	85%	89,193	51,299	13,203	(25,157)	(63,870)	(104,894)	(147,593)
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	15,215	(22,760)	(61,040)	(101,317)	(143,324)	(186,243)	(230,572)
	95%	(59,519)	(99,195)	(140,609)	(182,758)	(225,998)	(270,951)	(318,843)
	100%	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	105%	(222,176)	(264,873)	(309,162)	(356,051)	(407,648)	(467,795)	(634,958)
	110%	(307,713)	(352,808)	(401,162)	(455,623)	(517,748)	(761,336)	(1,091,026)
	115%	(398,047)	(448,348)	(506,313)	(568,978)	(891,655)	(1,219,374)	(1,547,093)
	120%	(498,033)	(558,453)	(700,168)	(1,025,916)	(1,351,664)	(1,677,413)	(2,003,161)
	125%	(611,889)	(840,342)	(1,164,119)	(1,487,897)	(1,811,674)	(2,135,451)	(2,459,228)

TABLE 7

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	80%	(1,346,790)	(1,521,937)	(1,697,084)	(1,872,232)	(2,047,379)	(2,222,527)	(2,397,674)
	82%	(1,029,821)	(1,220,816)	(1,411,812)	(1,602,808)	(1,793,804)	(1,984,800)	(2,175,796)
Market Values	84%	(712,852)	(919,696)	(1,126,540)	(1,333,385)	(1,540,229)	(1,747,073)	(1,953,918)
100%	86%	(522,419)	(618,575)	(841,268)	(1,063,961)	(1,286,654)	(1,509,346)	(1,732,039)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(453,858)	(495,882)	(555,996)	(794,537)	(1,033,078)	(1,271,620)	(1,510,161)
	90%	(392,701)	(431,837)	(476,353)	(525,114)	(779,503)	(1,033,893)	(1,288,283)
	92%	(337,442)	(375,159)	(416,457)	(463,758)	(525,928)	(796,166)	(1,066,404)
	94%	(285,485)	(323,294)	(363,380)	(407,370)	(458,046)	(558,439)	(844,526)
	96%	(235,568)	(274,234)	(314,471)	(357,243)	(404,539)	(459,287)	(622,648)
	98%	(187,000)	(226,953)	(268,053)	(310,927)	(356,778)	(408,224)	(467,604)
	100%	(139,378)	(180,877)	(223,248)	(266,935)	(312,722)	(362,200)	(419,147)
	102%	(92,442)	(135,651)	(179,556)	(224,466)	(270,940)	(320,026)	(374,003)
	104%	(48,033)	(91,054)	(136,657)	(183,056)	(230,664)	(280,213)	(333,203)
	106%	(4,995)	(48,889)	(94,344)	(142,407)	(191,429)	(241,958)	(295,030)
	108%	37,755	(7,977)	(54,072)	(102,325)	(152,952)	(204,782)	(258,570)
	110%	80,270	32,666	(15,257)	(63,606)	(115,041)	(168,389)	(223,292)
	112%	122,599	73,088	23,299	(26,856)	(77,571)	(132,580)	(188,862)
	114%	164,776	113,333	61,644	9,639	(42,812)	(97,223)	(155,065)
	116%	206,819	153,425	99,817	45,929	(8,343)	(63,178)	(121,751)
	118%	248,757	193,396	137,851	82,050	25,912	(30,709)	(88,812)
	120%	290,597	233,263	175,759	118,031	59,999	1,544	(57,531)

TABLE 8

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(419,147)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	5,000	(139,378)	(178,661)	(218,730)	(259,959)	(303,014)	(349,161)	(401,261)
	10,000	(139,378)	(176,444)	(214,215)	(253,015)	(293,388)	(336,351)	(384,063)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	(139,378)	(174,228)	(209,712)	(246,097)	(283,838)	(323,740)	(367,444)
-	20,000	(139,378)	(172,013)	(205,215)	(239,205)	(274,356)	(311,310)	(351,304)
	25,000	(139,378)	(169,804)	(200,726)	(232,337)	(264,937)	(299,039)	(335,571)
	30,000	(139,378)	(167,594)	(196,246)	(225,493)	(255,583)	(286,911)	(320,181)
	35,000	(139,378)	(165,385)	(191,772)	(218,671)	(246,281)	(274,912)	(305,088)
	40,000	(139,378)	(163,175)	(187,306)	(211,870)	(237,033)	(263,027)	(290,252)
	45,000	(139,378)	(160,970)	(182,847)	(205,093)	(227,831)	(251,250)	(275,638)
	50,000	(139,378)	(158,767)	(178,396)	(198,334)	(218,679)	(239,569)	(261,220)
	55,000	(139,378)	(156,564)	(173,950)	(191,594)	(209,567)	(227,974)	(246,974)

COLCHESTER LOCAL PLAN · WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY · REGULATION 19 BASE CASE

Land South of Berechurch Hall Road

Simplified one-page appraisal, live-linked to the full appraisal model

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	875
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	30.4
Site area, gross (acres)	75.1
Site area, net (hectares)	18.2
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	48.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	28.8
Total gross internal area (sq m)	74,549

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	613 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	229,289,375
Affordable rent	105 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	18,721,395
Social rent	105 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	15,317,505
Other intermediate	53 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	11,913,615
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**275,241,890**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £184,310 plus 3x for surveys	(839)	(839)	(734,310)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 57,855 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(21,875,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 18.2 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(30,625,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 65,672 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(102,186,293)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 8,877 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(17,221,038)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(2,315,250)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(17,911,100)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(1,180,375)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(648,375)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(959,394)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(4,725,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(5,970,367)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 53,996 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(1,767,824)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(3,062,500)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(416,500)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(9,187,110)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(11,024,531)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(5,847,116)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(6,507)	(6,507)	(5,693,302)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(48,615,026)
Total development costs			**(333,675)**	**(291,965,409)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(16,723,519)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(1,010,530)
Residual land value		**(17,734,049)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(236,081)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-6.4%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 75.1 acres	4,694,900
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(22,428,949)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(298,581)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	30.00	45,446	(11,677)	(69,227)	(131,079)	(194,115)	(258,420)	(324,706)
CIL £ psm	60.00	13,222	(42,481)	(100,365)	(161,096)	(222,772)	(285,848)	(351,130)
0.00	90.00	(19,100)	(73,405)	(131,947)	(191,266)	(251,623)	(313,528)	(377,902)
	120.00	(51,527)	(106,539)	(163,673)	(221,613)	(280,688)	(341,493)	(405,082)
	150.00	(84,772)	(139,854)	(195,570)	(252,158)	(310,010)	(369,792)	(432,741)
	180.00	(119,715)	(173,335)	(227,648)	(282,927)	(339,613)	(398,475)	(460,967)
	210.00	(154,802)	(206,990)	(259,934)	(313,955)	(369,551)	(427,617)	(489,883)
	240.00	(190,059)	(240,843)	(292,464)	(345,276)	(399,874)	(457,294)	(519,631)
	270.00	(225,512)	(274,919)	(325,262)	(376,944)	(430,652)	(487,623)	(550,416)
	300.00	(261,189)	(309,263)	(358,381)	(409,015)	(461,968)	(518,738)	(582,492)
	330.00	(297,117)	(343,897)	(391,863)	(441,554)	(493,929)	(550,820)	(615,235)
	360.00	(333,325)	(378,881)	(425,777)	(474,658)	(526,678)	(584,114)	(648,228)
	390.00	(369,876)	(414,272)	(460,198)	(508,435)	(560,392)	(618,804)	(681,515)
	420.00	(406,812)	(450,137)	(495,233)	(543,039)	(595,317)	(653,945)	(715,069)
	450.00	(444,208)	(486,570)	(531,001)	(578,660)	(631,788)	(689,400)	(835,184)
	480.00	(482,143)	(523,686)	(567,672)	(615,562)	(669,187)	(725,133)	(982,531)
	510.00	(520,736)	(561,634)	(605,466)	(654,105)	(706,868)	(762,898)	(1,129,878)
	540.00	(560,118)	(600,612)	(644,688)	(693,816)	(744,854)	(920,770)	(1,277,225)
	570.00	(600,476)	(640,885)	(685,750)	(733,827)	(783,169)	(1,078,642)	(1,424,572)
	600.00	(642,059)	(682,824)	(727,832)	(774,140)	(901,108)	(1,236,513)	(1,571,919)
	630.00	(685,203)	(726,727)	(770,230)	(814,815)	(1,069,504)	(1,394,385)	(1,719,266)
	660.00	(730,390)	(771,236)	(812,972)	(923,544)	(1,237,901)	(1,552,257)	(1,866,613)
	690.00	(777,090)	(816,124)	(856,077)	(1,102,466)	(1,406,297)	(1,710,129)	(2,013,960)
	720.00	(824,148)	(861,369)	(988,080)	(1,281,387)	(1,574,694)	(1,868,000)	(2,161,307)
	750.00	(871,558)	(906,956)	(1,177,527)	(1,460,308)	(1,743,090)	(2,025,872)	(2,308,654)

TABLE 2

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	356,571	298,888	241,058	183,019	124,730	66,097	7,016
	5,000	301,008	243,199	185,210	126,980	68,441	9,486	(50,042)
Site Specific S106	10,000	245,340	187,396	129,222	70,758	11,920	(47,444)	(109,870)
25,000	15,000	189,561	131,441	73,052	14,314	(44,898)	(106,911)	(171,936)
	20,000	133,659	75,334	16,682	(42,395)	(104,024)	(168,723)	(234,754)
	25,000	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	30,000	21,348	(37,497)	(98,439)	(162,617)	(227,820)	(294,561)	(363,788)
	35,000	(35,104)	(95,727)	(159,682)	(224,559)	(290,772)	(359,086)	(430,963)
	40,000	(93,059)	(156,821)	(221,408)	(287,170)	(354,733)	(425,242)	(501,103)
	45,000	(154,019)	(218,349)	(283,722)	(350,657)	(420,060)	(493,763)	(575,997)
	50,000	(215,378)	(280,415)	(346,810)	(415,309)	(487,323)	(565,918)	(656,168)
	55,000	(277,210)	(343,153)	(410,896)	(481,565)	(557,445)	(643,785)	(788,740)
	60,000	(339,654)	(406,764)	(476,341)	(550,132)	(632,084)	(724,801)	(1,149,367)
	65,000	(402,858)	(471,535)	(543,683)	(622,188)	(712,016)	(964,092)	(1,509,993)
	70,000	(467,072)	(537,894)	(613,794)	(699,740)	(793,701)	(1,324,719)	(1,870,620)

TABLE 3

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	281,443	212,693	143,539	73,855	3,425	(68,086)	(145,963)
	16.0%	240,672	173,961	106,845	39,200	(29,192)	(100,393)	(176,486)
Profit	17.0%	199,901	135,228	70,151	4,545	(61,809)	(133,097)	(207,010)
20.0%	18.0%	159,130	96,496	33,457	(30,111)	(95,859)	(165,801)	(237,534)
	19.0%	118,359	57,763	(3,237)	(64,766)	(130,744)	(198,505)	(268,058)
	20.0%	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)

TABLE 4

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	80,626	22,069	(36,893)	(98,164)	(162,590)	(228,170)	(295,543)
	70,000	68,474	9,917	(49,045)	(110,317)	(174,742)	(240,323)	(307,696)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	56,322	(2,236)	(61,197)	(122,469)	(186,895)	(252,475)	(319,848)
62,500	90,000	44,169	(14,388)	(73,350)	(134,621)	(199,047)	(264,628)	(332,000)
	100,000	32,017	(26,541)	(85,502)	(146,774)	(211,199)	(276,780)	(344,153)
	110,000	19,864	(38,693)	(97,655)	(158,926)	(223,352)	(288,932)	(356,305)
	120,000	7,712	(50,845)	(109,807)	(171,079)	(235,504)	(301,085)	(368,458)
	130,000	(4,440)	(62,998)	(121,959)	(183,231)	(247,657)	(313,237)	(380,610)
	140,000	(16,593)	(75,150)	(134,112)	(195,383)	(259,809)	(325,390)	(392,762)
	150,000	(28,745)	(87,303)	(146,264)	(207,536)	(271,961)	(337,542)	(404,915)
	160,000	(40,898)	(99,455)	(158,417)	(219,688)	(284,114)	(349,694)	(417,067)
	170,000	(53,050)	(111,607)	(170,569)	(231,841)	(296,266)	(361,847)	(429,220)
	180,000	(65,202)	(123,760)	(182,721)	(243,993)	(308,419)	(373,999)	(441,372)
	190,000	(77,355)	(135,912)	(194,874)	(256,145)	(320,571)	(386,152)	(453,524)
	200,000	(89,507)	(148,065)	(207,026)	(268,298)	(332,723)	(398,304)	(465,677)
	210,000	(101,660)	(160,217)	(219,179)	(280,450)	(344,876)	(410,456)	(477,829)

TABLE 5

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	25	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
Density (dph)	30	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
48.0	35	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	40	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	45	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	50	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	55	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	60	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	65	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	70	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)

TABLE 6

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	703,661	644,034	584,350	524,606	464,795	404,900	344,894
	75%	600,261	540,941	481,560	422,101	362,547	302,857	243,022
Build Cost	80%	496,577	437,551	378,438	319,204	259,833	200,282	140,499
100%	85%	392,573	333,790	274,874	215,808	156,535	96,987	37,091
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	288,151	229,551	170,763	111,745	52,428	(7,302)	(67,602)
	95%	183,214	124,703	65,918	6,793	(52,798)	(115,769)	(181,206)
	100%	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	105%	(28,944)	(88,735)	(152,299)	(216,773)	(282,593)	(350,498)	(421,899)
	110%	(141,109)	(204,657)	(269,259)	(335,420)	(404,016)	(476,764)	(557,517)
	115%	(258,330)	(323,136)	(389,754)	(459,241)	(533,683)	(617,794)	(709,612)
	120%	(378,465)	(445,693)	(516,310)	(592,892)	(679,841)	(809,452)	(1,343,605)
	125%	(503,336)	(575,380)	(654,673)	(743,436)	(960,830)	(1,492,045)	(2,023,261)

TABLE 7

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(697,870)	(741,827)	(1,022,916)	(1,314,287)	(1,605,659)	(1,897,030)	(2,188,401)
	82%	(598,167)	(645,297)	(693,719)	(881,586)	(1,198,410)	(1,515,235)	(1,832,059)
Market Values	84%	(507,789)	(553,028)	(603,074)	(656,032)	(791,162)	(1,133,440)	(1,475,717)

100%	86%	(425,164)	(470,246)	(518,217)	(570,971)	(628,566)	(751,645)	(1,119,375)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(346,885)	(393,272)	(441,550)	(492,772)	(548,970)	(611,254)	(763,033)
	90%	(271,301)	(319,734)	(369,505)	(421,267)	(476,199)	(536,671)	(604,054)
	92%	(197,507)	(248,412)	(300,308)	(353,646)	(409,179)	(468,326)	(534,068)
	94%	(124,950)	(178,590)	(232,992)	(288,486)	(345,592)	(405,235)	(469,238)
	96%	(54,639)	(109,839)	(166,981)	(224,989)	(284,227)	(345,348)	(409,558)
	98%	11,720	(43,952)	(101,923)	(162,660)	(224,378)	(287,555)	(353,031)
	100%	77,588	19,031	(39,931)	(101,202)	(165,628)	(231,209)	(298,581)
	102%	143,078	81,570	19,732	(42,560)	(107,677)	(175,913)	(245,572)
	104%	208,260	143,770	78,987	13,822	(51,870)	(121,391)	(193,613)
	106%	273,195	205,689	137,928	69,838	1,294	(67,882)	(142,431)
	108%	337,930	267,381	196,610	125,550	54,094	(17,897)	(91,845)
	110%	402,487	328,885	255,086	181,025	106,611	31,732	(43,817)
	112%	466,900	390,232	313,371	236,286	158,893	81,084	2,695
	114%	531,195	451,437	371,519	291,389	210,986	130,203	48,914
	116%	595,384	512,532	429,539	346,339	262,900	179,135	94,904
	118%	659,484	573,529	487,444	401,173	314,687	227,895	140,698
	120%	723,506	634,442	545,258	455,903	366,357	276,529	186,323

TABLE 8

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(298,581)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	77,588	21,880	(34,191)	(91,911)	(153,088)	(215,269)	(278,967)
	10,000	77,588	24,729	(28,452)	(82,631)	(140,574)	(199,394)	(259,487)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	77,588	27,578	(22,714)	(73,412)	(128,096)	(183,577)	(240,131)
-	20,000	77,588	30,427	(16,989)	(64,737)	(115,641)	(167,813)	(220,890)
	25,000	77,588	33,276	(11,264)	(56,087)	(103,205)	(152,101)	(201,742)
	30,000	77,588	36,125	(5,538)	(47,456)	(90,798)	(136,436)	(182,699)
	35,000	77,588	38,974	185	(38,824)	(78,414)	(120,816)	(163,733)
	40,000	77,588	41,822	5,896	(30,211)	(66,548)	(105,238)	(144,849)
	45,000	77,588	44,667	11,607	(21,602)	(55,010)	(89,699)	(126,040)
	50,000	77,588	47,510	17,319	(13,001)	(43,486)	(74,222)	(107,296)
	55,000	77,588	50,352	23,030	(4,413)	(31,978)	(59,709)	(88,614)

Land North of Oak Road

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	650
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	50.8
Site area, gross (acres)	125.5
Site area, net (hectares)	30.5
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	21.3
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	12.8
Total gross internal area (sq m)	55,379

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	455 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	170,329,250
Affordable rent	78 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	13,907,322
Social rent	78 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	11,378,718
Other intermediate	39 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	8,850,114
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**204,465,404**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £142,460 plus 3x for surveys	(881)	(881)	(572,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 42,978 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(16,250,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 30.5 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(22,750,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 48,785 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(75,909,818)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 6,594 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(12,792,771)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(1,719,900)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(13,305,388)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(876,850)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(481,650)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(712,693)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(3,510,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(4,435,129)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 40,111 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(1,313,240)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(2,275,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(309,400)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(6,824,710)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(8,189,652)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(4,343,572)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(6,131)	(6,131)	(3,985,360)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(36,114,019)
Total development costs			**(333,341)**	**(216,671,612)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(12,206,208)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(1,275,750)
Residual land value		**(13,481,958)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(107,403)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-6.6%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 125.5 acres	7,845,425
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(21,327,383)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(169,903)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

CIL £ psm: 0.00

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
0.00	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
30.00	(18,867)	(44,092)	(69,473)	(96,715)	(124,401)	(152,543)	(181,381)
60.00	(33,190)	(57,773)	(83,298)	(110,017)	(137,078)	(164,641)	(192,977)
90.00	(47,553)	(71,523)	(97,314)	(123,388)	(149,836)	(176,836)	(204,703)
120.00	(61,960)	(86,239)	(111,388)	(136,828)	(162,681)	(189,147)	(216,582)
150.00	(76,766)	(101,035)	(125,533)	(150,348)	(175,626)	(201,585)	(228,644)
180.00	(92,292)	(115,893)	(139,752)	(163,963)	(188,683)	(214,174)	(240,914)
210.00	(107,878)	(130,832)	(154,062)	(177,684)	(201,876)	(226,937)	(253,436)
240.00	(123,541)	(145,851)	(168,470)	(191,526)	(215,219)	(239,905)	(266,263)
270.00	(139,283)	(160,966)	(182,990)	(205,504)	(228,741)	(253,118)	(279,426)
300.00	(155,124)	(176,191)	(197,644)	(219,646)	(242,474)	(266,626)	(292,695)
330.00	(171,071)	(191,543)	(212,445)	(233,976)	(256,456)	(280,490)	(306,037)
360.00	(187,138)	(207,036)	(227,424)	(248,527)	(270,738)	(294,660)	(319,452)
390.00	(203,351)	(222,701)	(242,608)	(263,345)	(285,386)	(308,906)	(332,942)
420.00	(219,725)	(238,561)	(258,040)	(278,486)	(300,437)	(323,230)	(346,507)
450.00	(236,294)	(254,653)	(273,765)	(294,019)	(315,604)	(337,632)	(360,151)
480.00	(253,087)	(271,026)	(289,845)	(309,997)	(330,852)	(352,114)	(429,969)
510.00	(270,156)	(287,735)	(306,369)	(326,107)	(346,183)	(366,676)	(500,676)
540.00	(287,549)	(304,859)	(323,339)	(342,303)	(361,599)	(399,134)	(571,382)
570.00	(305,342)	(322,497)	(340,415)	(358,586)	(377,099)	(474,890)	(642,088)
600.00	(323,632)	(340,463)	(357,581)	(374,958)	(392,691)	(550,647)	(712,795)
630.00	(342,458)	(358,528)	(374,840)	(391,425)	(469,307)	(626,404)	(783,501)
660.00	(361,420)	(376,688)	(392,192)	(407,987)	(550,114)	(702,161)	(854,207)
690.00	(380,483)	(394,946)	(409,639)	(483,925)	(630,921)	(777,918)	(924,914)
720.00	(399,646)	(413,301)	(427,837)	(569,783)	(711,729)	(853,674)	(995,620)
750.00	(418,912)	(431,756)	(518,745)	(655,641)	(792,536)	(929,431)	(1,066,327)

TABLE 2

Site Specific S106: 25,000

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
-	119,308	93,781	68,194	42,539	16,791	(9,077)	(35,102)
5,000	94,629	69,051	43,405	17,678	(8,163)	(34,156)	(60,347)
10,000	69,907	44,271	18,558	(7,263)	(33,218)	(59,360)	(86,757)
15,000	45,137	19,433	(6,363)	(32,289)	(58,384)	(85,640)	(114,156)
20,000	20,309	(5,467)	(31,366)	(57,421)	(84,544)	(112,959)	(141,842)
25,000	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
30,000	(29,539)	(55,524)	(82,407)	(110,652)	(139,269)	(168,435)	(198,474)
35,000	(54,591)	(81,357)	(109,532)	(138,044)	(167,040)	(196,782)	(227,762)
40,000	(80,325)	(108,436)	(136,852)	(165,696)	(195,194)	(225,730)	(258,097)
45,000	(107,357)	(135,687)	(164,405)	(193,689)	(223,862)	(255,534)	(289,974)
50,000	(134,546)	(163,152)	(192,257)	(222,129)	(253,249)	(286,623)	(322,652)
55,000	(161,933)	(190,883)	(220,501)	(251,173)	(283,669)	(319,058)	(355,817)
60,000	(189,561)	(218,961)	(249,264)	(281,071)	(315,586)	(351,944)	(509,825)
65,000	(217,493)	(247,490)	(278,743)	(312,227)	(348,237)	(419,691)	(682,848)
70,000	(245,824)	(276,626)	(309,246)	(344,664)	(381,318)	(592,714)	(855,871)

TABLE 3

Profit: 20.0%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
15.0%	86,042	55,639	25,091	(5,653)	(36,667)	(68,069)	(102,057)
16.0%	67,918	38,421	8,779	(21,059)	(51,167)	(82,377)	(115,626)
17.0%	49,793	21,203	(7,533)	(36,465)	(65,667)	(96,916)	(129,196)
18.0%	31,669	3,984	(23,846)	(51,871)	(80,777)	(111,454)	(142,765)
19.0%	13,544	(13,234)	(40,158)	(67,277)	(96,285)	(125,992)	(156,334)
20.0%	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)

TABLE 4

BLV (£ per acre): 62,500

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
60,000	(1,674)	(27,546)	(53,563)	(80,562)	(108,886)	(137,624)	(166,996)
70,000	(13,300)	(39,172)	(65,189)	(92,188)	(120,512)	(149,250)	(178,623)
80,000	(24,926)	(50,798)	(76,815)	(103,814)	(132,138)	(160,877)	(190,249)
90,000	(36,552)	(62,424)	(88,441)	(115,440)	(143,764)	(172,503)	(201,875)
100,000	(48,178)	(74,050)	(100,068)	(127,067)	(155,391)	(184,129)	(213,501)
110,000	(59,804)	(85,676)	(111,694)	(138,693)	(167,017)	(195,755)	(225,127)
120,000	(71,430)	(97,302)	(123,320)	(150,319)	(178,643)	(207,381)	(236,753)
130,000	(83,056)	(108,928)	(134,946)	(161,945)	(190,269)	(219,007)	(248,379)
140,000	(94,682)	(120,554)	(146,572)	(173,571)	(201,895)	(230,633)	(260,005)
150,000	(106,309)	(132,181)	(158,198)	(185,197)	(213,521)	(242,259)	(271,631)
160,000	(117,935)	(143,807)	(169,824)	(196,823)	(225,147)	(253,885)	(283,258)
170,000	(129,561)	(155,433)	(181,450)	(208,449)	(236,773)	(265,511)	(294,884)
180,000	(141,187)	(167,059)	(193,076)	(220,075)	(248,399)	(277,138)	(306,510)
190,000	(152,813)	(178,685)	(204,702)	(231,702)	(260,025)	(288,764)	(318,136)
200,000	(164,439)	(190,311)	(216,329)	(243,328)	(271,652)	(300,390)	(329,762)
210,000	(176,065)	(201,937)	(227,955)	(254,954)	(283,278)	(312,016)	(341,388)

TABLE 5

Density (dph): 21.3

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
20	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
25	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
30	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
35	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
40	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
45	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
50	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
55	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
60	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
65	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
70	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)

TABLE 6

Build Cost: 100% (105% = 5% increase)

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
(169,903)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
70%	273,837	247,413	220,967	194,511	168,025	141,514	114,970
75%	227,850	201,572	175,279	148,951	122,593	96,196	69,751
80%	181,743	155,607	129,435	103,226	76,971	50,651	24,260
85%	135,493	109,473	83,406	57,282	31,091	4,806	(21,598)
90%	89,056	63,126	37,133	11,058	(15,124)	(41,451)	(67,973)
95%	42,387	16,518	(9,452)	(35,546)	(61,809)	(89,477)	(118,163)
100%	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
105%	(51,944)	(78,357)	(106,361)	(134,702)	(163,535)	(193,117)	(223,925)
110%	(101,839)	(129,836)	(158,229)	(187,199)	(217,059)	(248,397)	(282,388)
115%	(153,912)	(182,396)	(211,556)	(241,780)	(273,786)	(308,464)	(344,273)
120%	(207,231)	(236,650)	(267,334)	(300,187)	(335,155)	(370,944)	(603,017)
125%	(262,523)	(293,798)	(327,509)	(362,452)	(416,884)	(672,994)	(929,105)

TABLE 7

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(169,903)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30% 0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(341,608)	(358,249)	(449,719)	(590,449)	(731,179)	(871,909)	(1,012,639)
	82%	(301,554)	(319,763)	(338,258)	(382,324)	(535,296)	(688,269)	(841,242)
Market Values	84%	(262,865)	(281,979)	(302,023)	(322,394)	(343,170)	(504,629)	(669,845)
100%	86%	(226,830)	(246,209)	(266,590)	(288,316)	(310,601)	(333,362)	(498,448)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(192,454)	(212,592)	(233,403)	(255,229)	(278,621)	(302,849)	(327,653)
	90%	(159,131)	(180,289)	(201,925)	(224,264)	(247,695)	(272,888)	(299,139)
	92%	(126,514)	(148,843)	(171,529)	(194,730)	(218,699)	(243,902)	(271,113)
	94%	(94,404)	(117,990)	(141,861)	(166,122)	(190,956)	(216,675)	(243,861)
	96%	(63,225)	(87,570)	(112,707)	(138,153)	(164,043)	(190,597)	(218,214)
	98%	(33,802)	(58,369)	(83,928)	(110,642)	(137,709)	(165,294)	(193,683)
	100%	(4,580)	(30,452)	(56,470)	(83,469)	(111,793)	(140,531)	(169,903)
	102%	24,485	(2,712)	(30,032)	(57,517)	(86,191)	(116,171)	(146,658)
	104%	53,425	24,886	(3,756)	(32,541)	(61,514)	(92,107)	(123,802)
	106%	82,255	52,373	22,389	(7,714)	(37,979)	(68,476)	(101,243)
	108%	111,003	79,757	48,433	16,994	(14,585)	(46,365)	(78,910)
	110%	139,681	107,067	74,381	41,600	8,692	(24,390)	(57,713)
	112%	168,297	134,312	100,259	66,127	31,875	(2,524)	(37,139)
	114%	196,860	161,499	126,077	90,580	54,979	19,245	(16,674)
	116%	225,378	188,638	151,841	114,975	78,020	40,944	3,694
	118%	253,860	215,735	177,560	139,322	101,004	62,571	23,991
	120%	282,313	242,799	203,241	163,627	123,937	84,144	44,217

TABLE 8

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(169,903)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30% 0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	(4,580)	(29,185)	(53,921)	(79,345)	(106,239)	(133,491)	(161,276)
	10,000	(4,580)	(27,918)	(51,373)	(75,233)	(100,702)	(126,477)	(152,701)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	(4,580)	(26,651)	(48,825)	(71,150)	(95,172)	(119,486)	(144,174)
-	20,000	(4,580)	(25,383)	(46,283)	(67,298)	(89,655)	(112,517)	(135,688)
	25,000	(4,580)	(24,118)	(43,742)	(63,464)	(84,147)	(105,568)	(127,244)
	30,000	(4,580)	(22,854)	(41,201)	(59,630)	(78,647)	(98,637)	(118,837)
	35,000	(4,580)	(21,590)	(38,660)	(55,805)	(73,159)	(91,723)	(110,463)
	40,000	(4,580)	(20,326)	(36,120)	(51,982)	(67,916)	(84,827)	(102,119)
	45,000	(4,580)	(19,062)	(33,586)	(48,159)	(62,802)	(77,950)	(93,804)
	50,000	(4,580)	(17,799)	(31,052)	(44,346)	(57,691)	(71,117)	(85,516)
	55,000	(4,580)	(16,535)	(28,517)	(40,534)	(52,592)	(64,697)	(77,253)

Land at East Dawes Lane

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Higher Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	300
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	12.0
Site area, gross (acres)	29.7
Site area, net (hectares)	7.2
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	41.7
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	25.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	25,560

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	210 market units at £401,200 each	401,200	280,840	84,252,000
Affordable rent	36 units at 55% of market value	190,289	22,835	6,850,404
Social rent	36 units at 45% of market value	155,691	18,683	5,604,876
Other intermediate	18 units at 70% of market value	242,186	14,531	4,359,348
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**336,889**	**101,066,628**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £77,360 plus 3x for surveys	(1,025)	(1,025)	(307,360)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 19,836 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(7,500,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 7.2 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(10,500,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 22,516 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(35,035,301)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 3,043 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(5,904,356)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(793,800)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(6,140,948)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(404,700)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(222,300)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(328,935)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,620,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(2,046,983)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 18,513 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(606,111)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(1,050,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(142,800)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(3,149,866)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(3,779,839)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(7,161)	(7,161)	(2,148,337)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(4,710)	(4,710)	(1,413,104)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(59,531)	(59,531)	(17,859,278)
Total development costs			**(336,513)**	**(100,954,017)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		112,611
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	(1,689)
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(301,358)
Residual land value		**(190,437)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(6,422)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-0.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 29.7 acres	1,853,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(2,043,687)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(68,922)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
CIL £ psm 0.00	0.00	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	30.00	233,543	180,364	127,058	73,561	19,849	(34,165)	(90,084)
	60.00	205,959	154,087	102,077	49,883	(2,548)	(55,304)	(111,374)
	90.00	178,333	127,775	77,056	26,157	(25,002)	(77,152)	(132,743)
	120.00	150,656	101,405	51,989	2,376	(47,517)	(99,901)	(154,195)
	150.00	122,939	74,985	26,869	(21,471)	(70,337)	(122,731)	(175,752)
	180.00	95,177	48,514	1,689	(45,381)	(94,535)	(145,651)	(197,412)
	210.00	67,348	21,985	(23,560)	(69,557)	(118,854)	(168,677)	(219,189)
	240.00	39,459	(4,609)	(48,879)	(95,242)	(143,267)	(191,807)	(241,099)
	270.00	11,507	(31,275)	(74,765)	(121,071)	(167,778)	(215,062)	(263,162)
	300.00	(16,517)	(58,020)	(102,023)	(147,000)	(192,417)	(238,450)	(285,389)
	330.00	(44,620)	(86,079)	(129,381)	(173,037)	(217,178)	(261,999)	(307,805)
	360.00	(73,198)	(114,877)	(156,847)	(199,205)	(242,092)	(285,718)	(330,435)
	390.00	(103,447)	(143,784)	(184,434)	(225,511)	(267,164)	(309,634)	(353,316)
	420.00	(133,815)	(172,818)	(212,171)	(251,981)	(292,422)	(333,772)	(376,477)
	450.00	(164,315)	(201,997)	(240,056)	(278,626)	(317,893)	(358,170)	(399,973)
	480.00	(194,946)	(231,327)	(268,118)	(305,474)	(343,606)	(382,862)	(423,858)
	510.00	(225,747)	(260,834)	(296,385)	(332,556)	(369,589)	(407,904)	(448,198)
	540.00	(256,719)	(290,547)	(324,876)	(359,901)	(395,903)	(433,351)	(473,085)
	570.00	(287,897)	(320,484)	(353,630)	(387,557)	(422,587)	(459,279)	(498,366)
	600.00	(319,309)	(350,680)	(382,689)	(415,568)	(449,711)	(485,780)	(523,751)
	630.00	(350,986)	(381,185)	(412,094)	(444,002)	(477,365)	(512,825)	(549,240)
	660.00	(382,975)	(412,030)	(441,911)	(472,931)	(505,648)	(539,982)	(574,835)
	690.00	(415,310)	(443,293)	(472,213)	(502,459)	(534,507)	(567,250)	(600,581)
	720.00	(448,067)	(475,042)	(503,097)	(532,711)	(563,482)	(594,669)	(626,438)
	750.00	(481,320)	(507,366)	(534,680)	(563,414)	(592,572)	(622,214)	(652,406)

TABLE 2

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
Site Specific S106 25,000	-	501,214	447,065	392,856	338,568	284,198	229,724	175,097
	5,000	453,299	399,091	344,813	290,457	236,001	181,418	126,652
	10,000	405,326	351,059	296,716	242,277	187,719	133,000	78,081
	15,000	357,304	302,976	248,553	194,015	139,339	84,460	29,334
	20,000	309,235	254,830	200,312	145,659	90,837	35,783	(19,595)
	25,000	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	30,000	212,890	158,300	103,544	48,608	(6,595)	(62,155)	(121,750)
	35,000	164,600	109,892	54,993	(139)	(55,586)	(114,558)	(175,020)
	40,000	116,222	61,370	6,309	(49,053)	(107,421)	(167,652)	(228,775)
	45,000	67,742	12,724	(42,552)	(100,330)	(160,365)	(221,169)	(283,163)
	50,000	19,135	(36,063)	(93,291)	(153,149)	(213,689)	(275,238)	(338,390)
	55,000	(29,613)	(86,283)	(145,992)	(206,303)	(267,482)	(330,013)	(394,790)
	60,000	(79,297)	(138,885)	(198,996)	(259,866)	(321,883)	(385,741)	(452,847)
	65,000	(131,816)	(191,757)	(252,359)	(313,957)	(377,082)	(442,796)	(513,404)
	70,000	(184,576)	(244,955)	(306,189)	(368,724)	(433,356)	(501,768)	(575,627)

TABLE 3

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
Profit 20.0%	15.0%	450,866	386,883	322,766	258,495	194,007	129,239	64,075
	16.0%	412,914	350,828	288,609	226,235	163,645	100,774	37,509
	17.0%	374,961	314,773	254,451	193,976	133,283	72,310	10,942
	18.0%	337,009	278,718	220,294	161,716	102,921	43,845	(15,625)
	19.0%	299,057	242,664	186,137	129,457	72,559	15,381	(42,191)
	20.0%	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)

TABLE 4

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
BLV (£ per acre) 62,500	60,000	264,011	209,515	154,886	100,104	45,103	(10,177)	(66,016)
	70,000	252,384	197,889	143,260	88,477	33,477	(21,803)	(77,642)
	80,000	240,758	186,263	131,634	76,851	21,851	(33,429)	(89,268)
	90,000	229,132	174,637	120,008	65,225	10,225	(45,055)	(100,894)
	100,000	217,506	163,011	108,382	53,599	(1,401)	(56,681)	(112,520)
	110,000	205,880	151,385	96,756	41,973	(13,027)	(68,307)	(124,146)
	120,000	194,254	139,759	85,130	30,347	(24,653)	(79,933)	(135,772)
	130,000	182,628	128,132	73,504	18,721	(36,279)	(91,559)	(147,399)
	140,000	171,002	116,506	61,878	7,095	(47,905)	(103,186)	(159,025)
	150,000	159,376	104,880	50,251	(4,531)	(59,532)	(114,812)	(170,651)
	160,000	147,750	93,254	38,625	(16,157)	(71,158)	(126,438)	(182,277)
	170,000	136,123	81,628	26,999	(27,784)	(82,784)	(138,064)	(193,903)
	180,000	124,497	70,002	15,373	(39,410)	(94,410)	(149,690)	(205,529)
	190,000	112,871	58,376	3,747	(51,036)	(106,036)	(161,316)	(217,155)
	200,000	101,245	46,750	(7,879)	(62,662)	(117,662)	(172,942)	(228,781)
	210,000	89,619	35,124	(19,505)	(74,288)	(129,288)	(184,568)	(240,407)

TABLE 5

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
Density (dph) 41.7	20	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	25	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	30	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	35	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	40	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	45	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	50	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	55	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	60	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	65	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	70	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)

TABLE 6

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
Build Cost 100% (105% = 5% increase)	70%	801,491	745,390	689,254	633,106	576,945	520,743	464,522
	75%	711,944	656,173	600,349	544,525	488,649	432,754	376,800
	80%	622,241	566,768	511,262	455,717	400,139	344,489	288,773
	85%	532,357	477,162	421,941	366,672	311,321	255,895	200,366
	90%	442,222	387,316	332,345	277,290	222,145	166,867	111,437
	95%	351,835	297,158	242,390	187,506	132,479	77,278	21,824
	100%	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	105%	169,939	115,560	61,005	6,202	(48,936)	(107,109)	(167,245)
	110%	78,239	23,882	(30,750)	(87,035)	(146,414)	(206,585)	(267,961)
	115%	(14,162)	(68,795)	(127,464)	(186,807)	(247,064)	(308,693)	(372,560)
	120%	(110,312)	(168,955)	(228,307)	(288,706)	(350,673)	(415,209)	(484,375)
	125%	(211,534)	(270,944)	(331,541)	(393,943)	(459,304)	(529,465)	(602,082)

TABLE 7

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	80%	(385,118)	(415,830)	(447,917)	(481,515)	(515,656)	(550,376)	(693,076)
	82%	(312,907)	(345,519)	(379,042)	(413,877)	(450,673)	(488,643)	(527,319)
Market Values	84%	(243,094)	(278,065)	(313,686)	(350,211)	(388,057)	(427,945)	(469,829)
100%	86%	(174,851)	(212,445)	(250,517)	(289,257)	(328,937)	(370,017)	(413,330)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(107,708)	(148,070)	(188,807)	(230,057)	(272,012)	(314,991)	(359,540)
	90%	(43,027)	(84,578)	(128,116)	(172,055)	(216,548)	(261,819)	(308,263)
	92%	18,480	(24,696)	(68,230)	(114,910)	(162,106)	(209,921)	(258,631)
	94%	79,561	33,599	(12,556)	(58,970)	(108,412)	(158,921)	(210,152)
	96%	140,323	91,532	42,580	(6,593)	(56,047)	(108,588)	(162,485)
	98%	200,809	149,179	97,410	45,440	(6,769)	(59,302)	(115,437)
	100%	261,104	206,609	151,980	97,197	42,197	(13,083)	(68,922)
	102%	321,206	263,836	206,357	148,726	90,914	32,851	(25,548)
	104%	381,170	320,912	260,555	200,074	139,418	78,553	17,383
	106%	441,015	377,861	314,618	251,261	187,764	124,055	60,093
	108%	500,761	434,702	368,565	302,324	235,954	169,405	102,628
	110%	560,423	491,451	422,411	353,280	284,030	214,625	145,003
	112%	619,989	548,128	476,176	404,144	332,007	259,731	187,251
	114%	679,499	604,713	529,872	454,934	379,900	304,737	229,392
	116%	738,968	661,247	583,481	505,647	427,716	349,657	271,442
	118%	798,355	717,743	637,048	556,293	475,456	394,506	313,413
	120%	857,731	774,163	690,570	606,902	523,149	439,298	355,320

TABLE 8

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(68,922)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
	5,000	261,104	209,049	156,873	104,555	52,059	(688)	(53,772)
	10,000	261,104	211,485	161,767	111,913	61,910	11,686	(38,815)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	261,104	213,920	166,652	119,272	71,745	24,047	(23,897)
-	20,000	261,104	216,355	171,534	126,621	81,581	36,388	(9,007)
	25,000	261,104	218,791	176,416	133,961	91,407	48,715	5,863
	30,000	261,104	221,226	181,298	141,301	101,218	61,030	20,696
	35,000	261,104	223,661	186,179	148,641	111,029	73,325	35,510
	40,000	261,104	226,097	191,061	155,981	120,836	85,617	50,303
	45,000	261,104	228,532	195,943	163,309	130,622	97,881	65,068
	50,000	261,104	230,967	200,825	170,632	140,409	110,144	79,822
	55,000	261,104	233,403	205,699	177,955	150,196	122,390	94,544

Land West of Station Road

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	200
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	15.0
Site area, gross (acres)	37.1
Site area, net (hectares)	9.0
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	22.2
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	13.3
Total gross internal area (sq m)	17,040

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	140 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	52,409,000
Affordable rent	24 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	4,279,176
Social rent	24 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	3,501,144
Other intermediate	12 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	2,723,112
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**62,912,432**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £58,760 plus 3x for surveys	(1,194)	(1,194)	(238,760)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 13,224 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(5,000,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 9.0 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(7,000,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 15,011 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(23,356,867)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 2,029 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(3,936,237)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(529,200)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(4,093,966)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(269,800)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(148,200)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(219,290)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,080,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,364,655)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 12,342 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(404,074)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(95,200)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,099,911)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(2,519,893)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(1,336,484)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(5,832)	(5,832)	(1,166,351)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(11,112,006)
Total development costs			**(329,854)**	**(65,970,893)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(3,058,461)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(376,698)
Residual land value		**(3,435,159)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(92,679)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-5.5%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 37.1 acres	2,316,563
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(5,751,721)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(155,179)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	30.00	(1,759)	(27,759)	(53,872)	(80,958)	(109,266)	(137,886)	(166,958)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(16,717)	(42,026)	(67,513)	(94,791)	(122,408)	(150,367)	(178,828)
0.00	90.00	(31,714)	(56,341)	(82,005)	(108,684)	(135,623)	(162,938)	(190,805)
	120.00	(46,756)	(70,902)	(96,659)	(122,643)	(148,918)	(175,597)	(202,898)
	150.00	(61,848)	(86,299)	(111,377)	(136,678)	(162,294)	(188,368)	(215,128)
	180.00	(77,601)	(101,790)	(126,169)	(150,803)	(175,778)	(201,259)	(227,513)
	210.00	(93,871)	(117,358)	(141,052)	(165,014)	(189,370)	(214,289)	(239,962)
	240.00	(110,214)	(133,007)	(156,021)	(179,343)	(203,090)	(227,479)	(252,438)
	270.00	(126,637)	(148,743)	(171,099)	(193,790)	(216,962)	(240,810)	(264,963)
	300.00	(143,162)	(164,592)	(186,291)	(208,377)	(231,006)	(254,149)	(277,515)
	330.00	(159,790)	(180,552)	(201,627)	(223,129)	(245,214)	(267,559)	(290,116)
	360.00	(176,539)	(196,657)	(217,119)	(238,069)	(259,442)	(280,979)	(302,746)
	390.00	(193,422)	(212,916)	(232,794)	(253,175)	(273,734)	(294,470)	(315,423)
	420.00	(210,467)	(229,354)	(248,687)	(268,293)	(288,048)	(307,971)	(328,132)
	450.00	(227,695)	(246,007)	(264,694)	(283,487)	(302,425)	(321,545)	(340,885)
	480.00	(245,142)	(262,873)	(280,716)	(298,696)	(316,826)	(335,127)	(353,675)
	510.00	(262,831)	(279,769)	(296,819)	(313,980)	(331,290)	(348,786)	(366,506)
	540.00	(280,616)	(296,731)	(312,935)	(329,281)	(345,778)	(362,450)	(415,671)
	570.00	(298,433)	(313,729)	(329,135)	(344,656)	(360,330)	(376,194)	(496,309)
	600.00	(316,326)	(330,790)	(345,346)	(360,050)	(374,905)	(390,542)	(576,947)
	630.00	(334,244)	(347,891)	(361,645)	(375,518)	(389,548)	(476,940)	(657,585)
	660.00	(352,245)	(365,051)	(377,953)	(391,004)	(404,211)	(563,338)	(738,223)
	690.00	(370,268)	(382,255)	(394,350)	(406,567)	(480,611)	(649,736)	(818,861)
	720.00	(388,378)	(399,517)	(410,757)	(422,147)	(572,769)	(736,134)	(899,500)
	750.00	(406,507)	(416,826)	(427,253)	(507,321)	(664,926)	(822,532)	(980,138)

TABLE 2

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	142,154	115,757	89,318	62,832	36,282	9,653	(17,085)
	5,000	116,446	90,006	63,522	36,976	10,353	(16,367)	(43,230)
Site Specific S106	10,000	90,695	64,212	37,670	11,053	(15,656)	(42,500)	(69,642)
25,000	15,000	64,902	38,364	11,752	(14,949)	(41,770)	(68,841)	(97,881)
	20,000	39,058	12,452	(14,241)	(41,040)	(68,059)	(97,024)	(126,384)
	25,000	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	30,000	(12,825)	(39,602)	(66,522)	(95,351)	(124,580)	(154,180)	(184,344)
	35,000	(38,884)	(65,764)	(94,524)	(123,698)	(153,209)	(183,220)	(214,014)
	40,000	(65,034)	(93,710)	(122,833)	(152,266)	(182,141)	(212,706)	(244,337)
	45,000	(92,896)	(121,976)	(151,338)	(181,100)	(211,469)	(242,789)	(274,941)
	50,000	(121,128)	(150,429)	(180,093)	(210,290)	(241,318)	(273,322)	(305,748)
	55,000	(149,536)	(179,113)	(209,162)	(239,940)	(271,748)	(304,049)	(336,818)
	60,000	(178,150)	(208,078)	(238,646)	(270,201)	(302,378)	(334,983)	(368,124)
	65,000	(207,030)	(237,414)	(268,669)	(300,759)	(333,198)	(366,136)	(542,490)
	70,000	(236,237)	(267,224)	(299,160)	(331,498)	(364,249)	(438,176)	(739,779)

TABLE 3

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	107,585	76,179	44,670	13,015	(18,826)	(50,934)	(84,481)
	16.0%	88,699	58,236	27,672	(3,038)	(33,936)	(65,099)	(98,620)
Profit	17.0%	69,812	40,294	10,674	(19,092)	(49,045)	(80,026)	(112,760)
20.0%	18.0%	50,925	22,352	(6,324)	(35,146)	(64,154)	(95,175)	(126,900)
	19.0%	32,039	4,409	(23,322)	(51,199)	(80,026)	(110,325)	(141,040)
	20.0%	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)

TABLE 4

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	16,058	(10,627)	(37,413)	(64,384)	(93,279)	(122,568)	(152,273)
	70,000	4,432	(22,253)	(49,039)	(76,011)	(104,905)	(134,195)	(163,899)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	(7,194)	(33,879)	(60,665)	(87,637)	(116,531)	(145,821)	(175,525)
62,500	90,000	(18,820)	(45,505)	(72,292)	(99,263)	(128,157)	(157,447)	(187,151)
	100,000	(30,446)	(57,131)	(83,918)	(110,889)	(139,783)	(169,073)	(198,777)
	110,000	(42,072)	(68,757)	(95,544)	(122,515)	(151,409)	(180,699)	(210,403)
	120,000	(53,698)	(80,383)	(107,170)	(134,141)	(163,035)	(192,325)	(222,029)
	130,000	(65,324)	(92,009)	(118,796)	(145,767)	(174,662)	(203,951)	(233,656)
	140,000	(76,950)	(103,635)	(130,422)	(157,393)	(186,288)	(215,577)	(245,282)
	150,000	(88,577)	(115,262)	(142,048)	(169,019)	(197,914)	(227,203)	(256,908)
	160,000	(100,203)	(126,888)	(153,674)	(180,646)	(209,540)	(238,829)	(268,534)
	170,000	(111,829)	(138,514)	(165,300)	(192,272)	(221,166)	(250,456)	(280,160)
	180,000	(123,455)	(150,140)	(176,927)	(203,898)	(232,792)	(262,082)	(291,786)
	190,000	(135,081)	(161,766)	(188,553)	(215,524)	(244,418)	(273,708)	(303,412)
	200,000	(146,707)	(173,392)	(200,179)	(227,150)	(256,044)	(285,334)	(315,038)
	210,000	(158,333)	(185,018)	(211,805)	(238,776)	(267,670)	(296,960)	(326,664)

TABLE 5

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	25	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
Density (dph)	30	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
22.2	35	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	40	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	45	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	50	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	55	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	60	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	65	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	70	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)

TABLE 6

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(155,179)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	303,945	276,568	249,172	221,767	194,362	166,929	139,490
	75%	255,933	228,723	201,487	174,251	146,985	119,711	92,393
Build Cost	80%	207,795	180,726	153,656	126,548	99,423	72,261	45,049
100%	85%	159,479	132,569	105,613	78,631	51,605	24,519	(2,643)
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	110,982	84,175	57,328	30,426	3,455	(23,608)	(50,802)
	95%	62,228	35,508	8,724	(18,154)	(45,143)	(72,566)	(101,823)
	100%	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	105%	(36,334)	(63,061)	(91,459)	(120,468)	(149,826)	(179,694)	(210,351)
	110%	(87,642)	(116,392)	(145,436)	(174,909)	(205,005)	(236,066)	(267,743)
	115%	(142,002)	(171,126)	(200,762)	(231,163)	(262,407)	(294,018)	(326,001)
	120%	(197,563)	(227,430)	(258,182)	(289,358)	(320,828)	(352,730)	(451,464)
	125%	(254,959)	(285,765)	(316,847)	(348,235)	(379,977)	(529,716)	(823,284)

TABLE 7

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(155,179)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
		0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(325,894)	(340,173)	(354,592)	(438,987)	(600,612)	(762,238)	(923,863)
	82%	(288,839)	(304,755)	(320,812)	(337,022)	(376,649)	(552,272)	(727,895)
Market Values	84%	(252,161)	(269,726)	(287,410)	(305,246)	(323,266)	(342,307)	(531,927)
100%	86%	(215,894)	(234,996)	(254,304)	(273,761)	(293,402)	(313,257)	(335,959)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(180,710)	(200,895)	(221,512)	(242,594)	(263,835)	(285,278)	(306,997)
	90%	(146,382)	(167,799)	(189,545)	(211,746)	(234,544)	(257,589)	(280,877)
	92%	(112,655)	(135,409)	(158,409)	(181,755)	(205,597)	(230,139)	(255,014)
	94%	(79,363)	(103,515)	(127,861)	(152,477)	(177,475)	(203,026)	(229,381)
	96%	(47,828)	(71,997)	(97,731)	(123,700)	(149,962)	(176,666)	(204,022)
	98%	(17,244)	(42,535)	(68,017)	(95,298)	(122,904)	(150,862)	(179,335)
	100%	13,152	(13,533)	(40,320)	(67,291)	(96,185)	(125,475)	(155,179)
	102%	43,400	15,314	(12,867)	(41,168)	(69,766)	(100,394)	(131,411)
	104%	73,522	44,019	14,438	(15,246)	(45,073)	(75,556)	(107,945)
	106%	103,548	72,621	41,624	10,537	(20,670)	(52,038)	(84,706)
	108%	133,491	101,134	68,714	36,213	3,612	(29,139)	(62,082)
	110%	163,366	129,570	95,722	61,800	27,787	(6,349)	(40,658)
	112%	193,187	157,944	122,659	87,312	51,881	16,346	(19,353)
	114%	222,941	186,270	149,541	112,759	75,904	38,955	1,860
	116%	252,657	214,537	176,378	138,154	99,868	61,498	22,996
	118%	282,346	242,765	203,157	163,505	123,786	83,982	44,066
	120%	311,981	270,970	229,904	188,801	147,645	106,412	65,080

TABLE 8

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(155,179)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
		0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	13,152	(12,211)	(37,666)	(63,244)	(90,422)	(118,198)	(146,316)
	10,000	13,152	(10,889)	(35,013)	(59,236)	(84,673)	(110,936)	(137,493)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	13,152	(9,567)	(32,360)	(55,241)	(78,933)	(103,703)	(128,708)
-	20,000	13,152	(8,245)	(29,706)	(51,246)	(73,198)	(96,485)	(119,958)
	25,000	13,152	(6,923)	(27,053)	(47,252)	(67,581)	(89,281)	(111,241)
	30,000	13,152	(5,602)	(24,407)	(43,263)	(62,188)	(82,101)	(102,559)
	35,000	13,152	(4,284)	(21,763)	(39,283)	(56,857)	(74,928)	(93,903)
	40,000	13,152	(2,967)	(19,119)	(35,303)	(51,531)	(67,871)	(85,270)
	45,000	13,152	(1,649)	(16,475)	(31,323)	(46,206)	(61,136)	(76,660)
	50,000	13,152	(331)	(13,831)	(27,349)	(40,899)	(54,478)	(68,160)
	55,000	13,152	986	(11,186)	(23,383)	(35,593)	(47,823)	(60,088)

Land North of Coach Road

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	800
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	39.0
Site area, gross (acres)	96.4
Site area, net (hectares)	23.4
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	34.2
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	20.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	68,159

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	560 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	209,636,000
Affordable rent	96 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	17,116,704
Social rent	96 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	14,004,576
Other intermediate	48 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	10,892,448
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**251,649,728**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £170,360 plus 3x for surveys	(850)	(850)	(680,360)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 52,896 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(20,000,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 23.4 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(28,000,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 60,043 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(93,427,468)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 8,116 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(15,744,949)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(2,116,800)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(16,375,863)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(1,079,200)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(592,800)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(877,160)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(4,320,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(5,458,621)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 49,368 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(1,616,296)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(2,800,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(380,800)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(8,399,643)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(10,079,572)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(5,345,934)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(6,349)	(6,349)	(5,078,949)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(44,448,024)
Total development costs			**(333,528)**	**(266,822,438)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(15,172,710)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(1,272,458)
Residual land value		**(16,445,168)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(170,648)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-6.5%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 96.4 acres	6,023,063
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(22,468,230)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(233,148)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	30.00	10,897	(29,717)	(70,615)	(114,530)	(159,255)	(204,815)	(251,676)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(12,060)	(51,658)	(92,774)	(135,890)	(179,634)	(224,298)	(270,404)
0.00	90.00	(35,088)	(73,685)	(115,259)	(157,360)	(200,145)	(243,951)	(289,368)
	120.00	(58,188)	(97,272)	(137,847)	(178,949)	(220,807)	(263,796)	(308,605)
	150.00	(81,873)	(121,002)	(160,545)	(200,675)	(241,635)	(283,866)	(328,159)
	180.00	(106,759)	(144,838)	(183,373)	(222,556)	(262,664)	(304,199)	(348,091)
	210.00	(131,748)	(168,795)	(206,346)	(244,610)	(283,916)	(324,834)	(368,475)
	240.00	(156,862)	(192,892)	(229,488)	(266,874)	(305,431)	(345,833)	(389,411)
	270.00	(182,109)	(217,149)	(252,817)	(289,369)	(327,250)	(367,266)	(411,022)
	300.00	(207,509)	(241,588)	(276,361)	(312,139)	(349,436)	(389,219)	(433,387)
	330.00	(233,083)	(266,228)	(300,158)	(335,226)	(372,057)	(411,811)	(455,989)
	360.00	(258,856)	(291,112)	(324,253)	(358,700)	(395,202)	(435,203)	(478,750)
	390.00	(284,868)	(316,273)	(348,691)	(382,632)	(418,996)	(459,291)	(501,688)
	420.00	(311,146)	(341,760)	(373,548)	(407,118)	(443,589)	(483,567)	(524,794)
	450.00	(337,741)	(367,642)	(398,910)	(432,288)	(469,113)	(508,020)	(588,383)
	480.00	(364,713)	(393,988)	(424,880)	(458,316)	(494,936)	(532,644)	(696,271)
	510.00	(392,135)	(420,907)	(451,610)	(485,368)	(520,938)	(557,442)	(804,159)
	540.00	(420,099)	(448,526)	(479,298)	(512,791)	(547,126)	(650,386)	(912,047)
	570.00	(448,737)	(477,024)	(508,056)	(540,404)	(573,517)	(765,980)	(1,019,936)
	600.00	(478,210)	(506,643)	(537,118)	(568,207)	(635,326)	(881,575)	(1,127,824)
	630.00	(508,744)	(537,177)	(566,381)	(596,221)	(758,626)	(997,169)	(1,235,712)
	660.00	(540,566)	(567,943)	(595,859)	(651,091)	(881,927)	(1,112,764)	(1,343,600)
	690.00	(572,829)	(598,919)	(625,554)	(782,098)	(1,005,228)	(1,228,358)	(1,451,488)
	720.00	(605,313)	(630,110)	(697,681)	(913,105)	(1,128,529)	(1,343,952)	(1,559,376)
	750.00	(638,019)	(661,517)	(836,394)	(1,044,112)	(1,251,829)	(1,459,547)	(1,667,264)

TABLE 2

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	232,514	191,475	150,328	109,052	67,602	25,928	(16,040)
	5,000	192,932	151,811	110,553	69,143	27,527	(14,363)	(56,625)
Site Specific S106	10,000	153,281	112,055	70,683	29,113	(12,706)	(54,864)	(99,133)
25,000	15,000	113,553	72,205	30,684	(11,068)	(53,133)	(97,134)	(143,245)
	20,000	73,725	32,246	(9,452)	(51,433)	(95,180)	(141,082)	(187,860)
	25,000	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	30,000	(6,258)	(48,094)	(91,385)	(136,957)	(183,204)	(230,469)	(279,351)
	35,000	(46,456)	(89,534)	(134,970)	(181,004)	(227,930)	(276,232)	(326,859)
	40,000	(87,717)	(133,025)	(178,875)	(225,509)	(273,331)	(323,082)	(376,299)
	45,000	(131,116)	(176,803)	(223,183)	(270,601)	(319,648)	(371,494)	(428,811)
	50,000	(174,782)	(220,948)	(268,016)	(316,480)	(367,248)	(422,278)	(484,216)
	55,000	(218,779)	(265,553)	(313,525)	(363,432)	(416,733)	(476,542)	(554,282)
	60,000	(263,188)	(310,751)	(359,948)	(411,915)	(469,160)	(532,394)	(818,319)
	65,000	(308,121)	(356,735)	(407,642)	(462,693)	(524,475)	(681,981)	(1,082,356)
	70,000	(353,737)	(403,785)	(457,168)	(516,840)	(580,747)	(946,018)	(1,346,393)

TABLE 3

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	179,078	130,174	80,999	31,474	(18,544)	(69,277)	(124,381)
	16.0%	150,022	102,570	54,848	6,776	(41,789)	(92,254)	(146,134)
Profit	17.0%	120,966	74,967	28,697	(17,922)	(65,034)	(115,561)	(167,887)
20.0%	18.0%	91,909	47,363	2,546	(42,619)	(89,270)	(138,869)	(189,641)
	19.0%	62,853	19,759	(23,604)	(67,317)	(114,132)	(162,176)	(211,394)
	20.0%	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)

TABLE 4

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	36,825	(4,816)	(46,727)	(90,238)	(135,964)	(182,455)	(230,120)
	70,000	24,712	(16,929)	(58,840)	(102,350)	(148,077)	(194,568)	(242,232)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	12,599	(29,041)	(70,952)	(114,463)	(160,190)	(206,680)	(254,345)
62,500	90,000	487	(41,154)	(83,065)	(126,576)	(172,302)	(218,793)	(266,458)
	100,000	(11,626)	(53,267)	(95,178)	(138,688)	(184,415)	(230,906)	(278,570)
	110,000	(23,739)	(65,379)	(107,290)	(150,801)	(196,528)	(243,018)	(290,683)
	120,000	(35,851)	(77,492)	(119,403)	(162,914)	(208,640)	(255,131)	(302,796)
	130,000	(47,964)	(89,605)	(131,516)	(175,026)	(220,753)	(267,244)	(314,908)
	140,000	(60,077)	(101,717)	(143,628)	(187,139)	(232,866)	(279,356)	(327,021)
	150,000	(72,189)	(113,830)	(155,741)	(199,251)	(244,978)	(291,469)	(339,134)
	160,000	(84,302)	(125,942)	(167,853)	(211,364)	(257,091)	(303,582)	(351,246)
	170,000	(96,415)	(138,055)	(179,966)	(223,477)	(269,204)	(315,694)	(363,359)
	180,000	(108,527)	(150,168)	(192,079)	(235,589)	(281,316)	(327,807)	(375,471)
	190,000	(120,640)	(162,280)	(204,191)	(247,702)	(293,429)	(339,919)	(387,584)
	200,000	(132,752)	(174,393)	(216,304)	(259,815)	(305,541)	(352,032)	(399,697)
	210,000	(144,865)	(186,506)	(228,417)	(271,927)	(317,654)	(364,145)	(411,809)

TABLE 5

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	25	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
Density (dph)	30	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
34.2	35	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	40	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	45	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	50	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	55	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	60	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	65	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	70	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)

TABLE 6

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	479,963	437,514	395,021	352,498	309,931	267,308	224,616
	75%	406,267	364,041	321,776	279,460	237,079	194,622	152,062
Build Cost	80%	332,374	290,362	248,291	206,148	163,917	121,561	79,058
100%	85%	258,253	216,421	174,510	132,484	90,333	48,003	5,442
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	183,844	142,147	100,331	58,359	16,193	(26,248)	(69,051)
	95%	109,058	67,437	25,638	(16,391)	(58,728)	(103,400)	(149,791)
	100%	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	105%	(42,110)	(84,606)	(129,753)	(175,515)	(222,165)	(270,189)	(320,498)
	110%	(122,020)	(167,156)	(212,998)	(259,877)	(308,375)	(359,594)	(415,986)
	115%	(205,499)	(251,484)	(298,683)	(347,786)	(400,152)	(458,576)	(521,013)
	120%	(291,012)	(338,630)	(388,507)	(442,324)	(502,259)	(568,760)	(960,532)
	125%	(379,803)	(430,662)	(486,312)	(547,002)	(678,906)	(1,068,528)	(1,458,150)

TABLE 7

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(514,184)	(543,774)	(726,048)	(939,896)	(1,153,743)	(1,367,591)	(1,581,439)
	82%	(445,598)	(477,620)	(510,322)	(622,800)	(855,300)	(1,087,801)	(1,320,301)
Market Values	84%	(382,043)	(413,656)	(448,148)	(483,999)	(556,857)	(808,010)	(1,059,164)
100%	86%	(323,621)	(355,346)	(388,945)	(425,609)	(464,672)	(528,220)	(798,026)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(268,124)	(300,888)	(334,895)	(370,813)	(409,920)	(452,304)	(536,888)
	90%	(214,445)	(248,740)	(283,913)	(320,388)	(358,926)	(401,001)	(446,865)
	92%	(161,986)	(198,085)	(234,840)	(272,542)	(311,681)	(353,155)	(398,832)
	94%	(110,379)	(148,451)	(187,036)	(226,340)	(266,704)	(308,721)	(353,547)
	96%	(60,340)	(99,549)	(140,122)	(181,258)	(223,205)	(266,392)	(311,582)
	98%	(13,105)	(52,678)	(93,853)	(136,969)	(180,731)	(225,453)	(271,678)
	100%	33,796	(7,844)	(49,755)	(93,266)	(138,993)	(185,483)	(233,148)
	102%	80,432	36,681	(7,291)	(51,568)	(97,797)	(146,217)	(195,575)
	104%	126,859	80,971	34,892	(11,441)	(58,126)	(107,472)	(158,698)
	106%	173,111	125,071	76,859	28,431	(20,304)	(69,451)	(122,346)
	108%	219,221	169,011	118,652	68,097	17,274	(33,902)	(86,396)
	110%	265,211	212,820	160,289	107,589	54,657	1,413	(52,271)
	112%	311,104	256,516	201,815	146,947	91,881	36,535	(19,195)
	114%	356,912	300,121	243,226	186,186	128,967	71,500	13,692
	116%	402,646	343,648	284,552	225,332	165,947	106,336	46,422
	118%	448,316	387,105	325,805	264,393	202,822	141,055	79,016
	120%	493,934	430,505	366,994	303,380	239,618	175,681	111,500

TABLE 8

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(233,148)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	33,796	(5,815)	(45,666)	(86,652)	(130,070)	(174,157)	(219,229)
	10,000	33,796	(3,786)	(41,577)	(80,044)	(121,173)	(162,872)	(205,405)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	33,796	(1,757)	(37,496)	(73,497)	(112,293)	(151,627)	(191,663)
-	20,000	33,796	273	(33,417)	(67,320)	(103,426)	(140,419)	(177,993)
	25,000	33,796	2,302	(29,339)	(61,170)	(94,582)	(129,245)	(164,397)
	30,000	33,796	4,331	(25,260)	(55,019)	(85,753)	(118,104)	(150,861)
	35,000	33,796	6,360	(21,188)	(48,878)	(76,934)	(106,993)	(137,381)
	40,000	33,796	8,390	(17,119)	(42,744)	(68,521)	(95,911)	(123,959)
	45,000	33,796	10,419	(13,051)	(36,610)	(60,303)	(84,855)	(110,587)
	50,000	33,796	12,443	(8,982)	(30,492)	(52,103)	(73,864)	(97,259)
	55,000	33,796	14,468	(4,916)	(24,374)	(43,912)	(63,555)	(83,973)

Land North of Park Lane

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	850
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	39.6
Site area, gross (acres)	97.9
Site area, net (hectares)	23.8
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	35.8
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	21.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	72,419

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	595 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	222,738,250
Affordable rent	102 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	18,186,498
Social rent	102 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	14,879,862
Other intermediate	51 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	11,573,226
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**267,377,836**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £179,660 plus 3x for surveys	(847)	(847)	(719,660)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 56,202 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(21,250,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 23.8 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(29,750,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 63,796 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(99,266,685)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 8,623 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(16,729,008)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(2,249,100)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(17,399,354)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(1,146,650)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(629,850)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(931,983)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(4,590,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(5,799,785)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 52,453 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(1,717,314)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(2,975,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(404,600)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(8,924,621)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(10,709,545)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(5,680,055)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(6,460)	(6,460)	(5,490,750)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(47,226,025)
Total development costs			**(333,635)**	**(283,589,984)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP
Residual land value (gross)		(16,212,148)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(1,308,977)
Residual land value		**(17,521,125)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(179,058)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-6.6%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 97.9 acres	6,115,725
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(23,636,850)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(241,558)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	30.00	14,650	(27,924)	(70,805)	(116,876)	(163,827)	(211,699)	(261,010)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(9,383)	(50,886)	(94,013)	(139,254)	(185,184)	(232,132)	(280,683)
0.00	90.00	(33,484)	(73,949)	(117,562)	(161,744)	(206,682)	(252,749)	(300,613)
	120.00	(57,656)	(98,650)	(141,213)	(184,362)	(228,340)	(273,576)	(320,836)
	150.00	(82,456)	(123,492)	(164,986)	(207,127)	(250,186)	(294,649)	(341,411)
	180.00	(108,502)	(148,447)	(188,899)	(230,056)	(272,239)	(316,007)	(362,406)
	210.00	(134,667)	(173,537)	(212,965)	(253,178)	(294,537)	(337,696)	(383,898)
	240.00	(160,955)	(198,773)	(237,211)	(276,514)	(317,121)	(359,781)	(405,996)
	270.00	(187,387)	(224,178)	(261,654)	(300,107)	(340,035)	(382,337)	(428,849)
	300.00	(213,984)	(249,777)	(286,334)	(323,997)	(363,347)	(405,470)	(452,620)
	330.00	(240,765)	(275,591)	(311,283)	(348,229)	(387,133)	(429,308)	(476,804)
	360.00	(267,758)	(301,663)	(336,547)	(372,877)	(411,491)	(454,028)	(501,168)
	390.00	(295,001)	(328,036)	(362,189)	(398,024)	(436,558)	(479,708)	(525,741)
	420.00	(322,531)	(354,761)	(388,277)	(423,770)	(462,508)	(505,664)	(550,506)
	450.00	(350,400)	(381,902)	(414,910)	(450,265)	(489,573)	(531,848)	(633,619)
	480.00	(378,668)	(409,544)	(442,204)	(477,696)	(517,197)	(558,227)	(744,394)
	510.00	(407,422)	(437,802)	(470,323)	(506,326)	(545,025)	(584,804)	(855,168)
	540.00	(436,756)	(466,819)	(499,485)	(535,661)	(573,070)	(697,756)	(965,942)
	570.00	(466,815)	(496,787)	(529,970)	(565,210)	(601,352)	(816,443)	(1,076,717)
	600.00	(497,770)	(527,975)	(561,055)	(594,977)	(682,769)	(935,130)	(1,187,491)
	630.00	(529,873)	(560,502)	(592,368)	(625,000)	(809,368)	(1,053,817)	(1,298,266)
	660.00	(563,477)	(593,381)	(623,929)	(699,431)	(935,967)	(1,172,504)	(1,409,040)
	690.00	(597,983)	(626,539)	(655,747)	(833,943)	(1,062,567)	(1,291,191)	(1,519,814)
	720.00	(632,739)	(659,944)	(747,743)	(968,455)	(1,189,166)	(1,409,877)	(1,630,589)
	750.00	(667,749)	(693,595)	(890,168)	(1,102,966)	(1,315,765)	(1,528,564)	(1,741,363)

TABLE 2

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	246,627	203,639	160,527	117,275	73,832	30,146	(13,870)
	5,000	205,197	162,117	118,892	75,495	31,870	(12,055)	(56,399)
Site Specific S106	10,000	163,695	120,500	77,144	33,576	(10,268)	(54,490)	(100,976)
25,000	15,000	122,108	78,788	35,274	(8,502)	(52,616)	(98,804)	(147,224)
	20,000	80,416	36,948	(6,752)	(50,773)	(96,684)	(144,869)	(194,021)
	25,000	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	30,000	(3,316)	(47,173)	(92,577)	(140,384)	(188,940)	(238,615)	(290,099)
	35,000	(45,405)	(90,579)	(138,229)	(186,545)	(235,842)	(286,666)	(340,081)
	40,000	(88,611)	(136,123)	(184,232)	(233,200)	(283,481)	(335,907)	(392,212)
	45,000	(134,060)	(181,984)	(230,671)	(280,498)	(332,125)	(386,873)	(447,787)
	50,000	(179,794)	(228,241)	(277,677)	(328,648)	(382,178)	(440,476)	(507,027)
	55,000	(225,887)	(274,993)	(325,418)	(377,975)	(434,316)	(498,157)	(598,674)
	60,000	(272,423)	(322,388)	(374,151)	(428,986)	(489,730)	(557,975)	(869,786)
	65,000	(319,523)	(370,634)	(424,275)	(482,537)	(548,822)	(730,287)	(1,140,897)
	70,000	(367,362)	(420,043)	(476,420)	(540,024)	(609,118)	(1,001,399)	(1,412,009)

TABLE 3

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	190,644	139,394	87,862	35,935	(16,532)	(69,789)	(127,744)
	16.0%	160,239	110,509	60,498	10,091	(40,856)	(93,869)	(150,507)
Profit	17.0%	129,834	81,625	33,134	(15,753)	(65,180)	(118,258)	(173,270)
20.0%	18.0%	99,430	52,740	5,770	(41,597)	(90,565)	(142,647)	(196,032)
	19.0%	69,025	23,856	(21,594)	(67,441)	(116,580)	(167,036)	(218,795)
	20.0%	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)

TABLE 4

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	41,655	(1,993)	(45,924)	(91,575)	(139,560)	(188,389)	(238,523)
	70,000	29,515	(14,134)	(58,064)	(103,715)	(151,700)	(200,530)	(250,663)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	17,375	(26,274)	(70,204)	(115,856)	(163,840)	(212,670)	(262,804)
62,500	90,000	5,234	(38,414)	(82,345)	(127,996)	(175,981)	(224,811)	(274,944)
	100,000	(6,906)	(50,555)	(94,485)	(140,136)	(188,121)	(236,951)	(287,084)
	110,000	(19,046)	(62,695)	(106,625)	(152,277)	(200,261)	(249,091)	(299,225)
	120,000	(31,187)	(74,835)	(118,766)	(164,417)	(212,402)	(261,232)	(311,365)
	130,000	(43,327)	(86,976)	(130,906)	(176,557)	(224,542)	(273,372)	(323,505)
	140,000	(55,467)	(99,116)	(143,046)	(188,698)	(236,682)	(285,512)	(335,646)
	150,000	(67,608)	(111,257)	(155,187)	(200,838)	(248,823)	(297,653)	(347,786)
	160,000	(79,748)	(123,397)	(167,327)	(212,978)	(260,963)	(309,793)	(359,927)
	170,000	(91,888)	(135,537)	(179,467)	(225,119)	(273,103)	(321,933)	(372,067)
	180,000	(104,029)	(147,678)	(191,608)	(237,259)	(285,244)	(334,074)	(384,207)
	190,000	(116,169)	(159,818)	(203,748)	(249,399)	(297,384)	(346,214)	(396,348)
	200,000	(128,310)	(171,958)	(215,888)	(261,540)	(309,524)	(358,354)	(408,488)
	210,000	(140,450)	(184,099)	(228,029)	(273,680)	(321,665)	(370,495)	(420,628)

TABLE 5

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	25	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
Density (dph)	30	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
35.8	35	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	40	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	45	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	50	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	55	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	60	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	65	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	70	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)

TABLE 6

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	505,502	461,039	416,544	372,010	327,424	282,775	238,049
	75%	428,378	384,160	339,895	295,571	251,176	206,696	162,092
Build Cost	80%	351,061	307,060	262,992	218,845	174,593	130,215	85,663
100%	85%	273,500	229,683	185,777	141,744	97,567	53,197	8,566
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	195,638	151,953	108,143	64,159	19,948	(24,555)	(69,466)
	95%	117,379	73,765	29,959	(14,098)	(58,499)	(105,397)	(154,121)
	100%	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	105%	(40,822)	(85,376)	(132,734)	(180,758)	(229,761)	(280,284)	(333,353)
	110%	(124,462)	(171,805)	(219,919)	(269,176)	(320,206)	(374,261)	(434,112)
	115%	(211,859)	(260,123)	(309,716)	(361,406)	(416,704)	(478,957)	(546,471)
	120%	(301,414)	(351,457)	(403,977)	(460,844)	(525,055)	(614,032)	(1,015,810)
	125%	(394,469)	(448,044)	(506,899)	(572,294)	(727,622)	(1,127,191)	(1,526,761)

TABLE 7

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(538,205)	(570,432)	(774,819)	(994,026)	(1,213,233)	(1,432,440)	(1,651,647)
	82%	(464,625)	(499,289)	(534,822)	(668,641)	(906,988)	(1,145,336)	(1,383,683)
Market Values	84%	(397,502)	(431,039)	(467,999)	(506,887)	(600,743)	(858,231)	(1,115,719)
100%	86%	(336,029)	(369,522)	(405,112)	(444,153)	(486,484)	(571,126)	(847,754)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(277,747)	(312,245)	(348,123)	(386,139)	(427,747)	(473,564)	(579,790)
	90%	(221,440)	(257,490)	(294,512)	(332,984)	(373,758)	(418,527)	(468,096)
	92%	(166,452)	(204,357)	(242,987)	(282,665)	(323,941)	(367,834)	(416,486)
	94%	(112,376)	(152,328)	(192,839)	(234,148)	(276,629)	(320,956)	(368,435)
	96%	(59,962)	(101,089)	(143,656)	(186,849)	(230,943)	(276,404)	(324,108)
	98%	(10,494)	(51,977)	(95,170)	(140,411)	(186,367)	(233,386)	(282,076)
	100%	38,620	(5,028)	(48,959)	(94,610)	(142,595)	(191,425)	(241,558)
	102%	87,444	41,602	(4,489)	(50,906)	(99,409)	(150,232)	(202,089)
	104%	136,046	87,973	39,693	(8,876)	(57,820)	(109,607)	(163,392)
	106%	184,461	134,142	83,635	32,881	(18,198)	(69,735)	(125,261)
	108%	232,725	180,137	127,387	74,417	21,166	(32,485)	(87,571)
	110%	280,864	225,996	170,977	115,770	60,315	4,512	(51,783)
	112%	328,900	271,734	214,446	156,980	99,293	41,299	(17,121)
	114%	376,845	317,377	257,795	198,057	138,121	77,920	17,334
	116%	424,710	362,934	301,052	239,036	176,838	114,390	51,613
	118%	472,505	408,418	344,231	279,926	215,444	150,750	85,749
	120%	520,243	453,837	387,340	320,733	253,963	187,000	119,771

TABLE 8

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(241,558)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	38,620	(2,901)	(44,680)	(87,678)	(133,247)	(179,547)	(226,951)
	10,000	38,620	(774)	(40,404)	(80,765)	(123,925)	(167,718)	(212,442)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	38,620	1,353	(36,129)	(73,892)	(114,622)	(155,932)	(198,022)
-	20,000	38,620	3,475	(31,853)	(67,427)	(105,336)	(144,184)	(183,689)
	25,000	38,620	5,598	(27,586)	(60,980)	(96,067)	(132,475)	(169,423)
	30,000	38,620	7,720	(23,321)	(54,542)	(86,821)	(120,800)	(155,235)
	35,000	38,620	9,842	(19,056)	(48,112)	(77,586)	(109,158)	(141,104)
	40,000	38,620	11,964	(14,791)	(41,684)	(68,749)	(97,547)	(127,030)
	45,000	38,620	14,086	(10,533)	(35,271)	(60,147)	(85,964)	(113,014)
	50,000	38,620	16,209	(6,278)	(28,857)	(51,552)	(74,433)	(99,046)
	55,000	38,620	18,331	(2,024)	(22,452)	(42,980)	(63,623)	(85,123)

Marks Tey

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	2,500
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	171.0
Site area, gross (acres)	422.5
Site area, net (hectares)	102.6
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	24.4
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	14.6
Total gross internal area (sq m)	212,998

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	1,750 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	655,112,500
Affordable rent	300 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	53,489,700
Social rent	300 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	43,764,300
Other intermediate	150 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	34,038,900
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**786,405,400**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £427,537 plus 3x for surveys	(683)	(683)	(1,707,537)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 165,299 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(62,500,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£0 per ha on 102.6 ha net		-	-
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(87,500,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 187,636 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(291,960,838)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 25,362 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(49,202,965)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(6,615,000)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(51,174,570)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£1,349 per dwelling	(1,349)	(1,349)	(3,372,500)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(1,852,500)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(2,741,125)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(13,500,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(17,058,190)
Building Safety Levy	£32.74 psm on 154,274 sq m market floor area		(2,020)	(5,050,925)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£3,500 per dwelling	(3,500)	(3,500)	(8,750,000)
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(1,190,000)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,500)	(10,500)	(26,248,884)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,599)	(12,599)	(31,498,661)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(16,706,045)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(7,385)	(7,385)	(18,463,197)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(138,900,074)
Total development costs			**(334,397)**	**(835,993,012)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(49,587,612)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(7,300,952)
Residual land value		**(56,888,564)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(134,634)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-7.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£62,500 per gross acre on 422.5 acres	26,408,813
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		62,500

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(83,297,377)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(197,134)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	30.00	(18,394)	(47,731)	(77,357)	(109,329)	(142,050)	(175,684)	(210,788)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(34,817)	(63,451)	(93,298)	(124,718)	(156,804)	(189,902)	(224,650)
0.00	90.00	(51,297)	(79,232)	(109,456)	(140,201)	(171,679)	(204,283)	(238,756)
	120.00	(67,834)	(96,169)	(125,704)	(155,793)	(186,695)	(218,859)	(253,153)
	150.00	(84,785)	(113,202)	(142,049)	(171,506)	(201,871)	(233,660)	(267,897)
	180.00	(102,620)	(130,325)	(158,504)	(187,361)	(217,233)	(248,725)	(283,067)
	210.00	(120,543)	(147,552)	(175,087)	(203,378)	(232,813)	(264,109)	(298,755)
	240.00	(138,565)	(164,900)	(191,817)	(219,583)	(248,650)	(279,875)	(315,099)
	270.00	(156,698)	(182,382)	(208,716)	(236,008)	(264,794)	(296,110)	(332,279)
	300.00	(174,961)	(200,020)	(225,811)	(252,692)	(281,307)	(312,930)	(350,558)
	330.00	(193,373)	(217,839)	(243,138)	(269,689)	(298,273)	(330,490)	(369,966)
	360.00	(211,955)	(235,870)	(260,736)	(287,062)	(315,801)	(349,011)	(389,692)
	390.00	(230,738)	(254,153)	(278,665)	(304,895)	(334,039)	(368,811)	(412,405)
	420.00	(249,756)	(272,733)	(296,992)	(323,299)	(353,194)	(389,703)	(478,578)
	450.00	(269,053)	(291,674)	(315,811)	(342,430)	(373,567)	(410,896)	(544,751)
	480.00	(288,686)	(311,054)	(335,242)	(362,501)	(395,455)	(443,390)	(610,924)
	510.00	(308,726)	(330,979)	(355,458)	(383,824)	(417,914)	(514,290)	(677,097)
	540.00	(329,273)	(351,595)	(376,697)	(406,824)	(440,681)	(585,189)	(743,270)
	570.00	(350,450)	(373,100)	(399,314)	(430,626)	(502,736)	(656,089)	(809,442)
	600.00	(372,440)	(395,786)	(423,756)	(454,746)	(578,362)	(726,989)	(875,615)
	630.00	(395,492)	(420,086)	(448,977)	(510,088)	(653,988)	(797,888)	(941,788)
	660.00	(419,983)	(446,269)	(474,542)	(590,441)	(729,614)	(868,788)	(1,007,961)
	690.00	(446,493)	(472,992)	(536,347)	(670,793)	(805,240)	(939,687)	(1,074,134)
	720.00	(474,418)	(500,071)	(621,426)	(751,146)	(880,867)	(1,010,587)	(1,140,307)
	750.00	(502,713)	(581,512)	(706,506)	(831,499)	(956,493)	(1,081,486)	(1,206,480)

TABLE 2

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	140,110	110,622	81,024	51,289	21,374	(8,776)	(39,253)
	5,000	111,825	82,256	52,556	22,695	(7,383)	(37,752)	(68,530)
Site Specific S106	10,000	83,474	53,814	23,999	(6,013)	(36,290)	(66,931)	(99,391)
25,000	15,000	55,061	25,290	(4,663)	(34,857)	(65,376)	(97,538)	(131,395)
	20,000	26,569	(3,330)	(33,451)	(63,865)	(95,752)	(129,352)	(163,916)
	25,000	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	30,000	(30,707)	(60,940)	(92,350)	(125,533)	(159,440)	(194,459)	(231,343)
	35,000	(59,522)	(90,716)	(123,733)	(157,381)	(191,984)	(228,127)	(267,013)
	40,000	(89,124)	(121,992)	(155,418)	(189,668)	(225,210)	(262,962)	(304,991)
	45,000	(120,299)	(153,534)	(187,486)	(222,534)	(259,394)	(299,569)	(346,958)
	50,000	(151,719)	(185,413)	(220,052)	(256,196)	(294,973)	(339,055)	(394,490)
	55,000	(183,434)	(217,727)	(253,286)	(290,982)	(332,716)	(383,692)	(524,161)
	60,000	(215,531)	(250,609)	(287,446)	(327,445)	(374,101)	(443,002)	(686,161)
	65,000	(248,120)	(284,265)	(322,942)	(366,584)	(421,045)	(605,002)	(848,162)
	70,000	(281,362)	(319,005)	(360,472)	(410,410)	(523,843)	(767,003)	(1,010,163)

TABLE 3

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	101,531	66,300	30,803	(5,060)	(41,446)	(78,607)	(119,614)
	16.0%	80,821	46,626	12,165	(22,662)	(58,013)	(95,163)	(135,118)
Profit	17.0%	60,112	26,953	(6,473)	(40,265)	(74,580)	(111,775)	(150,622)
20.0%	18.0%	39,403	7,279	(25,111)	(57,868)	(91,964)	(128,387)	(166,126)
	19.0%	18,694	(12,394)	(43,749)	(75,471)	(109,683)	(144,998)	(181,630)
	20.0%	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)

TABLE 4

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	1,176	(28,877)	(59,196)	(90,833)	(124,211)	(158,419)	(193,943)
	70,000	(11,588)	(41,642)	(71,961)	(103,597)	(136,976)	(171,183)	(206,708)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	(24,353)	(54,406)	(84,726)	(116,362)	(149,740)	(183,948)	(219,472)
62,500	90,000	(37,117)	(67,171)	(97,490)	(129,127)	(162,505)	(196,712)	(232,237)
	100,000	(49,882)	(79,935)	(110,255)	(141,891)	(175,270)	(209,477)	(245,002)
	110,000	(62,647)	(92,700)	(123,019)	(154,656)	(188,034)	(222,242)	(257,766)
	120,000	(75,411)	(105,464)	(135,784)	(167,420)	(200,799)	(235,006)	(270,531)
	130,000	(88,176)	(118,229)	(148,549)	(180,185)	(213,563)	(247,771)	(283,295)
	140,000	(100,940)	(130,994)	(161,313)	(192,950)	(226,328)	(260,535)	(296,060)
	150,000	(113,705)	(143,758)	(174,078)	(205,714)	(239,092)	(273,300)	(308,825)
	160,000	(126,470)	(156,523)	(186,842)	(218,479)	(251,857)	(286,064)	(321,589)
	170,000	(139,234)	(169,287)	(199,607)	(231,243)	(264,622)	(298,829)	(334,354)
	180,000	(151,999)	(182,052)	(212,371)	(244,008)	(277,386)	(311,594)	(347,118)
	190,000	(164,763)	(194,817)	(225,136)	(256,773)	(290,151)	(324,358)	(359,883)
	200,000	(177,528)	(207,581)	(237,901)	(269,537)	(302,915)	(337,123)	(372,648)
	210,000	(190,293)	(220,346)	(250,665)	(282,302)	(315,680)	(349,887)	(385,412)

TABLE 5

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	25	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
Density (dph)	30	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
24.4	35	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	40	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	45	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	50	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	55	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	60	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	65	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	70	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)

TABLE 6

Affordable Housing - % on site 30%

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(197,134)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	316,396	285,977	255,521	225,023	194,465	163,845	133,138
	75%	263,836	233,565	203,249	172,865	142,411	111,862	81,195
Build Cost	80%	211,133	180,992	150,782	120,490	90,096	59,567	28,864
100%	85%	158,252	128,212	98,079	67,830	37,436	6,846	(24,007)
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	105,146	75,166	45,060	14,789	(15,696)	(46,477)	(77,669)
	95%	51,754	21,779	(8,376)	(38,771)	(69,496)	(102,163)	(136,250)
	100%	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	105%	(56,296)	(87,054)	(119,858)	(153,290)	(187,667)	(223,557)	(262,110)
	110%	(113,506)	(146,322)	(179,849)	(214,454)	(250,806)	(290,289)	(336,328)
	115%	(173,436)	(207,105)	(242,009)	(278,946)	(319,596)	(368,290)	(468,102)
	120%	(235,090)	(270,381)	(308,054)	(350,178)	(401,902)	(535,535)	(773,417)
	125%	(299,628)	(338,226)	(382,234)	(436,500)	(605,607)	(842,169)	(1,078,732)

TABLE 7

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(197,134)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30% 0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(414,687)	(499,089)	(628,420)	(757,752)	(887,084)	(1,016,415)	(1,145,747)
	82%	(354,952)	(384,416)	(423,530)	(564,245)	(704,959)	(845,674)	(986,388)
Market Values	84%	(305,156)	(330,735)	(360,571)	(394,888)	(522,835)	(674,932)	(827,029)
100%	86%	(261,141)	(285,635)	(312,417)	(343,264)	(379,965)	(504,190)	(667,670)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(220,149)	(244,807)	(270,888)	(299,295)	(331,920)	(371,285)	(508,311)
	90%	(180,948)	(206,363)	(232,750)	(260,638)	(291,040)	(326,177)	(368,847)
	92%	(142,895)	(169,388)	(196,590)	(224,839)	(254,756)	(287,564)	(326,131)
	94%	(105,627)	(133,389)	(161,689)	(190,767)	(221,032)	(253,242)	(289,005)
	96%	(69,599)	(98,067)	(127,642)	(157,819)	(188,883)	(221,350)	(256,222)
	98%	(35,661)	(64,288)	(94,202)	(125,643)	(157,779)	(190,974)	(225,906)
	100%	(2,015)	(32,068)	(62,388)	(94,024)	(127,402)	(161,610)	(197,134)
	102%	31,401	(111)	(31,853)	(63,899)	(97,554)	(132,957)	(169,396)
	104%	64,635	31,635	(1,562)	(35,018)	(68,836)	(104,824)	(142,383)
	106%	97,724	63,215	28,534	(6,369)	(41,583)	(77,233)	(115,901)
	108%	130,694	94,659	58,476	22,094	(14,553)	(51,575)	(89,817)
	110%	163,565	125,993	88,290	50,410	12,296	(26,141)	(65,041)
	112%	196,354	157,237	117,996	78,601	39,002	(883)	(41,172)
	114%	229,071	188,395	147,613	106,693	65,585	24,227	(17,485)
	116%	261,727	219,494	177,160	134,697	92,071	49,220	6,053
	118%	294,333	250,532	206,637	162,629	118,472	74,110	29,469
	120%	326,894	281,520	236,062	190,499	144,799	98,915	52,780

TABLE 8

Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(197,134)	Affordable Housing - % on site 30% 0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	(2,015)	(30,613)	(59,454)	(89,269)	(120,961)	(153,378)	(186,912)
	10,000	(2,015)	(29,158)	(56,525)	(84,518)	(114,538)	(145,185)	(176,780)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	(2,015)	(27,706)	(53,596)	(79,775)	(108,131)	(137,031)	(166,732)
-	20,000	(2,015)	(26,254)	(50,670)	(75,323)	(101,741)	(128,910)	(156,758)
	25,000	(2,015)	(24,802)	(47,747)	(70,898)	(95,366)	(120,825)	(146,852)
	30,000	(2,015)	(23,350)	(44,825)	(66,484)	(89,005)	(112,767)	(137,007)
	35,000	(2,015)	(21,898)	(41,904)	(62,071)	(82,658)	(104,739)	(127,220)
	40,000	(2,015)	(20,446)	(38,988)	(57,667)	(76,523)	(96,738)	(117,484)
	45,000	(2,015)	(18,994)	(36,071)	(53,266)	(70,612)	(88,762)	(107,793)
	50,000	(2,015)	(17,544)	(33,155)	(48,872)	(64,713)	(80,809)	(98,148)
	55,000	(2,015)	(16,095)	(30,245)	(44,481)	(58,825)	(73,301)	(88,542)

Land at Colchester Station

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Strategic Site
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	5.5
Site area, gross (acres)	13.5
Site area, net (hectares)	3.3
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	76.2
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	45.7
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	175 market units at £374,350 each	374,350	262,045	65,511,250
Affordable rent	30 units at 55% of market value	178,299	21,396	5,348,970
Social rent	30 units at 45% of market value	145,881	17,506	4,376,430
Other intermediate	15 units at 70% of market value	226,926	13,616	3,403,890
Grant	£0 per affordable unit		-	-
Total gross development value			**314,562**	**78,640,540**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land				
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	Statutory fee £68,060 plus 3x for surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	£0 psm on 16,530 sq m market floor area		-	-
Section 106 contributions	£25,000 per dwelling, spread over years 1-15	(25,000)	(25,000)	(6,250,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	£0 psm on total floor area		-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	£100,000 per ha on 3.3 ha net		(1,313)	(328,200)
Infrastructure and construction				
Site infrastructure	£35,000 per dwelling (40% in the lead-in phase)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(8,750,000)
Build cost - houses	£1,556 psm on 18,764 sq m of houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	£1,940 psm on 2,536 sq m of flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	£600 psm, 18 sq m each, market houses only		(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	15% of the dwelling build cost	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs				
Biodiversity net gain	£361 per dwelling	(361)	(361)	(90,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	£780 per dwelling on 95% of dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	£37,700 affordable and £15,170 market on 5%	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,113)
Future Homes Standard 2026	£5,400 per dwelling	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy	5% of the dwelling build cost	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	£16.37 psm on 15,427 sq m market floor area		(1,010)	(252,546)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	£0 per dwelling	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	£476 per dwelling	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return				
Contingency	5% of construction and design policy costs	(10,516)	(10,516)	(2,628,948)
Professional fees	6% of construction, contingency excluded	(12,619)	(12,619)	(3,154,738)
Disposal costs	2.50% of market value, 0.25% of affordable	(6,682)	(6,682)	(1,670,604)
Finance on development costs	7.5% APR on the development cashflow	(6,107)	(6,107)	(1,526,688)
Developer profit and margin	20% of market value and 6% margin on affordable	(55,560)	(55,560)	(13,890,007)
Total development costs			**(329,358)**	**(82,339,562)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)				-

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Residual land value (gross)		(3,699,022)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	2% agent and legal, SDLT on the HMRC scale	-
Interest on land (phased tranche draw-down)	7.5% APR on a phased land draw-down	(989,058)
Residual land value		**(4,688,080)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)		(346,845)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value		-6.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	ASSUMPTION APPLIED	
Benchmark land value (total)	£450,000 per gross acre on 13.5 acres	6,082,367
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)		450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(10,770,446)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(796,845)**
Viability outcome for this allocation	**Not Viable**

SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Each table below is driven by the main appraisal. Values shown are surplus / (deficit) in GBP per gross acre. Press Ctrl+Alt+F9 to repopulate.

TABLE 1

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	0.00	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	30.00	(260,557)	(351,336)	(442,579)	(535,998)	(635,039)	(735,259)	(837,204)
CIL £ psm	60.00	(311,691)	(400,148)	(489,085)	(583,321)	(680,025)	(777,997)	(877,886)
0.00	90.00	(362,957)	(449,102)	(537,458)	(630,842)	(725,225)	(821,026)	(918,907)
	120.00	(414,372)	(498,214)	(587,558)	(678,597)	(770,709)	(864,358)	(960,321)
	150.00	(465,953)	(550,022)	(637,870)	(726,583)	(816,450)	(908,036)	(1,002,181)
	180.00	(518,243)	(602,949)	(688,438)	(774,838)	(862,542)	(952,117)	(1,044,570)
	210.00	(573,743)	(656,124)	(739,254)	(823,406)	(908,989)	(996,656)	(1,087,548)
	240.00	(629,549)	(709,548)	(790,373)	(872,322)	(955,851)	(1,041,712)	(1,131,237)
	270.00	(685,604)	(763,259)	(841,816)	(921,626)	(1,003,189)	(1,087,387)	(1,175,630)
	300.00	(741,970)	(817,312)	(893,657)	(971,381)	(1,051,075)	(1,133,767)	(1,220,150)
	330.00	(798,655)	(871,738)	(945,923)	(1,021,651)	(1,099,610)	(1,180,986)	(1,264,894)
	360.00	(855,729)	(926,585)	(998,681)	(1,072,510)	(1,148,892)	(1,228,637)	(1,309,816)
	390.00	(913,218)	(981,922)	(1,052,009)	(1,124,079)	(1,199,052)	(1,276,476)	(1,354,872)
	420.00	(971,197)	(1,037,821)	(1,106,019)	(1,176,462)	(1,249,877)	(1,324,453)	(1,400,158)
	450.00	(1,029,740)	(1,094,362)	(1,160,802)	(1,229,819)	(1,300,843)	(1,372,682)	(1,445,625)
	480.00	(1,088,924)	(1,151,684)	(1,216,507)	(1,283,824)	(1,351,978)	(1,421,091)	(1,491,233)
	510.00	(1,148,889)	(1,209,901)	(1,273,296)	(1,337,993)	(1,403,396)	(1,469,644)	(1,537,069)
	540.00	(1,209,745)	(1,269,197)	(1,330,478)	(1,392,324)	(1,454,962)	(1,518,458)	(1,737,277)
	570.00	(1,271,668)	(1,329,480)	(1,387,927)	(1,446,971)	(1,506,718)	(1,567,453)	(2,003,638)
	600.00	(1,334,836)	(1,389,921)	(1,445,532)	(1,501,773)	(1,558,747)	(1,646,474)	(2,269,999)
	630.00	(1,398,371)	(1,450,645)	(1,503,407)	(1,556,763)	(1,610,932)	(1,931,861)	(2,536,361)
	660.00	(1,462,227)	(1,511,614)	(1,561,522)	(1,612,054)	(1,663,315)	(2,217,248)	(2,802,722)
	690.00	(1,526,252)	(1,572,751)	(1,619,801)	(1,667,508)	(1,936,187)	(2,502,635)	(3,069,083)
	720.00	(1,590,557)	(1,634,210)	(1,678,378)	(1,723,165)	(2,240,600)	(2,788,022)	(3,335,445)
	750.00	(1,655,143)	(1,695,888)	(1,737,179)	(2,016,617)	(2,545,013)	(3,073,410)	(3,601,806)

TABLE 2

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	-	232,571	140,492	48,235	(44,216)	(136,945)	(229,994)	(323,480)
	5,000	144,467	52,224	(40,207)	(132,878)	(225,889)	(319,281)	(413,227)
Site Specific S106	10,000	56,213	(36,197)	(128,834)	(221,784)	(315,103)	(408,934)	(503,451)
25,000	15,000	(32,188)	(124,799)	(217,679)	(310,954)	(404,679)	(499,032)	(600,036)
	20,000	(120,764)	(213,608)	(306,805)	(400,424)	(494,647)	(595,111)	(697,935)
	25,000	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	30,000	(298,546)	(392,019)	(485,987)	(585,458)	(687,671)	(791,293)	(897,048)
	35,000	(387,820)	(481,690)	(580,688)	(682,659)	(785,884)	(890,995)	(999,023)
	40,000	(477,435)	(575,990)	(677,709)	(780,598)	(885,141)	(992,213)	(1,103,411)
	45,000	(571,300)	(672,843)	(775,416)	(879,461)	(985,724)	(1,095,495)	(1,211,161)
	50,000	(668,006)	(770,316)	(873,934)	(979,525)	(1,088,102)	(1,201,667)	(1,320,608)
	55,000	(765,281)	(868,541)	(973,532)	(1,081,128)	(1,192,898)	(1,310,654)	(1,431,141)
	60,000	(863,261)	(967,730)	(1,074,489)	(1,184,812)	(1,300,939)	(1,420,587)	(1,542,910)
	65,000	(962,094)	(1,068,140)	(1,177,246)	(1,291,388)	(1,410,375)	(1,531,673)	(2,156,591)
	70,000	(1,062,010)	(1,170,113)	(1,282,448)	(1,400,445)	(1,520,846)	(1,804,277)	(2,808,319)

TABLE 3

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	15.0%	114,157	4,857	(104,890)	(215,161)	(326,159)	(438,184)	(554,504)
	16.0%	49,417	(56,646)	(163,155)	(270,190)	(377,950)	(486,738)	(602,972)
Profit	17.0%	(15,322)	(118,148)	(221,421)	(325,218)	(429,742)	(536,966)	(651,440)
20.0%	18.0%	(80,062)	(179,651)	(279,687)	(380,247)	(481,534)	(588,896)	(699,908)
	19.0%	(144,801)	(241,153)	(337,952)	(435,275)	(534,862)	(640,826)	(748,376)
	20.0%	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)

TABLE 4

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	60,000	243,878	150,762	57,200	(36,886)	(136,836)	(239,338)	(343,426)
	70,000	232,251	139,136	45,574	(48,512)	(148,462)	(250,965)	(355,053)
BLV (£ per acre)	80,000	220,625	127,510	33,948	(60,138)	(160,088)	(262,591)	(366,679)
450,000	90,000	208,999	115,884	22,322	(71,764)	(171,714)	(274,217)	(378,305)
	100,000	197,373	104,258	10,696	(83,390)	(183,340)	(285,843)	(389,931)
	110,000	185,747	92,632	(930)	(95,016)	(194,966)	(297,469)	(401,557)
	120,000	174,121	81,006	(12,556)	(106,642)	(206,592)	(309,095)	(413,183)
	130,000	162,495	69,379	(24,182)	(118,269)	(218,218)	(320,721)	(424,809)
	140,000	150,869	57,753	(35,808)	(129,895)	(229,844)	(332,347)	(436,435)
	150,000	139,243	46,127	(47,435)	(141,521)	(241,471)	(343,973)	(448,061)
	160,000	127,617	34,501	(59,061)	(153,147)	(253,097)	(355,599)	(459,687)
	170,000	115,990	22,875	(70,687)	(164,773)	(264,723)	(367,226)	(471,314)
	180,000	104,364	11,249	(82,313)	(176,399)	(276,349)	(378,852)	(482,940)
	190,000	92,738	(377)	(93,939)	(188,025)	(287,975)	(390,478)	(494,566)
	200,000	81,112	(12,003)	(105,565)	(199,651)	(299,601)	(402,104)	(506,192)
	210,000	69,486	(23,629)	(117,191)	(211,277)	(311,227)	(413,730)	(517,818)

TABLE 5

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	20	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	25	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
Density (dph)	30	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
76.2	35	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	40	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	45	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	50	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	55	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	60	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	65	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	70	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)

TABLE 6

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (g))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	70%	785,759	690,352	594,928	499,412	403,884	308,245	212,539
	75%	621,329	526,507	431,578	336,626	241,544	146,373	51,076
Build Cost	80%	456,492	362,149	267,756	173,219	78,565	(16,245)	(111,255)
100%	85%	291,112	197,258	103,254	9,097	(85,243)	(179,838)	(274,758)
(105% = 5% increase)	90%	125,116	31,631	(62,050)	(155,972)	(250,182)	(344,768)	(439,874)
	95%	(41,699)	(134,936)	(228,443)	(322,285)	(416,590)	(511,733)	(613,983)
	100%	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	105%	(378,709)	(471,993)	(569,721)	(671,091)	(773,763)	(878,316)	(985,816)
	110%	(552,319)	(652,687)	(754,126)	(857,087)	(962,310)	(1,071,073)	(1,185,532)
	115%	(737,815)	(839,429)	(942,852)	(1,048,958)	(1,159,312)	(1,274,919)	(1,392,640)
	120%	(927,090)	(1,031,161)	(1,138,422)	(1,250,730)	(1,366,312)	(1,483,801)	(1,855,892)
	125%	(1,122,151)	(1,230,872)	(1,344,375)	(1,459,762)	(1,576,916)	(2,106,671)	(3,084,172)

TABLE 7

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	80%	(1,379,024)	(1,433,260)	(1,488,238)	(1,782,974)	(2,325,114)	(2,867,254)	(3,409,394)
	82%	(1,246,448)	(1,306,322)	(1,366,896)	(1,428,212)	(1,586,071)	(2,174,402)	(2,762,732)
Market Values	84%	(1,116,334)	(1,181,070)	(1,247,216)	(1,314,061)	(1,381,803)	(1,481,549)	(2,116,070)

100%	86%	(991,948)	(1,059,440)	(1,129,131)	(1,201,387)	(1,274,649)	(1,348,901)	(1,469,407)
(105% = 5% increase)	88%	(871,726)	(942,897)	(1,015,639)	(1,090,646)	(1,168,851)	(1,248,555)	(1,329,506)
	90%	(754,306)	(829,685)	(906,237)	(984,468)	(1,065,129)	(1,149,452)	(1,235,779)
	92%	(638,887)	(718,776)	(799,610)	(881,719)	(965,649)	(1,052,339)	(1,143,189)
	94%	(524,897)	(609,543)	(694,935)	(781,341)	(869,160)	(959,075)	(1,052,241)
	96%	(418,455)	(502,167)	(591,698)	(682,669)	(774,785)	(868,544)	(964,775)
	98%	(313,686)	(402,064)	(490,947)	(585,268)	(681,941)	(779,942)	(879,884)
	100%	(209,541)	(302,656)	(396,218)	(490,304)	(590,254)	(692,757)	(796,845)
	102%	(105,879)	(203,821)	(302,095)	(400,853)	(500,216)	(606,655)	(715,158)
	104%	(2,647)	(105,398)	(208,486)	(311,954)	(415,971)	(521,413)	(634,527)
	106%	100,250	(7,375)	(115,265)	(223,535)	(332,253)	(441,620)	(554,687)
	108%	202,873	90,358	(22,402)	(135,457)	(248,969)	(363,014)	(477,822)
	110%	305,260	187,836	70,192	(47,727)	(166,026)	(284,803)	(404,277)
	112%	407,451	285,098	162,550	39,752	(83,367)	(206,949)	(331,116)
	114%	509,484	382,180	254,710	127,016	(960)	(129,374)	(258,299)
	116%	611,326	479,119	346,705	214,095	81,227	(52,033)	(185,745)
	118%	713,050	575,869	438,545	301,017	163,224	25,104	(113,425)
	120%	814,702	672,521	530,228	387,763	245,064	102,067	(41,312)

TABLE 8

		Affordable Housing - % on site 30%						
Balance (RLV - BLV £ per acre (n))	(796,845)	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	25%	30%
	5,000	(209,541)	(298,137)	(387,133)	(476,588)	(570,534)	(667,827)	(766,452)
	10,000	(209,541)	(293,622)	(378,049)	(462,872)	(550,839)	(642,960)	(736,201)
Grant (£ per unit)	15,000	(209,541)	(289,107)	(368,964)	(449,189)	(531,184)	(618,161)	(706,082)
-	20,000	(209,541)	(284,593)	(359,881)	(435,518)	(511,743)	(593,441)	(676,087)
	25,000	(209,541)	(280,078)	(350,824)	(421,848)	(493,211)	(568,765)	(646,205)
	30,000	(209,541)	(275,564)	(341,768)	(408,190)	(474,924)	(544,147)	(616,428)
	35,000	(209,541)	(271,049)	(332,712)	(394,564)	(456,640)	(519,648)	(586,745)
	40,000	(209,541)	(266,535)	(323,656)	(380,937)	(438,413)	(496,118)	(557,149)
	45,000	(209,541)	(262,020)	(314,599)	(367,310)	(420,186)	(473,259)	(527,629)
	50,000	(209,541)	(257,506)	(305,543)	(353,711)	(401,994)	(450,421)	(499,038)
	55,000	(209,541)	(252,991)	(296,514)	(340,127)	(383,825)	(427,637)	(471,594)

Typology appraisals — Regulation 19 base case

APPRAISAL RESULTS BY TYPOLOGY — GENERAL TYPOLOGIES

Typology	Dwellings	AH %	Gross acres	GDV	Total costs	Residual land value	RLV per acre	BLV	BLV per acre	Balance	Balance per acre	Outcome
Higher Value Greenfield	9	0%	0.9	3,678,750	(2,951,078)	584,377	630,651	92,662	100,000	491,715	**530,651**	Viable
Higher Value Greenfield	25	30%	2.2	8,610,922	(7,656,191)	764,130	352,533	216,754	100,000	547,375	**252,533**	Viable
Higher Value Greenfield	50	30%	4.8	17,221,845	(15,318,973)	1,514,729	312,631	484,510	100,000	1,030,220	**212,631**	Viable
Higher Value Greenfield	100	30%	10.3	33,688,876	(28,170,205)	4,377,193	425,142	1,029,583	100,000	3,347,609	**325,142**	Viable
Higher Value Greenfield	150	30%	20.6	50,533,314	(42,138,259)	6,654,294	323,155	2,059,167	100,000	4,595,128	**223,155**	Viable
Higher Value Greenfield	250	30%	34.3	84,222,190	(70,038,142)	11,237,176	327,429	3,431,944	100,000	7,805,231	**227,429**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	9	0%	0.9	3,429,000	(2,913,344)	416,534	449,517	92,662	100,000	323,871	**349,517**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	25	30%	2.2	8,030,122	(7,577,098)	366,951	169,294	216,754	100,000	150,197	**69,294**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	50	30%	4.8	16,060,245	(15,171,123)	712,190	146,992	484,510	100,000	227,680	**46,992**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	100	30%	10.3	31,456,216	(27,886,065)	2,834,638	275,319	1,029,583	100,000	1,805,055	**175,319**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	150	30%	20.6	47,184,324	(41,697,840)	4,351,712	211,334	2,059,167	100,000	2,292,545	**111,334**	Viable
Medium Value Greenfield	250	30%	34.3	78,640,540	(69,279,960)	7,418,657	216,165	3,431,944	100,000	3,986,712	**116,165**	Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	9	0%	0.9	3,179,250	(2,859,092)	261,767	282,495	92,662	100,000	169,104	**182,495**	Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	25	30%	2.2	7,449,322	(7,466,553)	(64,773)	(29,883)	216,754	100,000	(281,527)	**(129,883)**	Not Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	50	30%	4.8	14,898,645	(14,964,228)	(182,595)	(37,687)	484,510	100,000	(667,105)	**(137,687)**	Not Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	100	30%	10.3	29,254,050	(27,496,401)	1,399,763	135,954	1,029,583	100,000	370,179	**35,954**	Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	150	30%	20.6	43,881,075	(41,094,495)	2,214,321	107,535	2,059,167	100,000	155,154	**7,535**	Viable
Lower Value Greenfield	250	30%	34.3	73,135,125	(68,238,969)	3,884,376	113,183	3,431,944	100,000	452,431	**13,183**	Viable
Higher Value Brownfield	9	0%	0.7	3,678,750	(2,993,307)	550,946	743,216	333,585	450,000	217,361	**293,216**	Viable
Higher Value Brownfield	25	30%	2.1	8,610,922	(7,733,431)	644,124	312,808	926,625	450,000	(282,501)	**(137,192)**	Marginal
Higher Value Brownfield	50	30%	4.1	17,221,845	(15,478,035)	1,266,576	307,546	1,853,250	450,000	(586,674)	**(142,454)**	Marginal
Higher Value Brownfield	100	30%	8.2	33,688,876	(28,486,829)	4,126,535	500,996	3,706,500	450,000	420,035	**50,996**	Viable
Higher Value Brownfield	150	30%	12.4	50,533,314	(42,621,900)	6,271,418	507,602	5,559,750	450,000	711,668	**57,602**	Viable
Higher Value Brownfield	250	30%	20.6	84,222,190	(70,848,669)	10,595,519	514,554	9,266,250	450,000	1,329,269	**64,554**	Viable
Medium Value Brownfield	9	0%	0.7	3,429,000	(2,938,610)	396,532	534,914	333,585	450,000	62,947	**84,914**	Viable
Medium Value Brownfield	25	30%	2.1	8,030,122	(7,621,404)	175,351	85,156	926,625	450,000	(751,274)	**(364,844)**	Marginal
Medium Value Brownfield	50	30%	4.1	16,060,245	(15,264,728)	318,283	77,285	1,853,250	450,000	(1,534,967)	**(372,715)**	Marginal
Medium Value Brownfield	100	30%	8.2	31,456,216	(28,076,882)	2,414,366	293,124	3,706,500	450,000	(1,292,134)	**(156,876)**	Marginal
Medium Value Brownfield	150	30%	12.4	47,184,324	(41,995,606)	3,736,016	302,389	5,559,750	450,000	(1,823,734)	**(147,611)**	Marginal
Medium Value Brownfield	250	30%	20.6	78,640,540	(69,784,530)	6,427,842	312,157	9,266,250	450,000	(2,838,408)	**(137,843)**	Marginal
Lower Value Brownfield	9	0%	0.7	3,179,250	(2,884,434)	217,524	293,436	333,585	450,000	(116,061)	**(156,564)**	Marginal
Lower Value Brownfield	25	30%	2.1	7,449,322	(7,511,426)	(295,470)	(143,490)	926,625	450,000	(1,222,095)	**(593,490)**	Not Viable
Lower Value Brownfield	50	30%	4.1	14,898,645	(15,058,799)	(637,387)	(154,768)	1,853,250	450,000	(2,490,637)	**(604,768)**	Not Viable
Lower Value Brownfield	100	30%	8.2	29,254,050	(27,691,318)	597,764	72,574	3,706,500	450,000	(3,108,736)	**(377,426)**	Marginal
Lower Value Brownfield	150	30%	12.4	43,881,075	(41,401,618)	1,026,756	83,104	5,559,750	450,000	(4,532,994)	**(366,896)**	Marginal
Lower Value Brownfield	250	30%	20.6	73,135,125	(68,763,018)	1,943,939	94,404	9,266,250	450,000	(7,322,311)	**(355,596)**	Marginal
Aggregate across the typologies	**3,504**		**363.7**	**1,109,107,625**	**(990,072,560)**	**88,522,074**	**243,363**	**86,881,743**	**238,853**	**1,640,331**	**4,510**	

APPRAISAL RESULTS BY TYPOLOGY — RURAL EXCEPTION TYPOLOGIES

Typology	Dwellings	AH %	Gross acres	GDV	Total costs	Residual land value	RLV per acre	BLV	BLV per acre	Balance	Balance per acre	Outcome
Lower Value Rural	5	30%	0.5	1,489,864	(1,486,973)	(8,082)	(15,700)	51,479	100,000	(59,561)	**(115,700)**	Not Viable
Medium Value Rural	5	30%	0.5	1,606,024	(1,509,003)	79,973	155,350	51,479	100,000	28,494	**55,350**	Viable
Higher Value Rural	5	30%	0.5	1,722,184	(1,531,171)	157,328	305,614	51,479	100,000	105,849	**205,614**	Viable
Aggregate across the typologies	**15**		**1.5**	**4,818,074**	**(4,527,147)**	**229,218**	**148,421**	**154,438**	**100,000**	**74,781**	**48,421**	

AGGREGATE ACROSS ALL TYPOLOGIES

Typologies appraised	**39**
Viable	23
Marginal	11
Not viable	5
Total dwellings	3,519
Total gross development value	1,113,925,698
Total residual land value (net)	88,751,292
Total benchmark land value	87,036,181
Total surplus / (deficit)	**1,715,111**

Each appraisal that follows is stated on the Regulation 19 base case: policy affordable housing, nil CIL, site specific Section 106 of £10,500 per dwelling above the small site threshold, the full policy cost package including Future Homes Standard 2026, Policy NZ1 low carbon uplift, Building Safety Levy, biodiversity net gain, M4(2) and M4(3), and Essex Coast RAMS. Stamp duty, acquisition fees and interest on land are charged on the greater of the benchmark land value and the price actually payable, compounded monthly over the land hold period. Figures in brackets are negative. Viability is tested by comparing the residual land value with the benchmark land value.

Higher Value Greenfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.38
Site area, gross (acres)	0.93
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	408,750	3,678,750
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**408,750**	**3,678,750**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,160)	(19,440)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(12,141)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,079)	(10,079)	(90,712)
Professional fees	(16,127)	(16,127)	(145,139)
Disposal costs	(10,219)	(10,219)	(91,969)
Finance on development costs	(4,866)	(4,866)	(43,791)
Developer profit and margin	(81,750)	(81,750)	(735,750)
Total development costs	**-**	**(327,898)**	**(2,951,078)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	727,672
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(27,485)
Interest on land over the hold period	(115,810)
Residual land value	**584,377**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	630,651
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	15.9%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	92,662
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**491,715**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**530,651**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Greenfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.88
Site area, gross (acres)	2.17
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	28.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	286,125	7,153,125
Affordable rent	197,972	23,757	593,918
Social rent	161,978	19,437	485,932
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	251,965	15,118	377,948
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**344,437**	**8,610,922**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(1,512)	(37,800)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(33,725)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,747)	(9,747)	(243,663)
Professional fees	(15,594)	(15,594)	(389,862)
Disposal costs	(7,357)	(7,357)	(183,930)
Finance on development costs	(2,278)	(2,278)	(56,953)
Developer profit and margin	(60,724)	(60,724)	(1,518,093)
Total development costs	**-**	**(306,248)**	**(7,656,191)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	954,731
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(39,168)
Interest on land over the hold period	(151,433)
Residual land value	**764,130**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	352,533
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	8.9%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	216,754
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**547,375**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**252,533**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Greenfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.96
Site area, gross (acres)	4.85
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	25.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	286,125	14,306,250
Affordable rent	197,972	23,757	1,187,835
Social rent	161,978	19,437	971,865
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	251,965	15,118	755,895
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**344,437**	**17,221,845**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(1,512)	(75,600)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(67,450)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(100,839)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,747)	(9,747)	(487,327)
Professional fees	(15,594)	(15,594)	(779,723)
Disposal costs	(7,357)	(7,357)	(367,861)
Finance on development costs	(2,610)	(2,610)	(130,497)
Developer profit and margin	(60,724)	(60,724)	(3,036,186)
Total development costs	**-**	**(306,379)**	**(15,318,973)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	1,902,872
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(87,957)
Interest on land over the hold period	(300,185)
Residual land value	**1,514,729**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	312,631
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	8.8%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	484,510
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**1,030,220**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**212,631**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Greenfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	4.17
Site area, gross (acres)	10.30
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	28,084,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	2,283,468
Social rent	155,691	18,683	1,868,292
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	1,453,116
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**33,688,876**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(1,512)	(151,200)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(134,900)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(202,037)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(8,943)	(8,943)	(894,285)
Professional fees	(10,731)	(10,731)	(1,073,142)
Disposal costs	(7,217)	(7,217)	(721,717)
Finance on development costs	(1,825)	(1,825)	(182,463)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(5,953,093)
Total development costs	**-**	**(281,702)**	**(28,170,205)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	5,518,671
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(274,018)
Interest on land over the hold period	(867,461)
Residual land value	**4,377,193**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	425,142
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	13.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	1,029,583
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**3,347,609**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**325,142**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Greenfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	42,126,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	3,425,202
Social rent	155,691	18,683	2,802,438
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	2,179,674
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**50,533,314**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(1,512)	(226,800)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(202,350)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(303,055)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(8,943)	(8,943)	(1,341,428)
Professional fees	(10,731)	(10,731)	(1,609,714)
Disposal costs	(7,217)	(7,217)	(1,082,576)
Finance on development costs	(1,316)	(1,316)	(197,426)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(8,929,639)
Total development costs	**-**	**(280,922)**	**(42,138,259)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	8,395,055
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(422,029)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,318,731)
Residual land value	**6,654,294**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	323,155
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	13.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	2,059,167
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**4,595,128**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**223,155**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Greenfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	13.89
Site area, gross (acres)	34.32
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	70,210,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	5,708,670
Social rent	155,691	18,683	4,670,730
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	3,632,790
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**84,222,190**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(1,512)	(378,000)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(337,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(505,092)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(8,943)	(8,943)	(2,235,713)
Professional fees	(10,731)	(10,731)	(2,682,856)
Disposal costs	(7,161)	(7,161)	(1,790,280)
Finance on development costs	(861)	(861)	(215,140)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(14,882,731)
Total development costs	**-**	**(280,153)**	**(70,038,142)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	14,184,048
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(719,916)
Interest on land over the hold period	(2,226,955)
Residual land value	**11,237,176**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	327,429
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	13.3%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,431,944
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**7,805,231**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**227,429**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.38
Site area, gross (acres)	0.93
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	381,000	3,429,000
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**381,000**	**3,429,000**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(3,780)	(34,020)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(12,141)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,160)	(10,160)	(91,441)
Professional fees	(16,256)	(16,256)	(146,305)
Disposal costs	(9,525)	(9,525)	(85,725)
Finance on development costs	(5,086)	(5,086)	(45,775)
Developer profit and margin	(76,200)	(76,200)	(685,800)
Total development costs	**-**	**(323,705)**	**(2,913,344)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	515,656
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(16,575)
Interest on land over the hold period	(82,548)
Residual land value	**416,534**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	449,517
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	12.1%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	92,662
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**323,871**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**349,517**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.88
Site area, gross (acres)	2.17
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	28.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	266,700	6,667,500
Affordable rent	185,048	22,206	555,142
Social rent	151,402	18,168	454,208
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	235,515	14,131	353,272
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**321,205**	**8,030,122**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(66,150)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(33,725)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(245,081)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(392,130)
Disposal costs	(6,858)	(6,858)	(171,457)
Finance on development costs	(2,445)	(2,445)	(61,134)
Developer profit and margin	(56,610)	(56,610)	(1,415,257)
Total development costs	**-**	**(303,084)**	**(7,577,098)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	453,025
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(13,352)
Interest on land over the hold period	(72,721)
Residual land value	**366,951**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	169,294
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	4.6%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	216,754
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**150,197**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**69,294**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.96
Site area, gross (acres)	4.85
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	25.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	266,700	13,335,000
Affordable rent	185,048	22,206	1,110,285
Social rent	151,402	18,168	908,415
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	235,515	14,131	706,545
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**321,205**	**16,060,245**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(132,300)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(67,450)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(100,839)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(490,162)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(784,259)
Disposal costs	(6,858)	(6,858)	(342,913)
Finance on development costs	(2,984)	(2,984)	(149,195)
Developer profit and margin	(56,610)	(56,610)	(2,830,515)
Total development costs	**-**	**(303,422)**	**(15,171,123)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	889,122
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(35,792)
Interest on land over the hold period	(141,140)
Residual land value	**712,190**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	146,992
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	4.4%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	484,510
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**227,680**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**46,992**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	4.17
Site area, gross (acres)	10.30
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	26,204,500
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	2,139,588
Social rent	145,881	17,506	1,750,572
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	1,361,556
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**31,456,216**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(264,600)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(134,900)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(202,037)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(899,955)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(1,079,946)
Disposal costs	(6,735)	(6,735)	(673,494)
Finance on development costs	(2,178)	(2,178)	(217,762)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(5,556,003)
Total development costs	**-**	**(278,861)**	**(27,886,065)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	3,570,151
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(173,751)
Interest on land over the hold period	(561,761)
Residual land value	**2,834,638**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	275,319
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	9.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	1,029,583
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**1,805,055**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**175,319**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	39,306,750
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	3,209,382
Social rent	145,881	17,506	2,625,858
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	2,042,334
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**47,184,324**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(396,900)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(202,350)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(303,055)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(1,349,933)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(1,619,920)
Disposal costs	(6,735)	(6,735)	(1,010,240)
Finance on development costs	(1,574)	(1,574)	(236,166)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(8,334,004)
Total development costs	**-**	**(277,986)**	**(41,697,840)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	5,486,484
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(272,361)
Interest on land over the hold period	(862,411)
Residual land value	**4,351,712**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	211,334
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	9.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	2,059,167
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**2,292,545**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**111,334**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Greenfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	13.89
Site area, gross (acres)	34.32
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	65,511,250
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	5,348,970
Social rent	145,881	17,506	4,376,430
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	3,403,890
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**78,640,540**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(337,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(505,092)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(2,249,888)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(2,699,866)
Disposal costs	(6,682)	(6,682)	(1,670,604)
Finance on development costs	(1,019)	(1,019)	(254,672)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(13,890,007)
Total development costs	**-**	**(277,120)**	**(69,279,960)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	9,360,580
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(471,713)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,470,211)
Residual land value	**7,418,657**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	216,165
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	9.4%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,431,944
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**3,986,712**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**116,165**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.38
Site area, gross (acres)	0.93
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	353,250	3,179,250
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**353,250**	**3,179,250**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(3,780)	(34,020)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(12,141)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,160)	(10,160)	(91,441)
Professional fees	(16,256)	(16,256)	(146,305)
Disposal costs	(8,831)	(8,831)	(79,481)
Finance on development costs	(5,302)	(5,302)	(47,717)
Developer profit and margin	(70,650)	(70,650)	(635,850)
Total development costs	**-**	**(317,677)**	**(2,859,092)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	320,158
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(6,515)
Interest on land over the hold period	(51,876)
Residual land value	**261,767**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	282,495
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	8.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	92,662
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**169,104**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**182,495**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.88
Site area, gross (acres)	2.17
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	28.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	247,275	6,181,875
Affordable rent	172,122	20,655	516,368
Social rent	140,828	16,899	422,482
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	219,065	13,144	328,598
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**297,973**	**7,449,322**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(66,150)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(33,725)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(245,081)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(392,130)
Disposal costs	(6,359)	(6,359)	(158,983)
Finance on development costs	(2,636)	(2,636)	(65,898)
Developer profit and margin	(52,497)	(52,497)	(1,312,422)
Total development costs	**-**	**(298,662)**	**(7,466,553)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	(17,230)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(4,586)
Interest on land over the hold period	(42,956)
Residual land value	**(64,773)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(29,883)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	-0.9%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	216,754
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(281,527)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(129,883)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Not Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.96
Site area, gross (acres)	4.85
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	25.5
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	247,275	12,363,750
Affordable rent	172,122	20,655	1,032,735
Social rent	140,828	16,899	844,965
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	219,065	13,144	657,195
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**297,973**	**14,898,645**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(132,300)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(67,450)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,017)	(100,839)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(490,162)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(784,259)
Disposal costs	(6,359)	(6,359)	(317,966)
Finance on development costs	(3,458)	(3,458)	(172,918)
Developer profit and margin	(52,497)	(52,497)	(2,624,844)
Total development costs	**-**	**(299,285)**	**(14,964,228)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	(65,583)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(20,993)
Interest on land over the hold period	(96,019)
Residual land value	**(182,595)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(37,687)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	-1.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	484,510
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(667,105)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(137,687)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Not Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	4.17
Site area, gross (acres)	10.30
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	24,349,500
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	1,998,150
Social rent	136,238	16,348	1,634,850
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	1,271,550
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**29,254,050**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(264,600)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(134,900)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(202,037)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(899,955)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(1,079,946)
Disposal costs	(6,259)	(6,259)	(625,903)
Finance on development costs	(2,675)	(2,675)	(267,518)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(5,164,173)
Total development costs	**-**	**(274,964)**	**(27,496,401)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	1,757,649
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(80,485)
Interest on land over the hold period	(277,401)
Residual land value	**1,399,763**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	135,954
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	4.8%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	1,029,583
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**370,179**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**35,954**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	36,524,250
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	2,997,225
Social rent	136,238	16,348	2,452,275
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	1,907,325
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**43,881,075**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(396,900)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(202,350)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(303,055)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(1,349,933)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(1,619,920)
Disposal costs	(6,259)	(6,259)	(938,855)
Finance on development costs	(1,946)	(1,946)	(291,951)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(7,746,260)
Total development costs	**-**	**(273,963)**	**(41,094,495)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	2,786,580
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(133,431)
Interest on land over the hold period	(438,829)
Residual land value	**2,214,321**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	107,535
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	5.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	2,059,167
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**155,154**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**7,535**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Lower Value Greenfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Greenfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	13.89
Site area, gross (acres)	34.32
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	18.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	60,873,750
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	4,995,375
Social rent	136,238	16,348	4,087,125
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	3,178,875
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**73,135,125**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(337,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(2,020)	(505,092)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,000)	(9,000)	(2,249,888)
Professional fees	(10,799)	(10,799)	(2,699,866)
Disposal costs	(6,210)	(6,210)	(1,552,497)
Finance on development costs	(1,245)	(1,245)	(311,364)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(12,910,432)
Total development costs	**-**	**(272,956)**	**(68,238,969)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	4,896,156
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(241,984)
Interest on land over the hold period	(769,796)
Residual land value	**3,884,376**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	113,183
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	5.3%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,431,944
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**452,431**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**13,183**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Brownfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.30
Site area, gross (acres)	0.74
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	408,750	3,678,750
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**408,750**	**3,678,750**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(30,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(3,780)	(34,020)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(3,249)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,277)	(10,277)	(92,496)
Professional fees	(16,444)	(16,444)	(147,994)
Disposal costs	(10,219)	(10,219)	(91,969)
Finance on development costs	(5,077)	(5,077)	(45,693)
Developer profit and margin	(81,750)	(81,750)	(735,750)
Total development costs	**-**	**(332,590)**	**(2,993,307)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	685,443
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(25,312)
Interest on land over the hold period	(109,185)
Residual land value	**550,946**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	743,216
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	15.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	333,585
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**217,361**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**293,216**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Brownfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.83
Site area, gross (acres)	2.06
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	286,125	7,153,125
Affordable rent	197,972	23,757	593,918
Social rent	161,978	19,437	485,932
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	251,965	15,118	377,948
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**344,437**	**8,610,922**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(83,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(66,150)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(9,025)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(25,210)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(248,013)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(396,820)
Disposal costs	(7,357)	(7,357)	(183,930)
Finance on development costs	(2,444)	(2,444)	(61,112)
Developer profit and margin	(60,724)	(60,724)	(1,518,093)
Total development costs	**-**	**(309,337)**	**(7,733,431)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	877,491
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(49,731)
Interest on land over the hold period	(183,636)
Residual land value	**644,124**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	312,808
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	7.5%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	926,625
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(282,501)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(137,192)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Higher Value Brownfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.67
Site area, gross (acres)	4.12
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	286,125	14,306,250
Affordable rent	197,972	23,757	1,187,835
Social rent	161,978	19,437	971,865
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	251,965	15,118	755,895
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**344,437**	**17,221,845**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(166,667)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(132,300)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(18,050)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(496,025)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(793,641)
Disposal costs	(7,357)	(7,357)	(367,861)
Finance on development costs	(2,868)	(2,868)	(143,397)
Developer profit and margin	(60,724)	(60,724)	(3,036,186)
Total development costs	**-**	**(309,561)**	**(15,478,035)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	1,743,810
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(109,961)
Interest on land over the hold period	(367,272)
Residual land value	**1,266,576**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	307,546
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	7.4%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	1,853,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(586,674)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(142,454)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Higher Value Brownfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	3.33
Site area, gross (acres)	8.24
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	28,084,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	2,283,468
Social rent	155,691	18,683	1,868,292
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	1,453,116
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**33,688,876**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(333,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(264,600)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(36,100)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(101,018)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(911,682)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,094,018)
Disposal costs	(7,217)	(7,217)	(721,717)
Finance on development costs	(2,139)	(2,139)	(213,900)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(5,953,093)
Total development costs	**-**	**(284,868)**	**(28,486,829)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	5,202,047
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(257,725)
Interest on land over the hold period	(817,786)
Residual land value	**4,126,535**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	500,996
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	12.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,706,500
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**420,035**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**50,996**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Brownfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	5.00
Site area, gross (acres)	12.36
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	42,126,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	3,425,202
Social rent	155,691	18,683	2,802,438
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	2,179,674
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**50,533,314**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(500,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(396,900)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(54,150)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(151,528)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(1,367,523)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,641,028)
Disposal costs	(7,217)	(7,217)	(1,082,576)
Finance on development costs	(1,689)	(1,689)	(253,285)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(8,929,639)
Total development costs	**-**	**(284,146)**	**(42,621,900)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	7,911,414
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(397,142)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,242,854)
Residual land value	**6,271,418**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	507,602
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	12.4%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	5,559,750
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**711,668**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**57,602**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Brownfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	401,200	280,840	70,210,000
Affordable rent	190,289	22,835	5,708,670
Social rent	155,691	18,683	4,670,730
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	242,186	14,531	3,632,790
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**336,889**	**84,222,190**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(833,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(90,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(252,546)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(2,279,205)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(2,735,046)
Disposal costs	(7,161)	(7,161)	(1,790,280)
Finance on development costs	(1,251)	(1,251)	(312,697)
Developer profit and margin	(59,531)	(59,531)	(14,882,731)
Total development costs	**-**	**(283,395)**	**(70,848,669)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	13,373,521
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(678,209)
Interest on land over the hold period	(2,099,794)
Residual land value	**10,595,519**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	514,554
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	12.6%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	9,266,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**1,329,269**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**64,554**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Brownfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.30
Site area, gross (acres)	0.74
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	381,000	3,429,000
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**381,000**	**3,429,000**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(30,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(3,780)	(34,020)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(3,249)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,277)	(10,277)	(92,496)
Professional fees	(16,444)	(16,444)	(147,994)
Disposal costs	(9,525)	(9,525)	(85,725)
Finance on development costs	(5,243)	(5,243)	(47,190)
Developer profit and margin	(76,200)	(76,200)	(685,800)
Total development costs	**-**	**(326,512)**	**(2,938,610)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	490,390
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(15,275)
Interest on land over the hold period	(78,584)
Residual land value	**396,532**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	534,914
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	11.6%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	333,585
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**62,947**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**84,914**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Medium Value Brownfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.83
Site area, gross (acres)	2.06
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	266,700	6,667,500
Affordable rent	185,048	22,206	555,142
Social rent	151,402	18,168	454,208
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	235,515	14,131	353,272
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**321,205**	**8,030,122**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(83,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(66,150)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(9,025)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(25,210)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(248,013)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(396,820)
Disposal costs	(6,858)	(6,858)	(171,457)
Finance on development costs	(2,576)	(2,576)	(64,394)
Developer profit and margin	(56,610)	(56,610)	(1,415,257)
Total development costs	**-**	**(304,856)**	**(7,621,404)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	408,718
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(49,731)
Interest on land over the hold period	(183,636)
Residual land value	**175,351**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	85,156
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	2.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	926,625
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(751,274)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(364,844)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Medium Value Brownfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.67
Site area, gross (acres)	4.12
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	266,700	13,335,000
Affordable rent	185,048	22,206	1,110,285
Social rent	151,402	18,168	908,415
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	235,515	14,131	706,545
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**321,205**	**16,060,245**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(166,667)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(132,300)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(18,050)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(496,025)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(793,641)
Disposal costs	(6,858)	(6,858)	(342,913)
Finance on development costs	(3,214)	(3,214)	(160,708)
Developer profit and margin	(56,610)	(56,610)	(2,830,515)
Total development costs	**-**	**(305,295)**	**(15,264,728)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	795,517
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(109,961)
Interest on land over the hold period	(367,272)
Residual land value	**318,283**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	77,285
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	2.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	1,853,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(1,534,967)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(372,715)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Medium Value Brownfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	3.33
Site area, gross (acres)	8.24
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	26,204,500
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	2,139,588
Social rent	145,881	17,506	1,750,572
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	1,361,556
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**31,456,216**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(333,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(264,600)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(36,100)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(101,018)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(911,682)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,094,018)
Disposal costs	(6,735)	(6,735)	(673,494)
Finance on development costs	(2,493)	(2,493)	(249,266)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(5,556,003)
Total development costs	**-**	**(280,769)**	**(28,076,882)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	3,379,334
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(230,422)
Interest on land over the hold period	(734,545)
Residual land value	**2,414,366**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	293,124
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	7.7%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,706,500
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(1,292,134)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(156,876)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Medium Value Brownfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	5.00
Site area, gross (acres)	12.36
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	39,306,750
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	3,209,382
Social rent	145,881	17,506	2,625,858
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	2,042,334
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**47,184,324**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(500,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(396,900)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(54,150)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(151,528)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(1,367,523)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,641,028)
Disposal costs	(6,735)	(6,735)	(1,010,240)
Finance on development costs	(1,966)	(1,966)	(294,962)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(8,334,004)
Total development costs	**-**	**(279,971)**	**(41,995,606)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	5,188,718
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(350,884)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,101,817)
Residual land value	**3,736,016**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	302,389
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	7.9%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	5,559,750
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(1,823,734)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(147,611)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Medium Value Brownfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	374,350	262,045	65,511,250
Affordable rent	178,299	21,396	5,348,970
Social rent	145,881	17,506	4,376,430
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	226,926	13,616	3,403,890
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**314,562**	**78,640,540**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(833,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(90,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(252,546)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(2,279,205)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(2,735,046)
Disposal costs	(6,682)	(6,682)	(1,670,604)
Finance on development costs	(1,444)	(1,444)	(360,958)
Developer profit and margin	(55,560)	(55,560)	(13,890,007)
Total development costs	**-**	**(279,138)**	**(69,784,530)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	8,856,010
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(591,806)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,836,362)
Residual land value	**6,427,842**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	312,157
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	8.2%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	9,266,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(2,838,408)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(137,843)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Lower Value Brownfield - 9 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	9
Affordable housing (policy target)	0%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.30
Site area, gross (acres)	0.74
Site area, net (hectares)	0.30
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	792

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	353,250	3,179,250
Affordable rent	-	-	-
Social rent	-	-	-
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	-	-	-
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**353,250**	**3,179,250**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,800)	(2,800)	(25,202)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	-	-	-
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(30,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(45,000)
Build cost - houses	(155,144)	(155,144)	(1,396,296)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(3,780)	(34,020)
External works	(23,272)	(23,272)	(209,444)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(3,249)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(6,669)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(758)	(758)	(6,826)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(48,600)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,757)	(7,757)	(69,815)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(4,284)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(10,277)	(10,277)	(92,496)
Professional fees	(16,444)	(16,444)	(147,994)
Disposal costs	(8,831)	(8,831)	(79,481)
Finance on development costs	(5,468)	(5,468)	(49,208)
Developer profit and margin	(70,650)	(70,650)	(635,850)
Total development costs	**-**	**(320,493)**	**(2,884,434)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	294,816
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(11,183)
Interest on land over the hold period	(66,109)
Residual land value	**217,524**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	293,436
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	6.8%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	333,585
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(116,061)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(156,564)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Lower Value Brownfield - 25 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	25
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.83
Site area, gross (acres)	2.06
Site area, net (hectares)	0.83
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	2,125

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	247,275	6,181,875
Affordable rent	172,122	20,655	516,368
Social rent	140,828	16,899	422,482
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	219,065	13,144	328,598
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**297,973**	**7,449,322**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,624)	(2,624)	(65,600)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(262,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(83,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(125,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(3,746,507)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(66,150)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(561,976)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(9,025)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(18,525)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(27,411)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(135,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(187,325)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(25,210)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(11,900)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(248,013)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(396,820)
Disposal costs	(6,359)	(6,359)	(158,983)
Finance on development costs	(2,789)	(2,789)	(69,725)
Developer profit and margin	(52,497)	(52,497)	(1,312,422)
Total development costs	**-**	**(300,457)**	**(7,511,426)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	(62,103)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(49,731)
Interest on land over the hold period	(183,636)
Residual land value	**(295,470)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(143,490)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	-4.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	926,625
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(1,222,095)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(593,490)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Not Viable**

COLCHESTER LOCAL PLAN · WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY · REGULATION 19 BASE CASE

Lower Value Brownfield - 50 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	50
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	1.67
Site area, gross (acres)	4.12
Site area, net (hectares)	1.67
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	4,250

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	247,275	12,363,750
Affordable rent	172,122	20,655	1,032,735
Social rent	140,828	16,899	844,965
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	219,065	13,144	657,195
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**297,973**	**14,898,645**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,424)	(2,424)	(121,200)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(525,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(166,667)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(250,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(7,493,014)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(132,300)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(1,123,952)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(18,050)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(37,050)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(54,822)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(270,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(374,651)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,008)	(50,420)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(23,800)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,921)	(9,921)	(496,025)
Professional fees	(15,873)	(15,873)	(793,641)
Disposal costs	(6,359)	(6,359)	(317,966)
Finance on development costs	(3,708)	(3,708)	(185,397)
Developer profit and margin	(52,497)	(52,497)	(2,624,844)
Total development costs	**-**	**(301,176)**	**(15,058,799)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	(160,154)
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(109,961)
Interest on land over the hold period	(367,272)
Residual land value	**(637,387)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(154,768)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	-4.3%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	1,853,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(2,490,637)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(604,768)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Not Viable**

Lower Value Brownfield - 100 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	100
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	3.33
Site area, gross (acres)	8.24
Site area, net (hectares)	3.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	8,520

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	24,349,500
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	1,998,150
Social rent	136,238	16,348	1,634,850
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	1,271,550
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**29,254,050**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,602)	(1,602)	(160,160)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,050,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(333,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(500,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(11,678,434)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(1,968,119)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(264,600)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(2,046,983)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(36,100)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(74,100)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(109,645)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(540,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(682,328)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(101,018)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(47,600)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(911,682)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,094,018)
Disposal costs	(6,259)	(6,259)	(625,903)
Finance on development costs	(3,031)	(3,031)	(303,122)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(5,164,173)
Total development costs	**-**	**(276,913)**	**(27,691,318)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	1,562,732
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(230,422)
Interest on land over the hold period	(734,545)
Residual land value	**597,764**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	72,574
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	2.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	3,706,500
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(3,108,736)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(377,426)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Lower Value Brownfield - 150 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	150
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	5.00
Site area, gross (acres)	12.36
Site area, net (hectares)	5.00
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	12,780

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	36,524,250
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	2,997,225
Social rent	136,238	16,348	2,452,275
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	1,907,325
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**43,881,075**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,330)	(1,330)	(199,460)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(1,575,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(500,000)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(750,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(17,517,650)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(2,952,178)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(396,900)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(3,070,474)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(54,150)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(111,150)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(164,468)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(810,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,023,491)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(151,528)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(71,400)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(1,367,523)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(1,641,028)
Disposal costs	(6,259)	(6,259)	(938,855)
Finance on development costs	(2,401)	(2,401)	(360,104)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(7,746,260)
Total development costs	**-**	**(276,011)**	**(41,401,618)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	2,479,457
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(350,884)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,101,817)
Residual land value	**1,026,756**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	83,104
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	2.3%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	5,559,750
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(4,532,994)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(366,896)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Lower Value Brownfield - 250 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE	
Scheme typology	Lower Value Brownfield
Greenfield / brownfield	Brownfield
Total dwellings	250
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	8.33
Site area, gross (acres)	20.59
Site area, net (hectares)	8.33
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	21,300

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	347,850	243,495	60,873,750
Affordable rent	166,512	19,982	4,995,375
Social rent	136,238	16,348	4,087,125
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	211,925	12,716	3,178,875
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**292,540**	**73,135,125**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(1,072)	(1,072)	(268,060)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(2,625,000)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	(3,333)	(833,333)
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(1,250,000)
Build cost - houses	(138,501)	(116,784)	(29,196,084)
Build cost - flats	(125,518)	(19,681)	(4,920,296)
Garages	-	(2,646)	(661,500)
External works	(20,470)	(20,470)	(5,117,457)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(361)	(361)	(90,250)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(185,250)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(274,112)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(1,350,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(6,823)	(6,823)	(1,705,819)
Building Safety Levy	-	(1,010)	(252,546)
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(119,000)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,117)	(9,117)	(2,279,205)
Professional fees	(10,940)	(10,940)	(2,735,046)
Disposal costs	(6,210)	(6,210)	(1,552,497)
Finance on development costs	(1,749)	(1,749)	(437,128)
Developer profit and margin	(51,642)	(51,642)	(12,910,432)
Total development costs	**-**	**(275,052)**	**(68,763,018)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE	
Residual land value (gross)	4,372,107
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(591,806)
Interest on land over the hold period	(1,836,362)
Residual land value	**1,943,939**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	94,404
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	2.7%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE	
Benchmark land value (total)	9,266,250
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	450,000

VIABILITY BALANCE	
Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(7,322,311)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(355,596)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Marginal**

Lower Value Rural - 5 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Lower Value Rural
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	5
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.21
Site area, gross (acres)	0.51
Site area, net (hectares)	0.17
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	425

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	353,250	247,275	1,236,375
Affordable rent	172,122	20,655	103,274
Social rent	140,828	16,899	84,496
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	219,065	13,144	65,720
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**297,973**	**1,489,864**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,578)	(2,578)	(12,890)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(52,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(25,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(749,301)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(13,230)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(112,395)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(6,745)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(3,705)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(5,482)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(27,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(37,465)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(2,380)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(49,016)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(78,426)
Disposal costs	(6,359)	(6,359)	(31,797)
Finance on development costs	(3,431)	(3,431)	(17,156)
Developer profit and margin	(52,497)	(52,497)	(262,484)
Total development costs	**-**	**(297,395)**	**(1,486,973)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	2,892
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(772)
Interest on land over the hold period	(10,202)
Residual land value	**(8,082)**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	(15,700)
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	-0.5%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	51,479
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**(59,561)**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**(115,700)**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Not Viable**

Medium Value Rural - 5 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Medium Value Rural
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	5
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.21
Site area, gross (acres)	0.51
Site area, net (hectares)	0.17
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	425

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	381,000	266,700	1,333,500
Affordable rent	185,048	22,206	111,028
Social rent	151,402	18,168	90,842
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	235,515	14,131	70,654
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**321,205**	**1,606,024**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,578)	(2,578)	(12,890)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(52,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(25,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(749,301)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(13,230)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(112,395)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(6,745)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(3,705)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(5,482)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(27,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(37,465)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(2,380)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(49,016)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(78,426)
Disposal costs	(6,858)	(6,858)	(34,291)
Finance on development costs	(3,225)	(3,225)	(16,124)
Developer profit and margin	(56,610)	(56,610)	(283,051)
Total development costs	**-**	**(301,801)**	**(1,509,003)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	97,021
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(1,200)
Interest on land over the hold period	(15,849)
Residual land value	**79,973**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	155,350
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	5.0%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	51,479
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**28,494**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**55,350**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**

Higher Value Rural - 5 dwellings

SCHEME AND SITE

Scheme typology	Higher Value Rural
Greenfield / brownfield	Greenfield
Total dwellings	5
Affordable housing (policy target)	30%
Site area, gross (hectares)	0.21
Site area, gross (acres)	0.51
Site area, net (hectares)	0.17
Density, net (dwellings per hectare)	30.0
Density, gross (dwellings per hectare)	24.0
Total gross internal area (sq m)	425

GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Open market sale housing	408,750	286,125	1,430,625
Affordable rent	197,972	23,757	118,784
Social rent	161,978	19,437	97,186
First Homes	-	-	-
Other intermediate	251,965	15,118	75,590
Affordable housing grant	-	-	-
Total gross development value	**-**	**344,437**	**1,722,184**

DEVELOPMENT COSTS	GBP PER RELEVANT UNIT	GBP PER DWELLING	GBP
Planning, policy and land			
Planning fees, application costs and surveys	(2,578)	(2,578)	(12,890)
Community Infrastructure Levy	-	-	-
Section 106 contributions	(10,500)	(10,500)	(52,500)
Affordable housing commuted sum	-	-	-
Site clearance, demolition and remediation	-	-	-
Infrastructure and construction			
Site infrastructure	(5,000)	(5,000)	(25,000)
Build cost - houses	(149,860)	(149,860)	(749,301)
Build cost - flats	-	-	-
Garages	-	(2,646)	(13,230)
External works	(22,479)	(22,479)	(112,395)
Abnormal costs	-	-	-
Policy and regulatory costs			
Biodiversity net gain	(1,349)	(1,349)	(6,745)
M4(2) accessible and adaptable dwellings	(741)	(741)	(3,705)
M4(3) wheelchair dwellings	(1,096)	(1,096)	(5,482)
Future Homes Standard 2026	(5,400)	(5,400)	(27,000)
Additional low carbon and energy (Policy NZ1)	(7,493)	(7,493)	(37,465)
Building Safety Levy	-	-	-
Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace	-	-	-
Essex Coast RAMS	(476)	(476)	(2,380)
Fees, finance and return			
Contingency	(9,803)	(9,803)	(49,016)
Professional fees	(15,685)	(15,685)	(78,426)
Disposal costs	(7,357)	(7,357)	(36,786)
Finance on development costs	(3,046)	(3,046)	(15,231)
Developer profit and margin	(60,724)	(60,724)	(303,619)
Total development costs	**-**	**(306,234)**	**(1,531,171)**
Cross-check: itemised costs less total development costs (nil expected)			0.00

RESIDUAL LAND VALUE

Residual land value (gross)	191,013
Acquisition costs (SDLT, agent and legal)	(2,506)
Interest on land over the hold period	(31,179)
Residual land value	**157,328**
Residual land value (GBP per gross acre)	305,614
Residual land value as a percentage of gross development value	9.1%

BENCHMARK LAND VALUE

Benchmark land value (total)	51,479
Benchmark land value (GBP per gross acre)	100,000

VIABILITY BALANCE

Surplus / (deficit) - residual less benchmark land value	**105,849**
Surplus / (deficit) (GBP per gross acre)	**205,614**
Viability outcome for this typology	**Viable**