# Final Draft Ipswich Local Plan Review – Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document

## Ipswich Garden Suburb Response - Appendices

## March 2021

## Appendix 1 – Ipswich Borough Council and Mersea Homes joint table on affordable homes

| Site | AH provision | AH units | Original positions at Hearing – Phase 2 Planning and IBC Positions | Mersea Homes (MH) Response to IBC Comment | IBC's concluding Position |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Henley Gate – any viability review | 5% of total development (1100 dwellings) | 55 | Phase 2 Planning's Position: 20 dwellings, 5% of 400.<br><br>IBC's Position: The 5% is based on the entire development of 1100 dwellings. This equates to 55 units. This is evidenced at Para's 3.1 and 6 of Schedule 2 (Affordable Housing) of the S106 for application 16/00608/OUT.<br>The 55 units are required to be constructed within the first 400 dwellings on the site.<br><br>**Mathematically this is 55 units** | MH agrees that the 5% is based on the entire development, hence 55 dwellings. MH also agrees that the s106 provides for the first phase of development to be 'front loaded' with the units from later phases, and therefore that although the proportion for the first phase is 20 units (5% of 400), phase 1 will actually deliver 35 additional units drawn from the remainder (5% of 700). But the 35 units brought forward from the later phases can't be counted twice. So if the first phase is shown as 55 units, the later phases need to have the 35 units brought forward removed. This is therefore actually just a presentational issue as to whether the 35 units are shown as being in Phase 1 or later phases, it does not increase the overall number of units. | Mersea Homes continue to use the word 'phase' which is not a definition that is to be used in this context. Mersea Homes are using the word 'phase' in terms of the stages in which the development would be delivered, whereas for the purposes of Policy CS10 this mean the Phases as defined by MAP IGS1.<br><br>The reason for the 5% affordable housing being provided by 400 dwellings was secured as part of the negotiations of the overall package of S106 Planning Obligations and affordable housing.<br><br>Mersea Homes have accepted that 55 units is the correct mathematical sum.<br><br>**Mathematically 55 units are to be provided.** |
| Henley Gate – following two viability reviews | 35% of total development (1100) – to include baseline of 55 units | 385 – 55 = 330 units | Phase2Planning's Position: 5% minimum of 700 units (i.e. 35 units, which are forward provided in phase 1) and up to 35% of 700, including the 35 units forward provided in phase 1 i.e. 245 in total).<br><br>IBC's position: Two viability reviews are secured to provide deferred affordable housing units. The definition of "Deferred Affordable Housing Units" contained within the S106 allows for up to 35% of the entire development (including the baseline of 55 units). Full s106 definition provided below. This does not mean any units are double counted.<br><br>**Mathematically this is 330 units.** | Notwithstanding the s106 provisions, the normal interpretation of the wording of Policy CS10 is that it precludes more than 35% affordable housing in any phase of any development, and therefore Phases 2 and 3 cannot make up the shortfall on Phase 1. Therefore, whilst we understand that Policy CS10 also uses the word 'phase' to reference different sites in the IGS, we consider it still precludes in excess of 35% on any phase of development and therefore we stand by the calculation.<br><br>In any event, to achieve what is being suggested (i.e. using Phases 2 and 3 to make up the shortfall on Phase 1) would mean Phases 2 and 3 on Henley Gate requiring 47% affordable housing (330/700), and for Fonnereau, 70% affordable housing (252/360). Notwithstanding that we maintain these percentages fall foul of the policy, it is not credible that affordable housing could be provided at these proportions.<br><br>Furthermore, under the s106, any surplus that arises through the viability review process is required to be split 50/50 between the developer and additional s106 obligations, and therefore this would require later phases of Henley Gate to be effectively viable at 94% affordable (47% x 2) and Fonnereau to be viable at 140% affordable (70% x 2), which is not possible. | IBC wish to make it clear that the purpose of this table is to demonstrate that it is mathematically possible to achieve 35% Affordable Housing in IGS. Therefore, the comments by Phase2Planning on whether this can viably be achieved are not relevant for the purposes of this part of the follow up work.<br><br>As is clear from the deferred affordable housing definition, the S106 Obligation seeks 35% affordable housing of the entire development, to include the baseline of 55 units to ensure no double counting.<br><br>Mersea Homes again have made an incorrect interpretation of Policy CS10. Policy CS10 on the affordable housing levels, states *"Each phase of development will be subject to a cap of 35% affordable housing."*<br><br>As detailed in Paragraph 8.137 of the supporting text to CS10 *"a 35% cap on the percentage of affordable housing for each phase will be applied (i.e. phases N1(a), N1(b), N2(a), N2(b), N3(a) and N3(b) as set out in the Ipswich Garden Suburb Viability Assessment by Gerald Eve, June 2016). It may be appropriate for certain components of each phase to deliver more that 35% affordable housing in order to deliver the overall target of 31%. These provisions would be secured through the relevant planning obligations."*<br><br>Policy CS10, the supporting text and MAP IGS1 are clear that the Henley Gate planning permission (ref. IP/16/00608/OUT) covers Phase N2(a) and that this neighbourhood- phase of IGS could deliver up to 35% affordable housing. Mersea Homes are wrong in the use of the word "phase" in this context as they use that word to refer to phase of the delivery of the individual development. Paragraph 8.137 of the supporting text also details that later components of a phase (i.e. Henley Gate) as defined in Policy CS10 can deliver more than 35% if appropriate. As set out in the adopted Local Plan this to be secured by S106 Obligations.<br><br>For all of the reasons above it remains mathematically possible for 35% affordable housing to be provided under this planning permission through the agreed viability reviews. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | **Mathematically 330 units could be provided.** |
| Fonnereau – before viability review | 4% of total development (815) | 33 | Phase2Planning's Position: 4% minimum of 360 units (i.e. 15 units, which are to be forward provided in phase 1) and up to 35% of 360 units, including the 15 units forward provided in phase 1 i.e. 126 in total).<br><br>IBC's Position: The 4% is based on the entire development of 815 dwellings. This equates to 33 units. This is evidence at Paragraph 3 of Schedule 2 (Affordable Housing) of the S106 for application 14/00638/OUTFL.<br>The requirement is for these 33 units to be constructed within the first 455 dwellings.<br><br>**Mathematically this is 33 units** | As per first point above. | Mersea Homes continues to use the word 'phase' which is not a definition that is to be used in this context.<br><br>The reason for the 4% affordable housing being provided by 455 dwellings was secured as part of the negotiations of the overall package of S106 Planning Obligations and affordable housing. Mersea Homes have accepted that 33 units is the correct mathematical sum.<br><br>**Mathematically 33 units are to be provided.** |
| Fonnereau – after two viability reviews | 35% of total development (815) – to include baseline of 33 units | 285 – 33 = 252 | Two viability reviews are secured to provide deferred affordable housing units. The definition of "Deferred Affordable Housing Units" contained within the S106 allows for up to 35% of the entire development (including baseline). Full definition provided below.<br><br>**Mathematically this is 252 units.** | As per second point above. | IBC refer to the justification in the second row of this column but for this part of the Fonnereau Neighbourhood (permission ref IP/14/00638/OUT) this site is defined by Policy CS10, the supporting text and MAP IGS1 as Phase N1(a).<br><br>For all of the reasons above it remains mathematically possible for 35% affordable housing to be provided under this planning permission through the agreed viability reviews.<br><br>**Mathematically 252 units could be provided.** |
| IGS remainder | 35% of 1585 (3500-1915) | 555 | Phase2Planning's Position: 31% of 1585 (3500-1915)<br><br>IBC's Position: The policy allows for up to 35% of each Phase – these being N1b; N2b, N3a, N3b (Reference to Map IGS1 in Local Plan)<br><br>**Mathematically this is 555 units** | Policy CS10 sets a target of 31% for the IGS as a whole. If the developer of one site cannot achieve 31% on the grounds of viability, it would be unlawful under the CIL Regulations to require a different developer of a different site to make good the shortfall of that other party, as the additional affordable housing element would not fairly and reasonably be arising as a result of that development. The opportunity to exceed 31% and achieve 35% therefore can only apply on later phases within the control of the same developer, it cannot be made up by another. Any subsequent developer that achieves 31% will have met their requirement under the policy. Therefore 491 (being 31% of the remaining 1585 units) is the maximum that can be delivered from sites which do not currently have permission. | Again Mersea Homes has misinterpreted Policy CS10. The relevant part of the Policy states *"Overall, the Council will seek 31% affordable housing at Ipswich Garden Suburb".* The Policy does not set a cap on the level of affordable housing that can be provided across IGS. The cap limit on the percentage of affordable housing that can be provided relates to the Phases of IGS. As set out in Policy CS10: *"Each phase of development will be subject to a cap of 35% affordable housing".* These Phases are N1(a); N1(b); N2(a); N2(b); N3(a) and N3(b). Policy CS10 therefore means than 35% can be sought on these neighbourhoods. Therefore, the correct calculation is 35% of the remaining development of 1585.<br><br>**Mathematically 555 units could be provided.** |
| Total AH Units | | 1255 | **Mathematically this is 1255 units** | For the reasons given above, we contend that 900 is the effective mathematical maximum, based on all non-consented development at 31% and Phases 2 and 3 of Henley Gate and Fonnereau at 35%. | For the reasons above with the correct interpretation of the S106 Obligations for permissions IP/16/00608/OUT and IP/14/00638/OUTFL and of Policy CS10 including the supporting text and Map IGS1, the following is the correct mathematical calculation.<br><br>55 + 330 + 33 + 252 + 555 = 1225 units |
| Total % | 1255/3500 | 35% | **Mathematically this is 35% 1225/3500** | For the reasons above, we contend that 25.7% is the effective mathematical maximum (but as set out in our Hearing Statement, that 21% as a policy target is an ambitious but potentially realistic target for IGS as a whole, based on the best available evidence i.e. the site specific appraisals). | For the reasons set out above IBC have demonstrated that mathematically 35% affordable housing can be achieved on the IGS. There is no defined cap on the amount of affordable housing that can be achieved on the IGS as a whole. There is only a cap on a Phase as defined within Policy CS10, which would in turn mean 35% affordable housing would be what can mathematically be achieved. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Both Phase2Planning and Mersea Homes have failed to correctly apply Policy CS10 and the S106 Obligations and as such their calculations are incorrect. |

Henley Gate S106 – 16/000608/OUT:
**"Deferred Affordable Housing Units"** – means any Affordable Housing Units to be provided as part of the Development including the baseline 5% (five per cent) of all Residential Units to be provided as Affordable Units pursuant to Part 1 of Schedule 2 of this Deed to an overall maximum of 35% (thirty five per cent) of the Residential Units within the Development being required as a result of any Viability Review undertaken in accordance with Part 2 of Schedule 2 (subject to at all times to the provisions contained with paragraphs 5 and 6 of Part 2 to Schedule 2) and secured in accordance with any Deferred Affordable Housing Scheme.

Fonnereau S106 – 14/00638/OUTFL:
**"Deferred Affordable Housing Units"** – means any Affordable Housing Units to be provided as part of the Development including the baseline 4% (five per cent) of all Residential Units to be provided as Affordable Units pursuant to Paragraph 3.1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of this Deed to an overall maximum of 35% (thirty five per cent) of the Residential Units within the Development being required as a result of any Viability Review undertaken in accordance with Part 2 of Schedule 2 (subject to at all times to the provisions contained with paragraphs 5 and 6 of Part 2 to Schedule 2) and secured in accordance with any Deferred Affordable Housing Scheme.

**Mersea Homes Areas of Disagreement:**

- Columns 2 and 3 are presented as if they are a factual position, whereas in fact columns 2 and 3 are IBC's view of the number of AH units that the s106s provide for, not the view of Mersea Homes.
- In Column 4, Mersea Homes just need to clarify, to avoid any misunderstanding, that the text in bold forms part of IBC's view of the number of AH units, and should not be misconstrued as representing an agreed position between the parties. Also, in rows 6 and 7 of column 4, only IBC's view is included in the table, not our view.
- MH have no comments on column 5, which sets out the substance of our arguments on each point;
- On Column 6, Row 1, the statement is made "Mersea Homes have accepted 55 units is the correct mathematical sum" – MH have never disputed that 55 units is the sum of what is currently required under the S106 for the total minimum number of AH units, and that the 35 units from the later phase are frontloaded to the 20 units from phase 1. But it is misleading to say that MH have accepted that number without qualifying that MH does not accept that the 35 units that are brought forward from the later phase and added to phase 1 can then be 'double counted' by assuming those 35 are also provided again in the later phase as well. Therefore if the number of units in the Phase is said to be 55 by including the 'rolled forward' units, it is our understanding that those 35 units need to be deducted from what can be provided from later phases. The same applies to the 3rd row in relation to Phase 1 on Fonnereau.
- On Column 6, Rows 2 and 4, MH clearly disagree with the IBC interpretation for the reasons given (and, not least, that part of our argument relating to the provisions of Sections 4 and 5 of Schedule 2 of the s106s in respect of the apportionment of any viability surplus between the parties and between affordable housing and other contributions, which effectively means that the viability surplus could never provide the full quantum of affordable housing);
- On Column 6, Row 5, MH stand by the argument that it would be unlawful to require in excess of 31% provision on any "phase" (i.e. neighbourhood) as a means of making up any shortfall on any other "phase" (neighbourhood) by a different developer, as this is effectively requiring a higher level of affordable housing that is needed by one developer to offset a shortfall by another, which is not CIL compliant.
- On Column 6, Rows 6 and 7, we obviously consider that our calculation, of a theoretical maximum of 25.7%, is correct.

Subject to our clarifications/caveats as above, MH agree with the table.

**Appendix 2 – Note on the impact of delayed junction improvements on highway network**

# ISPA Local Plan Modelling : Model Run 7 Sensitivity Test

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **DATE:** [Publish Date] | | **CONFIDENTIALITY:** | Public |
| **DOCUMENT NAME:** | ISPA Model Run 7 Sensitivity Test – Technical Note on adjustments to A1214 | | |
| **DOCUMENT NO:** | MRNEOI-WSP-ZZ-XX-RP-TM-0004 | **REVISION:** | P00 |
| **AUTHOR:** | Michael Johns (WSP) | **CHECKED:** | Luke Barber (SCC) |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1.1. This Technical Note (TN) has been produced as an addendum to document references "D35 – ISPA Local Plan Modelling Methodology Report" and "D36 - Local Plan Modelling for ISPA Methodology Report", which relate to strategic traffic modelling undertaken to support the examination of the Ipswich Local Plan. This TN details a sensitivity test which has been undertaken to provide further evidence in response to issues raised in hearing position statements from the Northern Fringe Protection Group (NFPG) and Save Our County Spaces (SOCS), in particular responses to the following question from PINS related to the Ipswich Garden Suburb;

***31. Is the list of strategic and neighbourhood infrastructure requirements for the IGS in Table 8B complete?***

1.1.2. In the position statements, both NFPG and SOCS have raised the following concern in response to the above question:

*"Currently there is a major disconnect between the delivery dates assumed in the modelling and those specified in Planning applications, which is clearly unsound."*

1.1.3. This TN seeks to demonstrate the conclusions from the traffic modelling are not significantly affected by changes in when highway mitigation is delivered for the IGS development. The modelling in this TN is based on a sensitivity test of the following scenario which is considered a worst case:

- 2026 AM peak hour (0800-0900) and PM peak hour (1700-1800) **without demand mitigation**

1.1.4. The mitigation detailed below was previously assumed to be in place in the 2026 forecast year. These junctions were reverted to be the same as the 2016 base year for the purposes of the sensitivity test

- Westerfield Road / A1214 Valley Road junction
- Tuddenham Road / A1214 Valley Road junction

1.1.5. Other mitigation associated with IGS such as the road bridge over the railway line, Henley Road / A1214 Valley Road and Dale Hall Road / A1214 Valley Road has not previously been considered in the strategic highway model given they do not have an impact on highway traffic in the AM and PM peak hour.

## 2. IPSWICH GARDEN SUBURB ASSUMPTIONS

2.1.1. It is important to note the assumptions around the phasing of the IGS development differ between the strategic modelling and the latest delivery timetable provided by IBC in their I6 topic paper. Table 1 provides a comparison of what has been included in the strategic modelling compared to the topic paper, this demonstrates a significant difference of an additional 452 dwellings has been modelled. Therefore in terms of the trip generation to/from the IGS development, the 2026 modelling demonstrates a robust and worst-case scenario.

*Table 1 – Comparison of assumptions on buildout for Ipswich Garden Suburb for 2026 forecast year*

| Ipswich Garden Suburb parcel | 2026 dwellings – ISPA Local Plan modelling | 2026 dwellings – IGS delivery from 1st April 2020 (I6 Topic Paper) |
|---|---|---|
| IGS Phase 1a - Fonnereau | 364 | 210 |
| IGS Phase 2a – Henley Gate | 526 | 343 |
| IGS Phase 3a & 3b – Red House Farm | 241 | 126 |
| IGS Phase 1b – Ipswich School | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **1131** | **679** |

# 3. MODEL RESULTS

## 3.1. OVERALL JUNCTION VOLUME / CAPACITY

3.1.1. In keeping with how congested locations are reported in the D35 and D36 documents, Volume / Capacity ratio (V/C) is presented, firstly in terms of the overall figures for junctions on the A1214 Valley Road which have had the highway mitigation removed.

3.1.2. Table 2 shows the V/C values at the A1214 Valley Road junctions increase without the mitigation in place to a level where the junction is considered to be congested. However, overall the junctions are still considered to be operating within capacity.

*Table 2 – Overall junction Volume / Capacity changes for selected A1214 junctions*

| Junction | AM 2026 (V/C) | AM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) | PM 2026 (V/C) | PM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A1214 Valley Road / Westerfield Road | 76% | 92% | 69% | 88% |
| A1214 Valley Road / Tuddenham Road | 77% | 93% | 74% | 90% |

## 3.2. LINKED BASED VOLUME / CAPACITY

3.2.1. Table 3 details the link based V/C for the A1214 Valley Road / Westerfield Road junction between the 2026 scenarios. This demonstrates the eastern A1214 Valley Road approach becomes over capacity without the highway mitigation in place.

*Table 3 – Link based Volume / Capacity changes for approaches to A1214 Valley Road / Westerfield Road junction*

| Junction | AM 2026 (V/C) | AM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) | PM 2026 (V/C) | PM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Westerfield Road North | 78% | 97% | 41% | 57% |
| A1214 Valley Road East | 95% | 104% | 88% | 102% |
| Westerfield Road South | 52% | 68% | 54% | 81% |
| A1214 Valley Road West | 63% | 80% | 66% | 92% |

Table 4 details the link based V/C for the A1214 Valley Road / Tuddenham Road junction for the 2026 scenarios. This analysis shows the A1214 Colchester Road eastern arm becomes over capacity in the AM peak, whilst the southern Tuddenham Road approach in the PM peak become over capacity without the highway mitigation in place.

*Table 4 – Link based Volume / Capacity changes for approaches to A1214 / Tuddenham Road junction*

| Junction | AM 2026 (V/C) | AM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) | PM 2026 (V/C) | PM 2026 Sensitivity Test (V/C) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tuddenham Road North | 88% | 95% | 57% | 65% |
| A1214 Colchester Road East | 80% | 100% | 79% | 96% |
| Tuddenham Road South | 60% | 70% | 90% | 100% |
| A1214 Valley Road West | 76% | 97% | 72% | 96% |

3.2.2. In summary, whilst the increased congestion including links at/over capacity on the A1214 corridor is not ideal, the mitigation related to the IGS development is considered likely to be delivered in 2027 or 2028, therefore alleviating the congestion issues at these locations at the earliest opportunity during the Local Plan period.

## 3.3. AIR QUALITY

3.3.1. In relation to changes in traffic flows on the A1214 corridor, the changes in peak hour flows are not considered to materially change the conclusions which have been derived from the Air Quality assessment detailed in documents D33 and I9.

# 4. CONCLUSION

4.1.1. The sensitivity test within this note has sought to demonstrate the impact of removing the IGS improvements at the existing Westerfield Road and Tuddenham Road roundabouts on the A1214.

4.1.2. The sensitivity test is considered a robust test of likely traffic congestion in 2026 given it has been undertaken without the demand adjustment mitigation, and also includes a significantly higher quantum of development at the IGS development compared to the latest delivery timetable.

4.1.3. Congestion issues are shown to increase on the A1214 corridor without the highway mitigation in place at the two specified junctions, with specific arms becoming at or over capacity. However, overall these junctions continue to operate within capacity without the mitigation in place.

## Appendix 3 – Ipswich Borough Council Standard Viability Review Template

**Ipswich Garden Suburb**
**Viability Assessment Template (VAT) - Review 1** **% Affordable** **0%** **% Affordable** **0.00%**

## VRT Part 1 - Review 1 Base % Aff

**DEVELOPMENT REVENUE**

| **Market Housing** | **Units** | **Total ft2** | **Income/ ft2** | **Total Income** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | | | #DIV/0! | |
| | **0** | **0** | **#DIV/0!** | |
| **Affordable Housing** | | | | |
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | | | #DIV/0! | |
| | **0** | **0** | **#DIV/0!** | |
| **Self Build Plots** | | | | |
| **Total Units** | **0** | **0** | | |
| **Affordable Housing Percentage** | **#DIV/0!** | | | |
| Non-residential receipts | | | | |
| Non-recoverable grant funding | | | | |
| **Total Revenue** | | | | **£ -** |

**DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing fees Market housing | | | 3.00% | £0 |
| Affordable Transfer fees | | | 0.50% | £0 |
| Non-residential Marketing | | | 3.00% | £0 |
| **BCIS Costs (Market & Affordable)** | **Units** | **Total ft2** | **BCIS Costs/ ft2** | |
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| | **0** | **0** | **£0.00** | |
| Garages - Single (3 & 4 bed units) | | | £7,000 | £0 |
| Garages - Double (5 bed units) | | | £11,000 | £0 |
| | | **0** | | |
| Professional fees (8.0% of total building costs) | | | 8.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Market Units | | | 20.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Self Build Plot | | | 15.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Affordable units | | | 6.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Non-residential | | | 15.00% | £0 |
| | | % of Units in Subject Phase | | |
| Infrastructure/ Abnormal Costs | | 0% | £0 | £0 |
| S106 Contributions | | 0% | £0 | £0 |
| Finance costs (at 5% of total costs) | | | 5.00% | £0 |
| | | **Gross acres** | | |
| Benchmark Land Value | | 0.00 | £125,000 | £0 |
| BLV indexation (50/50 hybrid of Savill Land Index and Nationwide Building Society Index) | | | | £0 |
| SDLT | | | | £0 |
| Agency/ Legals | | | 1.75% | £0 |
| **Total Expenditure** | | | | **£ -** |
| **Surplus/ Deficit** | | | | **£ -** |

## VRT Part 2 - Review 1 Revised Affordable calcuation

**DEVELOPMENT REVENUE**

| **Market Housing** | **Units** | **Total ft2** | **Income/ ft2** | **Total Income** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | | | #DIV/0! | |
| | **0** | **0** | **#DIV/0!** | |
| **Affordable Housing** | | | | |
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | | | #DIV/0! | |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | | | #DIV/0! | |
| | **0** | **0** | **#DIV/0!** | |
| **Self Build Plots** | | | | |
| **Total Units** | **0** | **0** | | |
| **Affordable Housing Percentage** | **#DIV/0!** | | | |
| Non-residential receipts | | | | |
| Non-recoverable grant funding | | | | |
| **Total Revenue** | | | | **£ -** |

**DEVELOPMENT EXPENDITURE**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marketing fees Market housing | | | 3.00% | £0 |
| Affordable Transfer fees | | | 0.50% | £0 |
| Non-residential Marketing | | | 3.00% | £0 |
| **BCIS Costs (Market & Affordable)** | **Units** | **Total ft2** | **BCIS Costs/ ft2** | |
| Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Estate Housing - Detached Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Estate Housing - Terraced Generally | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median) | 0 | 0 | £0.00 | £0 |
| | **0** | **0** | **£0.00** | |
| Garages - Single (3 & 4 bed units) | | | £7,000 | £0 |
| Garages - Double (5 bed units) | | | £11,000 | £0 |
| | | **0** | | |
| Professional fees (8.0% of total building costs) | | | 8.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Market Units | | | 20.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Self Build Plot | | | 15.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Affordable units | | | 6.00% | £0 |
| Developer Profit - Non-residential | | | 15.00% | £0 |
| | | % of Units in Subject Phase | | |
| Remaining Infrastructure/ Abnormal Costs | £0 | 0% | £0 | £0 |
| Remaining S106 Contributions | £0 | 0% | £0 | £0 |
| Finance costs (at 5% of total costs) | | | 5.00% | £0 |
| | | **Gross acres** | | |
| Benchmark Land Value | | 0.00 | £125,000 | £0 |
| BLV indexation (50/50 hybrid of Savill Land Index and Nationwide Building Society Index) | | 0.00 | 0.00% | £0 |
| SDLT | | | 0.00% | £0 |
| Agency/ Legals | | | 1.75% | £0 |
| Crest share of Surplus | | | 50.00% | £0 |
| **Total Expenditure** | | | | **£ -** |
| **Surplus/ Deficit** | | | | **£ -** |

| | Average (£/m2) | Average (£/ft2) | Locational Weighting | Net to Gross Allowance 15% | External Cost Allowance 10% | Contingency Allowance 2.5% | BCIS Figure |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Estate Housing - Semi Detached Generally** | | £0.00 | £0.00 | - | £0.00 | £0.00 | **£0.00** |
| **Estate Housing - Detached Generally** | | £0.00 | £0.00 | - | £0.00 | £0.00 | **£0.00** |
| **Estate Housing - Terraced Generally** | | £0.00 | £0.00 | - | £0.00 | £0.00 | **£0.00** |
| **Flats (Apartments) - Generally (Median)** | | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | £0.00 | **£0.00** |

| | |
|---|---|
| Viability BCIS Costs per square foot | £127.47 |
| Updated Average BCIS Costs per square foot | £0.00 |
| Uplift | 0.0% |

£ Check -

| | |
|---|---|
| **LPA Commuted Sum Payment** | **£ -** |
| or | |
| **On-site Affordable** | 0.00% |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Total Dwellings** | 1100 |

# IPSWICH GARDEN SUBURB VIABILITY REVIEW TEMPLATE

**SCHEDULE OF VARIABLE INPUTS AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION** **Rev C**

| Ref. | Item | Description | Information Source |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Residential Values | Sale Value of each residential unit type<br>or Capital Value of units for open market<br>rental. All to be net of incentives | RICS local valuer<br>Internet Research<br>Local Estate Agents<br>Evidence from the IGS development |
| 2 | Self Build Income | Value of each plot sale to a self-builder | RICS local valuer<br>Internet Research<br>Local Estate Agents<br>Evidence from the IGS development |
| 3 | Base Build Costs | Building Costs for each type of building<br>including locational weighting at valuation date<br>exclusive of abnormal costs | BCIS |
| 4 | Abnormal Costs | Those costs over and above the normal<br>costs allowed in the assessment of the<br>base build as noted in 3 above.<br>eg: Decontamination, Demolision,<br>Site Preparation, Archealogical Surveys<br>Foundations in excess of 1m deep<br>Basement or UnderCroft Parking applied<br>as a per unit cost | Quantity Surveyor's Cost Plan<br>supported by evidence from<br>appropriate surveys and engineer's<br>reports |
| 5 | Infrastructure | Cost of roads, sewers, utlities and<br>engineering works to service the land | Quantity Surveyor's Cost Plan<br>supported by evidence from<br>appropriate surveys and engineer's<br>reports |
| 6 | Affordable Housing Income | An offer from an agreed Registered<br>Provider for the purchase of the<br>Affordable Homes or<br>Details of Affordable Rents<br>First Tranche Sales<br>and Equity Rent for Shared Ownership,<br>yields to be applied to rents and<br>management costs to be deducted | Registered Provider<br>RICS valuer familiar with Affordable<br>Housing.<br>Council Housing Dept<br>Evidence from the IGS development |
| 7 | Social Housing Grant | Amount of Grant to be offered to the<br>Registered Provider to assist in<br>purchasing the affordable housing | Registered Provider<br>HE Investment Team<br>Council Housing Dept |
| 8 | Other forms of Funding | HE grants for Infrastrusture<br>EU Grants<br>Cross Subsidy from the Registered<br>Provider for the purchase of the<br>Affordable Homes<br>Other sources of Funding | Appropriate funding body |
| 9 | Planning Obligations | Capital & Maintenance Sums included in the S.106<br>Agreement or agreed subsequently applied<br>on a per unit basis | Council / S.106 Agreement |
| 10 | Acquisition Costs | Stamp Duty | HMRC |
| 11 | Residential Unit Mix | Building Type, Unit Type and Number of Each<br>Size (Net Internal Area and Gross Internal Area)<br>Tenure of each dwelling type | Architect's or Developer's accomodation<br>schedule |
| 12 | Ground Rents | Annual ground rents | RICS local valuer<br>Internet Research<br>Local Estate Agents<br>Evidence from the IGS development |
| 13 | Non Residential/Commercial land<br>value indexation | Nationwide Building Society Property Index<br>or a suitable alternative agreed by the parties | Nationwide Building Society |
| 14 | Non Residential/Commercial land<br>acreage | Area of land designated for this use | Architect's or Developer's accomodation<br>schedule |
| 15 | Number of 3,4, and 5 Bed Houses | Used to calculate the number of garages on the<br>remainder of the scheme | Architect's or Developer's accomodation<br>schedule |
| 16 | Benchmark Land Value Indexation | Nationwide Building Society Property Index<br>or a suitable alternative agreed by the parties | Nationwide Building Society |