



North Tyneside Council

Affordable Housing Viability Assessment March 2010





www.northtyneside.gov.uk

Executive summary

Introduction

- S1 Fordham Research was commissioned by North Tyneside MBC to carry out a study of affordable housing viability in the Borough. The viability study is intended to inform ongoing work on the preparation of Local Development Frameworks (LDF).
- S2 Government Guidance in PPS3 (2006 para 29) requires councils to set a *'plan wide'* affordable housing target, and to test this for *'deliverability'* by means of the *'economic viability of land for housing within the area'*.
- S3 The HCA has issued the first official guidance to reflect the downturn (Good Practice Note on Investment and Planning Obligations: responding to the downturn). This says that affordable housing targets should not be set for the plan period based on the present poor market conditions.
- S4 As a result Fordham Research's Dynamic Viability approach is proposed, as that is designed to take account of a range of possible future housing market outcomes through the use of a matrix approach. Such an approach is already used in the London Plan for density issues.

The approach to valuation

- S5 The study involved preparing financial appraisals for a representative range of sites to give a picture of the ability of such sites North Tyneside wide, to afford given targets for affordable housing. The approach was to *'model'* viability using a range of variables and our bespoke spreadsheet software.
- S6 The sites were chosen: to reflect a range of typical development situations; an appropriate balance between previous uses; a range of site sizes; and to give coverage across the four main market subareas of North Shields, Wallsend, Whitley Bay, and North West Tyneside.
- S7 The key features were:
 - i) A set of 12 actual sites was selected after discussion with the Council, from a longer list of possible sites. All were considered to be representative when taken together. These were supplemented by the selection of six 'notional' sites – identical with an actual site, but relocated to an area with a different price level.
 - ii) The sites covered a wide range of site size (4 dwellings to 188) and development types. Ten of the 12 actual sites were brownfield and had been in a variety of previous uses.
 - iii) The sites were at various stages in the development process

S8 The 12 actual sites' locations are shown below.



Source: North Tyneside BC

- S9 The actual sites total 804 dwellings on an area of 19.10 ha, at an average density of 48.2 dwellings per ha net. There is a good range of site size, including four sites under the national threshold guidance size of 15 dwellings. All sites are wholly residential. Sites 1A, 2A & 7A were selected as models for the six notionals, each being transplanted to two new locations.
- A typical development in the council area might generate 15,000 net sq ft per acre (3,450 sq m per ha). However this 'floorspace density' would vary up (for more intensively developed urban sites) and down (for a more suburban type of site) to reflect plausible development scenarios for each site.
- S11 A wide range of data was collected about housing in North Tyneside; this included prices (secondhand, and newbuild, of which a relatively limited amount of newbuild is currently being marketed), rents and RSL information about affordable housing costs. The map below illustrates house price variations across North Tyneside.





Figure S2 Postcode price indices: local prices compared to the national average level

Indices compare prices to value for median postcode sector in England & Wales

Testing sites for viability assessment

- S12 In order to provide reliable evidence on deliverability, the sites were to be examined under a range of assumptions about the key factors affecting viability:
 - i) Affordable housing target levels of 10%, 20%, 30% 40% & 50%.
 - ii) Affordable housing split: 80% social rented & 20% intermediate, and alternatively 40%:60%
 - iii) Land values for alternative uses for the sites: clearly if the site viability falls below the level of alternative use (eg industrial use), it is best used for the alternative use and cannot be considered as primarily a housing site. Hence it is important to establish the best alternative use value for each site.
 - iv) A starting point of zero Social Housing Grant (SHG)
 - v) The calculations consider levels of planning gain consistent with SPD adopted in October 2009
 - vi) Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes was assumed, and also the RSS requirement for 10% renewable energy.



- vii) Abnormal costs were assessed and the figures taken into account where information collected for the sites indicated they were likely.
- S13 The appraisals considered viability for alternative scenarios with indicative levels of grant funding. Further, they considered viability determined by a possible short-term trend (prices falling 10% and costs rising 5%), and also alternatively reverting to the peak market of November 2007 (prices 25% higher than those assumed, costs 10% lower).
- S14 Clearly this range of elements generated a large range of possible outcomes. These were assessed through our bespoke valuation methodology to indicate 'residual land values'. This is the standard approach, and assumes that all costs and returns are measured, except for the land value outcome. The latter is the key variable. It can then be compared with other scenarios, and with alternative use values. The latter are commonly agricultural in rural areas, and industrial/warehousing in urban locations.

Appraisal outcomes

- S15 To assess viability, the value of the land for the particular residential scheme adopted needs to be compared to the alternative use value, to determine whether there is a higher yielding use than housing. If the site value does not exceed the alternative use value, then it is not judged viable as a housing site. If the excess above alternative use value (the 'margin') is sufficiently large, the development is judged viable, but if the excess is not very large it is labelled 'marginal'.
- S16 For the purpose of a strategic study like the present one, it is necessary to take a comparatively simplistic approach to determining the alternative use value. In practice a wide range of considerations could influence the precise value that should apply in each case, and at the end of extensive analysis the outcome might still be contentious. Our 'model' approach to alternative use value is outlined below.
 - i) For sites previously in agricultural use, then agricultural land represents the existing use value
 - ii) Where the development is on former industrial, warehousing or similar land, then the alternative use value is considered to be industrial, and an average value of industrial land for the locality is adopted as the alternative use value.
 - For an existing building in useable condition and for Council owned car park at Eastbourne Gardens we considered the current capital value.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

- S17 There is a further consideration, which is the level of price above the alternative use value which is likely to be required to prompt an owner to sell. It is generally accepted that some additional payment will be required, though this is not usually identified separately. Fordham Research has defined this incentive payment as the 'cushion' and the values range from about £40k to £140k depending on the nature of each sample site.
- S18 Applying this approach, the results for the 18 sites are shown below. The viability figures exclude public sector grant, because the aim is to show the viability of affordable housing targets for landowners/developers. Grant enables more affordable housing to be built, not of itself change the ability of private sector sites to subsidise affordable housing. Grant may, in some cases, help to 'unlock' less profitable sites. But the sensible base position is the zero grant one.



No	Site			Value £k pe	er acre	
		Alt use value	No affordable	10%	20%	30%
1 A	West Chirton S	125	-22	-92	-161	-233
		164	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1B	Palmersville	130	68	-8	-87	-167
		169	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1C	Whitley Bay S	140	287	192	96	0
		179	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2A	Holyfields	10	323	234	143	54
		89	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	MARGINAL
2B	Dudley	10	120	50	-25	-99
		89	VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2C	Longbenton	10	143	67	-11	-92
	-	89	VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-86	-411	-934	-1,362
		194	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	194	113	33	-51
	·	104	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	1,690	1,110	524	-71
		152	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
6A	St. Joseph's	150	366	279	192	106
	·	191	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	
7 A	Emperor Hadrian	140	22	-81	-184	-288
		187	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
7B	North Shields	175	582	431	282	129
		222	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
7C	Wallsend	150	36	-68	-173	-278
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
8A	Marine House	125	132	56	-23	-103
•	Marino House	168	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
9A	Pioneer	125	-51	-170	-288	-413
•		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
104	The Old Dairy	100	107	39	-31	-101
	Sid bully	157	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
114	Co-on Br'y Ave	175	-764	-912	-1,060	-1,212
		285	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
124	The Railwayman	304	-493	-591	-691	-791
	The ranwayman	442				NOT VIAB

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study

S19 The results can be summarised as follows:



- With no grant, at 100% market housing 8 sites were fully viable and two were marginal. At 10% six were viable
- Modifying the tenure split to 40% social rented 60% intermediate had very little impact on these results. However with indicative levels of grant, viability does improve significantly. Seven sites are now viable at 20%, plus one which is marginally viable and two marginal. By 20% only four were viable. None was fully viable at 30%.
- S20 Sensitivity testing suggests that at the peak viability level during November 2007(when prices were perhaps 25% higher than those assumed in our study, whilst costs may have been 10% lower), then, without grant, 16 of the 18 schemes would have been viable at the 20% level. At 30%, 14 would be viable and one marginal, whilst 9 would be viable at 40% plus one marginal.
- S21 Conversely, sensitivity testing also suggests that should prices fall by a further 10% whilst costs increase by 5%, then even with grant no scheme would be viable at the 20% level just one being marginal.

Affordable target as at early summer 2009

S22 National planning guidance requires a single 'plan wide' target. Reviewing the analysis just summarised and at the base date of early summer 2009, it appears that the highest reasonable plan wide target at that point is:

15%

- S23 The target level can be systematically altered by varying one significant cost. Social rented affordable housing costs much more to provide than intermediate affordable housing. However if the proportion of intermediate housing were greatly increased, affordable housing would be less likely to meet the overall need. This is a policy issue which can be considered in relation to particular site locations when they come forward for planning permission.
- S24 The SHMA indicated that a plan-wide target of 25% could be supported by the housing needs evidence. This provides a ceiling to the general target: in other words as and when viability improves the target could be increased from 15 to 25% at the overall plan level.
- S25 Such broad brush targets are designed to provide guidance across whole plan areas. Where the plan area contains such varied housing markets as North Tyneside it is clear that particular sties within the area may be able to support much higher or lower targets than this. This issue could, as discussed below, be built into policy.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

- S26 It should also be noted that the target excludes public sector grant: that is because landowners/developers require a target that is 'zero grant' in order to calculate whether their site can provide the necessary subsidy.
- S27 In setting a plan-long target for the provision of affordable housing the Council could reasonably hope for more affordable housing than is suggested by a 15% target for two reasons:
 - i) Public sector grant will be available at various levels over the plan period, and it should add to the number of new affordable dwellings provided. It is impossible to predict grant levels for any particular district over a long plan period, and so no figure is provided here. It is open to the Council to take a view on this and add to the target level suggested above
 - ii) Using the Dynamic Viability approach discussed below, the target level will rise, as and when the housing market does, and so increase the overall yield of affordable housing over the plan period
- S28 The broad brush target is distinct from the site specific viability test that has existed since affordable housing became a matter of Government policy in 1991. Each applicant for planning permission is entitled, on the basis of viability evidence for the particular site, to argue for a lower target than the broad brush one. Thus there are in practice two levels of valuation involved nowadays rather than one (the site specific level) as was the case before the Blyth Valley Court of Appeal decision of August 2008.
- S29 Given that individual sites in better market areas of the Council area may be able to bear higher targets than the general 15% it is open to the Council to require site specific viability tests of all (significant) new housing proposals, so as to set site specific targets which may be higher as well as lower than 15%. Such variations of targets could be based on the viability model used in this study.
- S30 The target discussed above applies to developments of 15 dwellings and more. We investigated the possibility of a target for smaller sites, eg between 5-14 dwellings. This analysis was not productive, as all 4 of the smaller sites in the sample were either unprofitable even without affordable housing or could not carry any significant target. However the issue of a sub-15 dwelling target should be kept under review. Our results suggest that if market conditions improve some of the smaller sties could support a target.

Dynamic Viability analysis

S31 This is designed to overcome a dilemma created by the economic downturn. During the history of affordable housing targets since their creation in 1991 there had been a broadly rising market. This meant that targets could rise also, and reach their current national level of around 30 to 50% depending on the housing markets in each region.



- S32 The downturn following the Credit Crunch meant that targets had to be lowered. It was always a condition of such targets that they should not remove viability from the market housing developments of which they were a part (such targets only apply to market housing developments, not to ones that are fully funded by public grants).
- S33 There has been no practical suggestion for the way in which affordable housing targets should be treated given their fall in the recession. Many alternative scenarios can be generated, but that does not point to a single target. PPS3 is quite clear that there should be a plan-wide target. Targets cannot be substantially changed through supplementary guidance after the Core Strategy Examination. If a high ('normal market') target were set it would be correctly attacked as undeliverable, and thus contradict the Blyth Valley Court of Appeal decision which requires that targets should be deliverable. It should be noted, however, that Planning Inspectors have permitted a number of such 'normal' market targets, set well above the level that is currently deliverable. This may reflect the limited choices faced by those Inspectors: it is the case that targets which are not broadly deliverable across the plan area are vulnerable to attack by Section 78 Inquiry. Hence such targets are not a wise basis for LDF action.
- S34 Fordham Research has therefore devised a system which permits deliverable targets to be set, regardless of future fluctuations in the market, using sets of price and cost indices. It means that the Core Strategy Examination can be presented with the full range of possible target outcomes, and once approved (in whatever form) no new policy change is required to alter the target. It is changed only by the movement of published indexes. The intervals at which it is changed must be infrequent enough to permit an orderly land market, thus perhaps annually.
- In order to generate the data below it is necessary to agree a Benchmark Site. This is necessary to permit a reasonably simple outcome. In the case of North Tyneside that site is No 2A: Holyfields (as amended). It is judged to be typical of the Council area, and will remain so for the plan period. This is immaterial of whether the site itself is built. Sites of this character will remain typical: this is the assumption.



- S36 The mechanism for producing the target ranges is quite complex. It builds on the viability analysis set out in the summary above. It then examines the full range of possible cost and price changes and generates a matrix of possible affordable targets.
- S37 The SHMA has indicated a 25% affordable housing target excluding viability checking. However it is feasible for targets within North Tyneside to be set higher than that for parts of the district, provided that the average outturn is of the order of 15% (or as updated via the matrix).

	Table S2 North Tyneside Fine Matrix with base alternative use value											
Price Change HPI												
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%	
	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0	
dex	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%	
	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%	55%
	0%	284.3	5%	15%	15%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%	
s In	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	
BCI	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%	45%
nge	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%	40%
Cha	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%	35%
Cost	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%	30%
Ŭ				0	%		5%	10%				

Source: Fordham Research 2009: North Tyneside Viability Study 2009

- S38 Table S2 shows the 'Fine' matrix which provides fairly narrow bands of the two indexes (4% intervals). This is intended to provide practical changes of target, eg 15% to 20% or 25%, rather than bigger steps such as arise if 10% intervals are used. The wider intervals ('Coarse Matrix) are shown in the main text, in order to provide robust plan long target indications to cover any possible changes in the market.
- S39 The full detail of this approach is set out in Chapter 8.

Conclusion

S40 The two staged process, with Dynamic Viability at the end, ensures that the council achieves a share of the land value increase when prices/viability goes up again. This is shared with the landowner/developer because the reviews (assumed to be annual) will be followed by periods when the landowner makes windfall gains in value, alternated with points where the target has risen and there is no windfall gain in value for landowners selling land at that point. The exact outcome depends on the time of planning permissions and the movements of the housing market.



Figure S3: Gain of Affordable Housing from Dynamic Viability

- S41 This figure also shows that the landowners/developers will gain from any uplift in the market (the 40% pre-credit crunch target shown is general and not specific to any district). The basic viability assessment assures the landowner and the developer of a reasonable return. When the market goes up, the private sector will gain a windfall profit (shown by the blue areas under the viability curve) and the public interest will gain affordable housing as the targets are periodically altered.
- S42 The Dynamic Viability procedure ensures that the maximum of deliverable affordable housing is achieved.
- S43 The Dynamic Viability process ensures that the amount of affordable housing is maximised, without harming the landowner's basic profit and the house builder's gross return on cost

Table of Contents

Executive summary	i
List of abbreviations	xv
1. Introduction	1
Introduction	1
Reasons for this study	2
Stage 1 viability methodology	2
Stage 2: Dynamic Viability analysis	
Fordham Research	4
Structure of this report	4
2. Individual development sites	5
Introduction	5
The Borough	5
Identifying a range of sites	6
The sites	6
Development assumptions	8
3. Affordable housing and other developer contributions	13
Introduction	13
Affordable housing assumptions	13
Other developer contributions	16
4. Local market conditions	19
4. Local market conditions	19 19
4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider	19 19
4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market	19 19
4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals	
4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values	
4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values Current and Alternative Use Values	
 4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values Current and Alternative Use Values 5. Assumptions for viability analysis 	
 4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values Current and Alternative Use Values 5. Assumptions for viability analysis Introduction 	
 4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values Current and Alternative Use Values 5. Assumptions for viability analysis Introduction Development costs 	
 4. Local market conditions Introduction Issues to consider The residential market Price assumptions for financial appraisals Land values Current and Alternative Use Values 5. Assumptions for viability analysis Introduction Development costs Financial and other appraisal assumptions 	

6. Results of viability analysis	37
Introduction	37
Financial appraisal approach and assumptions	37
Appraisal results	37
Alternative use benchmarks	39
Comments on the results	43
Sensitivity: price and cost levels	45
Sensitivity: the market peak	47
Sensitivity: tenure split	49
Sensitivity: availability of grant	51
Sensitivity: built form	53
Sensitivity: margin	54
7. Stage 1 Conclusions: Implications of the appraisal results	55
Our approach	55
Basis for the affordable housing target	56
Affordable target suggestion	57
The threshold for affordable housing	58
8 Stage 2: Dynamic Viability	59
What Dynamic Viability does	59
Details of the outputs	60
Implementing Dynamic Viability	64
Conclusion	65
Appendices	67
Appendix 1 Site built form data	69
Appendix 2 Newbuild schemes	77
Appendix 3 House price variations	79
Appendix 4 Small plots for sale	83
Appendix 5 Dynamic Viability Analysis printouts	85
Appendix 6 Financial appraisal summaries	93
Appendix 7 Site Location Plan	69

List of abbreviations

£k	thousand pounds
£m	million pounds
dw	dwelling
dwgs	dwellings
ft	foot
ha	hectare
m	metre
sq	square
Q1	Quarter 1



1. Introduction

Introduction

- 1.1 Fordham Research was commissioned by North Tyneside MBC to produce guidance on the financial viability implications of alternative targets and size thresholds for affordable housing provision within the Borough area.
- 1.2 National guidance (PPS3: Housing 2006) requires Councils to set a target for the proportion of affordable housing to be delivered through new developments. The purpose of the present study is to address that issue of affordable housing, enabling the Council to set a robust target in the light of current commercial circumstances in North Tyneside MBC. That latter target is just that a target. The actual amount of affordable housing required on any particular site must be assessed for that actual site, and take into account the particular factors of developing that site at that point of the economic cycle.
- 1.3 The actual requirement will not only take into account the normal costs of developing that site, but also the abnormal costs such as off-site highways works and the like that may be required. It will take into account the nature of development, the current use of the land and all the other factors that a developer would take into account when embarking on a development project. It will need to allow for factors which are unknowable at present, such as possible use of a community infrastructure levy, and the availability of grant aid for affordable housing.
- 1.4 This study is designed to set the current target in an informed way. Given the pattern of housing market conditions since late 2007, and more particularly a general expectation that house prices may remain below peak market values for some time to come, it may be necessary for any proposed target to be reviewed regularly, so to reflect the resulting changes in the profitability of development.
- 1.5 The availability and cost of land are matters at the core of the viability for any development of new houses. The fact that a developer may have over-paid for a site will not excuse them from providing affordable housing; correspondingly if they paid less than the market rate that would not lead to a requirement to provide more. It must be recognised that in the current development and planning regime, the cost of meeting S106 requirements and affordable housing is a factor in development appraisals and does impact on land values and this must be understood by land owners, developers and their advisors and agents.

1.6 The land price element of the viability appraisal can cause much debate. This study does not attempt to assess the specific price that could or should be paid for each site. The appraisal works out what land on a site may be worth if a range of scenarios were to occur, and then compares that amount with its value in some other use to which it could be put. This study does not attempt to predict when a landowner may sell the land, or even if he will sell, as the owners of individual land areas, whether individuals or corporate bodies, can operate in very different ways and in very different circumstances.

Reasons for this study

1.7 This means that the study is in two stages: the first being the standard viability analysis (in Chapters 2 to 7) and then the second stage containing the Dynamic Viability analysis in the latter part of Chapter 8.

Stage 1 viability methodology

- 1.8 The Stage 1 viability methodology is summarised in Figure 1.2 below. Fundamentally, it involves preparing financial appraisals for a representative range of sites across the study area. In this case a selection of sites was chosen from a shortlist.
- 1.9 The appraisals tested alternative levels of affordable housing provision: in each case a combination of social rented and intermediate housing. We considered the likely purchase prices RSLs would pay for units in each category. Assumptions were also required for the developer contributions that would be sought under other headings like education and open space.
- 1.10 We surveyed the local housing market, in order to obtain a picture of sales values for the market housing. We also surveyed land values for residential development, to calibrate the appraisals and for other uses, to assess alternative use values. Alongside this we considered local development patterns, in order to arrive at appropriate built form assumptions for those sites where information from a current planning permission or application was not available. These in turn informed the appropriate build cost figures.





Figure 1.2 Stage 1 viability methodology

Source: Fordham Research 2009

- 1.11 A number of other technical assumptions were required before appraisals could be produced. The appraisal results were in the form of pounds per acre/ha 'residual' land values, showing the maximum value a developer could pay for the site and still return a target profit level.
- 1.12 Finally, the residual value was compared to the benchmark alternative use value for each site. Only if the residual value exceeded the benchmark figure, and by what is explained in due course to be a satisfactory margin, could the scheme be judged to be viable.

Stage 2: Dynamic Viability analysis

- 1.13 Fordham Research has developed a model which enables the Council to establish through the Core Strategy Examination a matrix of possible future affordable targets. These would be automatically changed in accordance with published indexes of the performance of the housing market. In this way the target would always remain deliverable, but at the same time would ensure that windfall gains in land value are translated into increased affordable housing. This is in accordance with Government Guidance. It would also ensure that the landowner's and housebuilder's margins are not harmed.
- 1.14 The Dynamic Viability approach is set out in Chapter 8 below.

Fordham Research

- 1.15 Fordham Research has been providing advice to Councils in respect of planning gain and development viability since the late 1980s. The firm's approach throughout this time has involved the preparation of financial appraisals. Over the last few years in particular Councils have increasingly commissioned the firm to evaluate financial appraisals which have been prepared by developers in order to support a case for a reduced affordable housing contribution, for enabling development and so on.
- 1.16 Since 1993 Fordham Research has become a leading consultancy in carrying out Housing Needs Surveys and more recently the more wide ranging Strategic Housing Market Assessments that have largely replaced them, and advising Councils on affordable housing policy issues.
- 1.17 Since that time the firm has assisted Councils on very many occasions by providing expert witness services at Local Plan and S78 Inquiries, successfully supporting housing need and affordable housing policies. Particularly in recent years this has regularly included evidence in respect of viability issues.

Structure of this report

- 1.18 The remainder of the report covers the following topics:
 - Chapter 2 The individual development sites
 - Chapter 3 Affordable housing and developer contributions
 - Chapter 4 Local market conditions
 - Chapter 5 Assumptions for viability analysis
 - Chapter 6 Results of the appraisal's analysis
 - Chapter 7 Implications of viability results
 - Chapter 8 Dynamic viability



2. Individual development sites

Introduction

2.1 This chapter deals with the sites identified for study, first outlining the key characteristics of each site, and then considering the assumptions made about proposed development upon each site for the purpose of producing a financial appraisal. The individual sites chosen were visited at an early stage in the work.

The Borough

- 2.2 North Tyneside is one of five metropolitan districts within the conurbation of Tyne & Wear. The borough is an area of considerable contrasts and is without a main centre at its core. The northern fringe of the borough is open countryside, and around 20% of the borough is greenbelt. North Tyneside has the North Sea to the east, the River Tyne as its southern boundary, Newcastle City to the west and Northumberland along its northern boundary.
- 2.3 The main urban areas, including the towns of Wallsend, North Shields, and Whitley Bay, lie along the river and coastline stretches. There are three other large settlements, Longbenton, Forest Hall and Killingworth, located in the northwest of the borough, between the main towns and the rural hinterland. Along the northern edge of the borough are a number of former mining villages. A new settlement with a Metro station and a district centre is currently being developed between Shiremoor and Backworth.
- 2.4 Although the river's traditional role has declined in modern times, bringing economic problems and creating opportunities for regeneration throughout the conurbation, the Tyne remains a commercial river with shipbuilding, offshore fabrication, fishing and port related industries. It provides access to the North Sea, and with the only passenger port in the region supports regular passenger services to northern Europe. It is increasingly used for recreational purposes. The river provides opportunities for North Tyneside, but it can also act as a barrier between North Tyneside and the south of the region.
- 2.5 The borough has an attractive coastline with cliffs and beaches providing recreational facilities for the wider conurbation and beyond. The Hadrian's Wall World Heritage site and the Tynemouth village conservation area are of national and regional significance.



2.6 The borough has external road links via the A19 southwards via the Tyne Tunnel and has access to the A1 to the north west. It has a good system of internal roads with the A1058 linking it with Newcastle City. Newcastle Airport is to the north west. A suburban electric rail 'Metro' system loops through the borough linking the main towns and the coastal area with Newcastle and other districts of Tyne and Wear. North Tyneside has 17 Metro stations within its boundary, more than any other Tyne & Wear authority. Overall, the Borough has good transport links which contribute to it being an attractive and popular location for new housing and business development.

Identifying a range of sites

- 2.7 It was decided that for North Tyneside MBC the required guidance on viability would best be achieved by looking at a range of site sizes, and at both actual and notional sites. In discussion with the Council, it was decided that a total of 12 representative sites should be examined, and this number would provide some scope for exploring viability on sites below the current national guidance size threshold of 15 dwellings. These twelve were supplemented by the selection of 6 additional 'notional' sites.
- 2.8 A final list of 18 (12 actual and 6 notional) sites was established by discussion. They were chosen: to reflect a range of typical development situations; an appropriate balance between previous uses; a range of site sizes; and to give coverage across the four main market sub-areas of North Shields, Wallsend, Whitley Bay, and North West Tyneside.
- 2.9 The sites range in size from four to 188 dwellings. Nine of the 12 actual sites were on previously developed land, and three on undeveloped greenfield land. The brownfield sites had a range of differing previous uses including a shipyard, dairy, car park, college, shop and public house.
- 2.10 The 12 actual sites were at various stages in the planning process. Ten were subject to a planning application; eight of these had been approved with one pending and one refusal. The remaining two sites were potential allocations.
- 2.11 The six notional sites were chosen to complement the 12 actuals, being identical with an actual site but set down in areas of contrasting price levels. They reflect typical urban conditions in Palmersville, Whitely Bay, Dudley, Longbenton, North Shields and Wallsend Town Centre.
- 2.12 Information available from the various planning applications was taken into account in considering the appropriate development forms to use in our appraisals.

The sites

2.13 Locations for the 12 actual sites identified in discussion with the Council are set out in the map below.





Figure 2.1 Site locations

Source: North Tyneside BC

- 2.14 Summary details of the sites are shown in the table below. The tables show both total site area, and where a significant area of non developable land applied, the net residential area.
- 2.15 The actual sites total 804 dwellings on an area of 19.10 ha, at an average density of 48.2 dwellings per ha net. There is a good range of site size, including four sites under the national threshold guidance size of 15 dwellings. All of the ten sites are wholly residential.
- 2.16 The information described above shows the site sizes as used in appraisals. After consideration the original sizes of three sites were varied to allow appraisals to reflect more closely what we anticipated might be built on them in a commercial development situation. Densities were revised on two sites one up, one down. Site 3 Smith's Dock was appraised as a specimen site, after it became clear that the site would not be viable without considerable grant funding for the major ground remediation works required to produce a developable site. (In any case a revised scheme providing for a more mixed range of dwelling types than the approved application 1,220 dwellings, all apartments was understood to be in the pipeline).
- 2.17 In order to move forward it was assumed that a specimen scheme, with development characteristics similar to the Eastbourne Gardens site, would be produced on a clean development parcel of 120 dwellings within the remediated Smith's Dock site.

Table 2.1 Site details							
Site	Nama	Area	n ha	No	net	Planning status	
No	Name	Gross	Net	dwgs	(dw/ha)	Fianning status	
1A	West Chirton South Trading Estate	5.40	5.00	188	37.6	Pending consideration	
1B	Palmersville	5.40	5.00	188	37.6	Hypothetical location	
1C	Whitley Bay South	5.40	5.00	188	37.6	Hypothetical location	
2A	Holyfields	(10.78)	4.00	150	37.5	Permitted	
2B	Dudley	(10.78)	4.00	150	37.5	Hypothetical location	
2C	Longbenton	(10.78)	4.00	150	37.5	Hypothetical location	
3A	Smith's Dock	0.72	0.72	120	166	(Permitted)	
4A	Wideopen UDP	(20.99)	2.75	110	40.0	Refused on appeal	
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	0.51	0.51	85	166	Permitted	
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	1.72	1.72	38	22.1	Potential site	
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	0.56	0.56	38	67.6	Permitted	
7B	North Shields	0.56	0.56	38	67.6	Hypothetical location	
7C	Wallsend Town Centre	0.56	0.56	38	67.6	Hypothetical location	
8A	Marine House	0.88	0.88	41	46.4	Potential site	
9A	Pioneer Social Club	0.15	0.15	12	82.2	Permitted	
10A	The Old Dairy	0.26	0.26	10	38.3	Permitted	
11A	Former Co-op, Brenkley Ave	0.07	0.07	8	114	Permitted	
12A	The Railwayman	0.05	0.05	4	80.0	Permitted	
	Total	(75.58)	35.80	1,556	43.5		

Development assumptions

2.18 In arriving at appropriate assumptions for residential development on each site, the development form in an approved planning application must always be an important consideration. On the other hand the application could conceivably now be so historic, that it represents something that would either not now be proposed, or not be permitted. After consideration we took the view that in each case where application details were available the built form described there remains the best basis for carrying out appraisals. These provided a basis for modelling development assumptions on a majority of the sites.

- 2.19 A view had to be taken about the appropriate development form on those 'actual' sites where no application had so far been submitted. Whilst there are in fact only two of these, there has to be a clear justification for the assumptions used. This is set out below.
- 2.20 Earlier in the present decade, as development proposals have engaged with the various implications of PPG3/PPS3, but aided by rising land values, a particular development format emerged quite commonly on significant sized sites in most larger urban areas, initially in the more prosperous or pressured parts of the country, but increasingly also in smaller centres. This format provided for a majority of houses (with perhaps 15%+ flats) in a mixture of two storey and two and a half to three storey form, with some rectangular emphasis to the layout. Typically, these would generate a floorspace density of around 15,000-15,500 sq ft per acre (3,450-3,550 sq m per ha) on a substantial site, or sensibly shaped smaller site. A representative dwelling density might be 40-45 dwellings per ha.
- 2.21 Alongside this, there are of course schemes where land is used rather more intensively. Within Greater London, in other urban locations, and indeed sometimes elsewhere, there have been large numbers of higher density schemes providing largely or wholly apartments, in blocks of three storeys or higher. These provide floorspace density from around 30,000 sq ft per acre (6,900 sq m per ha) upwards, at densities of 100 dw per ha plus.
- 2.22 In contrast, there will be situations where, for planning reasons, particularly on small sites, in rural, edge of town or more sensitive locations, schemes with densities below a 15,500 sq ft per acre (3,550 sq m per ha) 'baseline' will come forward. A typical density might be around 12,500 sq ft per acre (2,850 sq m per ha).

	Table	2.2 Typolog	y of development form		
	Density	y			
Category title	Floorspace net	Dwellings	Built form characteristics		
Category title	sq ft/acre (net sq	(typical			
	m per ha)	dw/ha)			
	12 500		Edge of settlement, less pressured location. Mostly 2		
Lower density	(2.875)	20-33	storey, largely 3 & 4 bed detached houses with		
	(2,075)		garages.		
	4 = = 0.0		Mixture of 0.9.0 E/2 starsy houses many		
Baso	15,500	40-45	wixture of 2 & 2.5/3 storey houses, many		
Base	15,500 (3,550)	40-45	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging.		
Base	15,500 (3,550) 19,500	40-45	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging.		
Base Urban	(3,550) 19,500 (4,480)	40-45 50	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging. 30-40% flats, fewer 2 storey units than base		
Base Urban	15,500 (3,550) 19,500 (4,480) 30,000	40-45 50	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging. 30-40% flats, fewer 2 storey units than base		
Base Urban High	15,500 (3,550) 19,500 (4,480) 30,000 (6,900)	40-45 50 100+	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging. 30-40% flats, fewer 2 storey units than base Flats in small blocks on 3 storeys, parking spaces		
Base Urban High	15,500 (3,550) 19,500 (4,480) 30,000 (6,900) 50,000	40-45 50 100+	terraced; some (15-25%) flats, limited garaging. 30-40% flats, fewer 2 storey units than base Flats in small blocks on 3 storeys, parking spaces		

- 2.23 These observations suggest a built form typology as set out in the table above. It comprises five categories. There is a 'base' category to reflect the common urban form referred to above, i.e. giving around 3,550 sq m per ha, and one less dense and three more dense variations from this starting point.
- 2.24 The above typology informed model development assumptions for the two sites where actual information on planning proposals was not available. After careful thought site 8A was felt to merit the 'base' category, whilst for site 6A a lower density form was considered more appropriate.
- 2.25 The resulting assumptions for residential development for each of the 12 'actual' sites are set out in the Table below. The sites where actual data was available (shown as P in the table) conform closely with the two sites using model data informed by the typology (shown as M).



Table 2.3 Site development assumptions: actual sites								
Site ref	Category	Development form		Floorsp (ro	Ave dwg net sa ft			
	Gutogoly	Category	(M/P)	Net sq ft/acre	Net sq m/ha	(sq m)		
1A	West Chirton South	Base	Р	15,100	3,450	991		
2A	Holyfields	Base	Р	14,750	3,400	972		
3A	Smith's Dock	Very high	Р	55,350	12,700	824		
4A	Wideopen UDP	Base	Р	14,950	3,450	923		
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	Very high	Р	55,350	12,700	824		
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	Lower	М	12,500	2,850	1,398		
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	Urban	Р	21,450	4,925	784		
8 A	Marine House	Base	М	15,450	3,550	822		
9A	Pioneer Social Club	Urban	Р	22,450	5,150	675		
10A	The Old Dairy	Lower	Р	12,325	2,850	795		
11A	Former Co-op, Brenkley Ave	High	Р	31,000	7,100	670		
12A	The Railwayman	Urban	Р	20,550	4,700	635		

2.26 Among the twelve sites there is good range of density, with four sites fitting into the Base category, two with densities matching the Lower group, three broadly in the Urban category one up from Base, and three in the two highest density categories. The three sites duplicated to provide notional sites comprise two Base, and one Urban.



3. Affordable housing and other developer contributions

Introduction

3.1 This chapter considers the assumptions used to test a range of affordable housing scenarios for the individual sites, and similarly the developer contributions assumed for each site.

Affordable housing assumptions

3.2 We undertook appraisals for a number of development scenarios which involved varying proportions of affordable housing, and tenure split. The assumptions in respect of proportions, and the financial terms on which they are to be provided, are considered below.

(i) Affordable proportion

- 3.3 Following discussions with the Council we agreed to test the following options:
 - **NO** affordable housing
 - 30% affordable
 - 40% affordable
 - 50% affordable
- 3.4 The North Tyneside Housing Strategy 2006-2010 suggests an affordable housing target of 30% on residential development sites of 15 dwellings or more. However, such targets will be informed by the ongoing SHMA, as well as by the present study.
- 3.5 Also, new targets will be proposed in emerging Local Development Framework Documents.

(ii) Tenure split

3.6 The Council currently seeks a mixture of social rented and intermediate housing, though with a majority (60%) provided as social rented. The emerging SHMA document may suggest changing this proportion. In the meantime we undertook to test a base split of 80/20 and consider a variant split of 40/60; intermediate positions could be inferred fairly readily from these two.

3.7 In principle, intermediate tenure could constitute a wide range of different housing propositions. After discussion with the Council it was agreed that intermediate housing should be assumed to be consistent with affordability proposals in the ongoing SHMA Study. They could be either intermediate rent, or home purchase solutions, but would need to be made available to match the income thresholds¹ set out in the Table below.

Tabl	e 3.1 North Tyneside Purchas	e Income Threshold	s 2009
A		Income Thresholds (£	"
Area	1 Bed Flat	2 Bed Flat	2 Bed Terrace
North West	20,400	21,700	23,100
Whitley Bay	19,000	27,100	36,600
North Shields	23,100	32,600	36,600
Wallsend	12,200	16,300	15,900
Borough-Wide	18,500	19,000	25,800

Source: DCA Estate Agency Survey 2009 Table 8.9

Table 3.2	North Tyneside Rental Inco	me Thresholds 200	9
4.000	Inco	ome Thresholds (£)	
Area	1 Bed Flat	2 Bed Flat	2 Bed Terrace
North West	19,200	21,600	21,600
Whitley Bay	20,600	22,100	23,800
North Shields	13,200	16,300	21,600
Wallsend	15,600	15,600	21,600
Borough-Wide	14,400	16,800	21,600

Source: DCA Estate Agency Survey 2009 Table 8.13

(iii) Size profile

3.8 After discussion we assumed that the mix of affordable housing on each site should broadly follow the market housing, achieving an average dwelling size (i.e. net sq ft/sq m) in line with that of the market housing. This assumption is a convenient one, which ensures that as the affordable housing proportion varies between the options being tested, the floorspace density remains constant - a desirable aim if the appraisals are to constitute a realistic development scenario, consistently, across the options.

¹ Income thresholds are the lowest household incomes required to enter any particular housing tenure. Purchase income thresholds are based on 95% mortgage availability and a 3x gross income lending ratio. Rental income thresholds are based on rent at 25% of gross income (equivalent to 30% of net income).



3.9 In assembling development assumptions for the sites, we collected, or in a few cases made broad assumptions about, the indicative mix of dwellings on each individual site. Collectively these deliver an overall mix profile as set out in the table below.

Table 3.3 Aggregate siz	e mix profil	е
	No of dwgs	%
1 bed flat	10	1.2%
2 bed flat	317	39.4%
2 bed house	66	8.2%
3 bed house	221	27.5%
4 + bed house	190	23.7%
Total	804	100

Source: Fordham Research 2009

3.10 Inevitably, the profile reflects the particular characteristics of the sites chosen for assessment. Nonetheless there is felt to be a reasonable spread of dwelling size and type.

(iv) Financial terms

- 3.11 To be consistent with national guidance the viability study must take into account the likely availability of public subsidy i.e. Social Housing Grant.
- 3.12 The future availability of grant both the total quantum of grant, and the amounts forthcoming for different sizes of dwelling and tenure is typically subject to some uncertainty. The uncertainty reflects both the longer term trend, as the available funding has been directed to achieving specific regional or strategic priorities, and the recent past, as funding has been extended, in a short term ad hoc response to the national economic situation.
- 3.13 An assumption based on a 'default position' of zero Social Housing Grant has become a common starting point in this situation. The zero grant assumption also has the incidental advantage of allowing the requirement for grant in individual cases to be calculated more simply than if a set level were already allowed for.
- 3.14 After consideration it was decided that appraisals should be produced with an assumption of zero Social Housing Grant, showing its impact on the base appraisal results.

- 3.15 It was necessary to seek advice from the Councils' partner RSLs about the financial terms on which properties of various sizes would be purchased from the developer in order to achieve the 'zero grant' scenario. We received only a partial response to our request, partly reflecting the uncertain market conditions. However the RSL responses we did receive, in conjunction with our own experience from other Viability Assessments, provided a basis for arriving at appropriate figures for the four 'market areas'.
- 3.16 The figures are set out below. The intermediate housing figures vary across the four market areas, with market prices whilst the social rented figures are unchanged.

Table 3	.4 Purchase	prices for at	fordable dw	ellings: zero	o grant basis	5					
		£ per sq ft (sq m)									
	Social	Social rented		diate rent	Shared o'ship						
	Flat	House	Flat	House	Flat	House					
North West	74	70	95	90	103	98					
	(796)	(753)	(1,022)	(968)	(1,108)	(1,049)					
Whitley Bay	74	70	105	100	114	110					
	(796)	(753)	(1,130)	(1,076)	(1,229)	(1,184)					
North Shields	74	70	95	90	103	98					
	(796)	(753)	(1,022)	(968)	(1,108)	(1,049)					
Wallsend	74	70	90	85	94	90					
	(796)	(753)	(968)	(915)	(1,014)	(968)					

Other developer contributions

- 3.17 Aside from affordable housing, developer contributions could potentially be sought by North Tyneside Council under a number of headings. They might be either made in kind, or as financial payments. In either case, it is necessary to allow for the additional financial cost of such contributions in preparing appraisals for each site.
- 3.18 The Council has prepared a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) dealing with Planning Obligations (published in October 2009). The report assumptions on this topic were made before the SPD was finalised, the Council having provided appropriate guidance.



- 3.19 In providing that guidance the Council has considered the likely level of contributions that would arise under the emerging SPD, and also the level of contributions that were typically paid in the previous five year period. Where there was little or no existing provision and full contributions arose, the total cost of contributions might be quite significantly greater than the level of cost implied by contributions made in the past, which would of course reflect previous/existing policies, the degree of spare capacity in existing social and physical infrastructure, the economic viability of the development proposal and Council priorities.
- 3.20 After careful analysis and consideration the Council formed a view about an appropriate average proportion of the theoretical maximum contribution that should be assumed to apply to the sites examined in our appraisal. This suggested a figure of £2,070 per dwelling. Accordingly we have applied this figure to each site.
- 3.21 It must be emphasised that this approach is simply intended to treat the study sites consistently and equitably in order to allow financial appraisals to be produced which provide a strategic overview. The figures do not purport to represent necessarily what would be sought, offered or negotiated, on specific sites.
- 3.22 Many Councils are currently considering the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) providing a standard charge based on an assessment of aggregated infrastructure costs. It is likely that such a charge would lead to higher costs than those assumed here.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD



4. Local market conditions

Introduction

- 4.1 This chapter sets out an assessment of the local housing market in North Tyneside MBC, providing a basis for the assumptions on house prices and costs to be used in financial appraisals for the 18 sites tested in the study.
- 4.2 As well as house prices, however, land values are also considered. They are required in order to form a view of likely alternative use values for all of the sites, and it is such values which will represent a minimum viability threshold when appraisals are prepared for the range of affordable housing scenarios.
- 4.3 Before looking at the results from the market assessments, there are some general points arising from the nature of the exercise.

Issues to consider

- 4.4 It is necessary to assess property market conditions in the study area in order to provide a reasonable guide as to likely values to use in evaluating different development proposals.
- 4.5 Although development schemes do have similarities, every scheme is unique to some degree, even schemes on neighbouring sites. While market conditions in general will broadly reflect a combination of national economic circumstances and local supply and demand factors, even within a town there will be particular localities, and ultimately site specific factors, that generate different values and costs. There are indeed quite significant value variations in different parts of the study area.
- 4.6 Property market forces are in a constant state of flux and assessments of viability can change over relatively short periods of time, in response to broader economic fluctuations such as the impact of changes in interest rates on the costs of borrowing, the actual availability of funding, and the outlook in the employment market. Equally significant, sub-area market conditions are often changed by local factors.
- 4.7 For example, high value areas encourage demand in lower value neighbouring areas, where new developments encourage changes in value growth in what perhaps were previously less popular areas.
The residential market

- 4.8 The housing market in the Borough will, to some extent, reflect national trends but there are local factors that underpin the market including:
 - Attractive, rugged and unspoilt landscape within easy reach of the area, to the north and west, as well as an attractive coastline, each providing both recreation opportunities for residents of the area, and tourism potential
 - a variety of situations, including those arising from the river frontage and coastline, many providing striking residential locations
 - close proximity to a vibrant regional and riverside centre in Newcastle with many employment opportunities
 - a range of other employment opportunities within North Tyneside
 - good transportation links via the Tyne Tunnel and A1(M)
 - a degree of self containment, imposed by the coastline and limited Tyne crossing points
 - several older areas undergoing regeneration and providing cheaper housing stock.
- 4.9 We analysed various sources of market information but the most relevant are the prices of units on new developments. A list setting out details of some relevant new developments in the area, as at May 2009, is provided in Appendix 2. The Appendix also has details of recently developed and completed schemes directly relevant to the sample sites. Any historic prices have been adjusted to current date levels by reference to the Halifax House Price Index.
- 4.10 Analysis of these, and other schemes in the study area, shows that prices for newbuild homes vary quite widely across the area, ranging between approximately £150 and £260 per square foot (£1,600 £2,800 per square metre). Indeed prices for individual properties within a scheme might vary more widely than this.
- 4.11 Table 4.1 shows average prices for North Tyneside MBC for the latest quarter available from Land Registry, Q2 2009. Although the Land Registry data covers both second-hand and newbuild prices, the former will predominate. The average prices in the Table are compared to a corresponding England & Wales figure and expressed as indices.
- 4.12 The average price of detached and semi-detached properties, and flats, in the North Tyneside MBC area are somewhat below the national average, whilst the average price of terraced properties is much closer to the national average.



Table 4.1 Average house prices Q2 2009: comparison with England & Wales average							
Aroa		Ave price (£k & % index)					
Alea	Detached	Semi		Terrace	Flat		
Q2 09	ave £k	£234.4	£145.6	£143.1	£94.9		
	no of sales	71	160	179	102		
	index	88%	88%	99%	74%		

Source: Land Registry data.

Index compares LA's ave £k price figure to the median LA value across England & Wales for house type.

4.13 Generally, as throughout the country, prices in the borough have fallen over the last 18 months. However, because Land Registry data reports sales after completion there is some lag and the figures show the decline to only a limited extent, although the decline in sales numbers does show up quite clearly (sales are seasonally low in the first quarter).

Table 4.2 Average house prices in previous quarters					
4100			Ave price (£k	& % index)	
Alea		Detached	Semi	Terrace	Flat
Q4 07	ave £k	£241.1	£172.1	£149.7	£100.0
	no of sales	120	301	374	375
Q1 08	ave £k	£259.0	£158.2	£152.2	£100.0
	no of sales	86	182	247	175
Q2 08	ave £k	£259.0	£158.1	£152.5	£102.1
	no of sales	38	120	119	220
Q3 08	ave £k	£226.7	£151.3	£145.6	£101.7
	no of sales	76	150	187	157
Q4 08	ave £k	£204.7	£138.2	£144.5	£96.6
	no of sales	38	87	100	109
Q1 09	ave £k	£211.4	£157.5	£140.1	£103.5
	no of sales	31	94	115	63

Source: Land Registry data.

- 4.14 Within a Council area there can be considerable variations in price, and Land Registry house price data at postcode sector level helps to show these variations. Because the number of sales in individual postcode areas in a single quarter can be quite small, we looked at information for four separate quarters (Q4 2007, Qs 2 & 4 2008, Q2 2009). The data has been expressed as an index as a percentage of the nationwide average price level and standardised, to allow for variations in type mix. (Appendix 3 provides a worked example of the index calculation, for one postcode area at Q4 2008, and sets out the resulting price index figures for the three quarters examined).
- 4.15 It can be seen from the indices in Appendix 3 that variations between the individual quarters' indices are, in most cases, relatively slight. Variations tend to be greater for rural and town centre areas, which are mostly numerically smaller and/or more diverse, than for urban areas generally, where postcode sectors are larger numerically and can often be more uniform.
- 4.16 The average figures for the three quarters are mapped in Figure 4.1 below.



Figure 4.1 Postcode price indices: local prices compared to the national average level

Source: Land Registry

Indices compare prices to value for median postcode sector in England & Wales

4.17 This shows that prices in many postcode sectors are well below, under 80% of, the national average level. In contrast a band of areas towards the coast, northwards from Tynemouth through Whitley Bay, are at or in some cases well above the national average. There is also a central belt of prices above 80% running through to the northwest at Wideopen. These variations will need to be reflected in setting figures for new build prices, which follows below.



Price assumptions for financial appraisals

- 4.18 It is necessary to form a view about the appropriate prices for the 18 individual schemes to be appraised in the study. The preceding analysis suggests that although prices in some locations will be quite similar, there will be some locations where prices are appreciably lower or higher.
- 4.19 It is also clear that we should allow for differences between apartments and houses, particularly in locations where flats are going to be attractive. Finally, in drawing on the newbuild price data we have to bear in mind that, particularly in the present market conditions, the prices at which homes are offered may include appreciable discounts, such as deposit paid for first-time purchasers, or stamp duty.
- 4.20 Taking these points into consideration we considered what sale prices should be for flats, for detached or semi-detached houses and for terraced or town houses on each of the eighteen sites. These were then to be combined on the basis of the proportions of each type on each scheme, to produce a single composite average price.
- 4.21 The evidence of sales prices across the area is summarised in Appendix 2.

Table 4.3 Price bands						
Price			per		Price £ per	
ocation	Sq ft	Sq m	_	Site/location	Sq ft	Sq m
West Chirton South	156	1,683	6A	St. Joseph's	194.5	2,093
Palmersville	165	1,775	7A	Emperor Hadrian	155	1,669
Whitley Bay South	189	2,031	7B	North Shields	196	2,113
Holyfields	183	1,971	7C	Wallsend Town Centre	156	1,677
Dudley	161	1,728	8 A	Marine House	165	1,775
Longbenton	167	1,794	9A	Pioneer Social Club	165	1,775
Smith's Dock	205	2,206	10A	The Old Dairy	170	1,829
Wideopen	170	1,833	11A	Co-op, Brenkley Ave	160	1,722
Eastbourne Gardens	260	2,798	12A	The Railwayman	150	1,614
	ocation West Chirton South Palmersville Whitley Bay South Holyfields Dudley Longbenton Smith's Dock Wideopen Eastbourne Gardens	PriceocationPriceSq ftSq ftWest Chirton South156Palmersville165Whitley Bay South189Holyfields183Dudley161Longbenton167Smith's Dock205Wideopen170Eastbourne Gardens260	Price £ per Sq ft Sq m West Chirton South 156 1,683 Palmersville 165 1,775 Whitley Bay South 189 2,031 Holyfields 183 1,971 Dudley 161 1,728 Longbenton 167 1,794 Smith's Dock 205 2,206 Wideopen 170 1,833 Eastbourne Gardens 260 2,798	Price £ per Sq ft Sq m West Chirton South 156 1,683 6A Palmersville 165 1,775 7A Whitley Bay South 189 2,031 7B Holyfields 183 1,971 7C Dudley 161 1,728 8A Longbenton 167 1,794 9A Smith's Dock 205 2,206 10A Wideopen 170 1,833 11A Eastbourne Gardens 260 2,798 12A	Price £ perSite/locationOcationPrice £ perSite/locationSq ftSq mSite/locationWest Chirton South1561,6836ASt. Joseph'sPalmersville1651,7757AEmperor HadrianWhitley Bay South1892,0317BNorth ShieldsHolyfields1831,9717CWallsend Town CentreDudley1611,7288AMarine HouseLongbenton1671,7949APioneer Social ClubSmith's Dock2052,20610AThe Old DairyWideopen1701,83311ACo-op, Brenkley AveEastbourne Gardens2602,79812AThe Railwayman	Price \pounds per Sq ftSite/locationPrice Sq ftNest Chirton South1561,6836ASt. Joseph's194.5Palmersville1651,7757AEmperor Hadrian155Whitley Bay South1892,0317BNorth Shields196Holyfields1831,9717CWallsend Town Centre156Dudley1611,7288AMarine House165Longbenton1671,7949APioneer Social Club165Smith's Dock2052,20610AThe Old Dairy170Wideopen1701,83311ACo-op, Brenkley Ave160Eastbourne Gardens2602,79812AThe Railwayman150

4.22 The site figures resulting from our type-specific assumptions are set out in the table below.

4.23 The figures cover a range from the cheapest £150 per sq ft (£1,614 per sq m) at The Railwayman to £260 per sq ft (£2,798 per sq m) at Eastbourne Gardens. This is not quite as great as the spread of prices we saw in the Land Registry data for second-hand prices.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

4.24 It is necessary to consider whether the presence of affordable housing would have a discernible impact on sales prices. In fact affordable housing will be present on some sites whose selling prices have informed our analysis. Our view is that in any case any impact can and should be minimised through an appropriate quality design solution.

Land values

- 4.25 We consider below what the available information suggests land values for residential housing land might be in North Tyneside. General figures are available from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) relating to residential land values. Land values vary dramatically depending upon the development characteristics (size and nature of the site, density permitted etc.) and any affordable or other development contribution.
- 4.26 The VOA publishes figures for residential land in the Property Market Report. These cover areas which generate sufficient activity to discern a market pattern. That means locally we have figures for the North East as a whole, and major towns and cities within the region.
- 4.27 These values can, in any case, only provide broad guidance because it is likely that the figures will, to some degree, be net of allowances for developer contributions and/or affordable housing requirements. As such, they can only be indicative, and it may be that values for 'oven ready' land with no affordable provision or other contribution, or servicing requirement, are in fact higher.

Table 4.4 Residential Land Values half yr to Jan 2009				
	Lanc	l Value £m per acre (h	ectare)	
Area	Small sites	Bulk sites	Land for anotmonto	
	(< 5 dwgs)	(> 2 ha)	Land for apartments	
North East	1.82m	1.65m	2.00m	
NOITITEAS	(4.50m)	(4.08m)	(4.95m)	
Nowaaatla (Haatan)	2.32m	2.00m	2.64m	
Newcastle (Heaton)	(5.74m)	(4.95m)	(6.53m)	
Alpurial	1.84m	1.60m	1.84m	
AITWICK	(4.55m)	(3.96m)	(4.55m)	
Sundarland	1.52m	1.40m	1.60m	
Sulluenallu	(3.76m)	(3.47m)	(3.96m)	
Middloobrough	1.20m	1.20m	1.20m	
Middlesbrough	(2.97m)	(2.97m)	(2.97m)	
Durbom	2.24m	2.05m	2.70m	
Dumam	(5.54m)	(5.07m)	(6.68m)	

Source: VOA Property Market Report Jan 2009



- 4.28 With the decline in the market and general economic conditions these values are now in any case going to be rather historic - values will be falling faster than prices. As such, we sought information about values from residential land currently on sale in the Borough.
- 4.29 There are a small number of sites for residential development currently available in the immediate and adjacent areas. Those we found varied in (grossed up) value from around £1.0m per acre (Whitley Bay, up to £2.5m per acre for a site at North Shields. These are only small sites, and limited generalisation is possible from them. A detailed schedule of the residential land available is set out in Appendix 3.

Current and Alternative Use Values

- 4.30 In order to assess development viability it is necessary to analyse current and alternative use values. Current use values refer to the value of the land in its current use, for example, as agricultural land. Alternative use values refer to any potential use for the site. For example, a brownfield site may have an alternative use as industrial land.
- 4.31 To assess viability, the value of the land for the particular residential scheme adopted needs to be compared to the alternative use value, to determine if there is another use which would derive more revenue for the landowner. If the assessed value does not exceed the alternative use value, then the development is not viable.
- For the purpose of the present study, it is necessary to take a comparatively simplistic approach to 4.32 determining the alternative use value. In practice a wide range of considerations could influence the precise value that should apply in each case, and at the end of extensive analysis the outcome might still be contentious.
- 4.33 Our 'model' approach is outlined below.
 - i) For sites previously in agricultural use, then agricultural land represents the existing use value
 - ii) Where the development is on former industrial, warehousing or similar land, then the alternative use value is considered to be industrial, and an average value of industrial land for the locality is adopted as the alternative use value.
 - iii) For an existing building capable of beneficial use we would attempt to estimate the building's capital value.
 - iv) For the Council owned car park at Eastbourne Gardens, we took Council advice.
- 4.34 The VOA's typical industrial land values for the region and subregions for the second half of 2009 are set out in the table below.

	Table 4.5 Industrial	land values	
4.00	Land	tare)	
Area	Low	High	Typical
North East	90k (223k)	252k (624k)	178k (441k)
North Tyneside (Newcastle)	180k (446k)	247k (611k)	216k (535k)
Northumberland (Cramlington)	90k (223k)	180k (446k)	135k (334k)
Sunderland	157k (389k)	252k (624k)	200k (495k)
Middlesbrough	135k (334k)	247k (611k)	170k (421k)
Durham	157k (389)	225k (557k)	170k (421k)

Source: VOA Property Market Report July 2009

- 4.35 Across the region as a whole there is a spread of values, although really only in the broad range £100k-£250k per acre (£250k-£620k per ha). North Tyneside appears to sit higher rather than lower in this range, with a 'typical' value just over £200k per acre (£495k per ha).
- 4.36 One would expect these figures to be now somewhat out of date, as values have dropped with the general downturn, since mid-2008. Information about the local market is hard to come by with comparatively few transactions to provide evidence in the current market situation, but it does seem likely that values are now in the range of £125k-£150k per acre, or £310k-£370k per ha. We developed figures for sites 1A/B/C, 3A, 6A, 8A, 9A & 10A accordingly (note that for the purpose of the study 3A Smith's Dock is assumed to be a fully remediated and cleared site ready for development). Site 7A (former PH, now cleared) was given a value at the top of this range, and values for 7B & 7C just slightly increased from this base figure. Site 11A (also cleared Co-op site) was given a similar slight premium. The Railwayman PH, still in place but in moderate physical condition, was assumed to have a nominal value as an existing building but requiring extensive work, giving a site value equivalent to £300k per acre (£740k per ha).
- 4.37 The agricultural land at sites 2A/B/C and 4 was assumed to have a value as agricultural land of £10k per acre (£25k per ha). Part of the Wideopen site has been used as a scrapyard. This would have an enhanced use value though possibly a little short of industrial value; the area of the scrapyard use is a relatively small proportion however and we have set the overall value at £35k per acre (£75k per ha).
- 4.38 Finally the Council's Valuation Dept suggested a use value of £105k per acre (£260k per ha) for the Eastbourne Gardens car park.



	Table 4.6 Alternative Use Value bases				
	Site	Basis	£k per acre	£k per ha	
1A	West Chirton South	Employment land	125	310	
1B	Palmersville	Employment land	130	320	
1C	Whitley Bay S	Employment land	140	345	
2A	Holyfields	Agricultural	10	25	
2B	Dudley	Agricultural	10	25	
2C	Longbenton	Agricultural	10	25	
3A	Smith's Dock	Employment land	150	370	
4A	Wideopen	Agricultural/scrapyard	35	85	
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	Car park	105	260	
6A	St. Joseph's	Employment land	150	370	
7A	Emperor Hadrian	Public house	140	345	
7B	North Shields	Public house	175	430	
7C	Wallsend Town Centre	Public house	150	370	
8A	Marine House	Employment land	125	310	
9A	Pioneer Social Club	Employment land	125	310	
10A	The Old Dairy	Employment land	100	250	
11A	Co-op, Brenkley Ave	Retail building	175	430	
12A	The Railwayman	Public house	300	740	

Source: Fordham Research 2009

- 4.39 It was noted earlier that brownfield sites could face 'abnormal costs' if they are to be redeveloped for residential use. Some of those costs, but not necessarily all, might also arise if the site were redeveloped for the alternative use. The alternative use value would need to be reduced to allow for those costs that would still arise in that situation.
- 4.40 The costs arising from development or redevelopment of the 18 sites are considered in the next chapter, along with the other financial and technical assumptions required to prepare financial appraisals for each of the sites.



5. Assumptions for viability analysis

Introduction

5.1 This chapter considers the costs and other assumptions required to produce financial appraisals for the 12 actual + 6 notional sites.

Development costs

(i) Construction costs: baseline costs

- 5.2 Drawing upon our own experience, and taking into account published Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) data, we have developed a set of base £ per sq ft construction costs for different built forms of residential development. The costs are specific to different built forms (flats v houses; number of storeys). On the basis of these cost figures, it is possible to draw up appropriate cost levels for constructing newbuild market housing in North Tyneside MBC at a base date of June/July 2009.
- 5.3 The question arises as to what extent the Code for Sustainable Development should impact on build costs in the study. Whilst from April 2008 the Code's Level 3 has been a requirement for all homes commissioned by RSLs that would not necessarily be the case for affordable homes built by developers for disposal to an RSL, unless grant is made available from the Homes and Communities Agency. However, the Government has indicated that Level 3 will apply to all newbuild housing (i.e. will be incorporated in Building Regulations) from 2010, with higher levels (4 then 6) intended to be triggered from 2013 onwards. Accordingly for the present study we have therefore assumed that Level 3 applies to <u>both</u> market and affordable housing on the sites being appraised.
- 5.4 Guidance on the impact of Level 3 is available from a Report commissioned by the Housing Corporation & English Partnerships (*A Code For Sustainable Development, 2007*) in respect of the impact of Level 3 on construction costs. This guide estimates (Table S2, *A Code For Sustainable Development, 2007*) the increase in costs arising for different house types under various scenarios. On average, current newbuild costs would need to increase by 4.2% to achieve Level 3.
- 5.5 In addition to this national requirement, Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) policy 39 also seeks a proportion of 10% of energy costs of new residential building to be to be from renewable sources. This requirement will add to baseline building costs, although it is possible that there would be some overlap with the Level 3 specification. For the purpose of the study we assumed a 3.5% increase in costs, representing a premium of about £3,100 on the build cost for the average dwelling (£88,500) across the eighteen sites.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

5.6 After allowing for the above 'Level 3' and '10% renewable' premiums, we drew up appropriate cost levels for constructing market housing for the various built forms in the study, taking into account the mix of house types on each. These are set out in the table below. Site 12A involves conversion rather than new build and to take account of this we have reduced the new build price overall by 20%.

Table 5.1 Construction costs: market housing (actual sites only)					
		Build cost £ pe	er sq ft/sq m		
Site	sq ft	(sq m)	Site	sq ft	(sq m)
1A. West Chirton South	87.75	(944)	7A. Emperor Hadrian PH	88.92	(957)
2A. Holyfields	85.88	(924)	8A. Marine House	85.33	(918)
3A. Smith's Dock	103.17	(1,110)	9A. Pioneer Social Club	87.14	(938)
4A. Wideopen UDP	85.49	(920)	10A. The Old Dairy	82.20	(885)
5A. Eastbourne Gardens	103.17	(1,110)	11A. Former CO- OP, Brenkley Ave	92.48	(995)
6A. St. Joseph's Training Centre	82.99	(893)	12A. The Railwayman	80.56	(867)

Source: Fordham Research derived from analysis of BCIS cost data

(ii) Construction costs: site specific adjustments

- 5.7 It is necessary to consider whether any site specific factors would suggest adjustments to these baseline cost figures. Two factors need to be considered in particular; small sites, and high specifications.
- 5.8 Since the mid 1990s, planning guidance on affordable housing has been based on a view that construction costs were appreciably higher for <u>smaller sites</u>, with the consequence that, as site size declined, an unchanging affordable percentage requirement would eventually render the development uneconomic. Hence the need for a 'site size threshold', below which the requirement would not be sought.
- 5.9 It is not clear to us that this view is completely justified. Whilst, other things held equal, build costs would increase for smaller sites, other things are not normally equal, and there are other factors which may offset the increase. The nature of the development will change. The nature of the developer will also change, as small local firms with lower central overheads replace the regional and national house builders. Furthermore, very small sites may be able to secure a 'non estate' price premium, which we have not allowed for.



- 5.10 In the present study, four of the sites are considered to fall into the 'small site' category –those with less than 15 dwellings, i.e. Sites 9A onwards. It is felt necessary to make some allowance for the economics of these sites in preparing financial appraisals. A range of cost premiums has been estimated for each specific site size, ranging from 3% for the 12 dwellings at Pioneer Social Club through to 14% for the smallest site the Railwayman with four dwellings. Any such premium must be based on judgement; as explained above, it is difficult to see how hard data could ever be obtained to show the effect of scale alone.
- 5.11 In addition, we considered that several sites would be built to a higher specification external or internal than the other sites. Allowances of an additional 4% and 6% were assumed for sites 3 & 6, and site 5 respectively, in order to cover this.

(iii) Construction costs: affordable dwellings and final figures

- 5.12 The procurement route for affordable housing is assumed to be through construction by the developer, and disposal to an RSL on completion. In the past, when considering the build cost of affordable housing provided through this route, we took the view that it should be possible to make a small saving on the market housing cost figure, on the basis that one might expect the affordable housing to be built to a slightly different specification than market housing. However, the pressures of increasingly demanding standards for RSL properties have meant that for conventional schemes of houses at least, it is no longer appropriate to assume a reduced build cost.
- 5.13 Taking all the above into account, we arrived at build costs for all (market and affordable) housing which after rounding were as in the Table below.

Table 5.2 Construction costs adjusted and rounded: all housing (actual sites only)						
	Build cost £ per sq ft/sq m					
Site	sq ft	(sq m)	Site	sq ft	(sq m)	
1A. West Chirton South	88	(945)	7A. Emperor Hadrian PH	89	(955)	
2A. Holyfields	86	(925)	8A. Marine House	85.50	(920)	
3A. Smith's Dock	107.50	(1,155)	9A. Pioneer Social Club	90	(965)	
4A. Wideopen UDP	88.50	(920)	10A. The Old Dairy	86.50	(930)	
5A. Eastbourne Gardens	109.50	(1,175)	11A. Former CO-OP, Brenkley Ave	99	(1,065)	
6A. St. Joseph's Training Centre	86.50	(930)	12A. The Railwayman	92	(990)	

Source: Fordham Research derived from analysis of BCIS cost data

(iv) Other normal development costs

- 5.14 In addition to the per sq ft/m build cost figures described above, allowance needs to be made for a range of infrastructure costs roads, drainage and services within the site, parking, footpaths, landscaping and other external costs; off site costs for drainage and other services, and so on. Many of these items will depend on individual site circumstances and can only properly be estimated following a detailed assessment of each site. This is not practical within the present study, and would require at least a design or layout for each site.
- 5.15 Nevertheless, it is possible to generalise. Drawing on experience from examining financial assessments for individual schemes, it is possible to determine a percentage allowance in relation to total build costs. Any such allowance would (other things equal) normally be lower for higher density than for lower density schemes; the former have a smaller area of external works, and also services can be used more efficiently. Large greenfield sites would also be more likely to require substantial expenditure on bringing mains services to the site.
- 5.16 In the light of these considerations we determined a scale of appropriate allowances for each site. The allowances ranged from 14.5% of build costs for the West Chirton site, down to 8% for the highest density schemes at Eastbourne Gardens and Smith's Dock. The Table below sets out the individual site assumptions.

	Table 5.3 Development cost allowances (actu	al sites only)
Ref	Site/location	% of build costs
1A	West Chirton South	14.5%
2A	Holyfields	13.5%
3A	Smith's Dock	8.0%
4A	Wideopen UDP	13.5%
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	8.0%
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	12.5%
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	10.0%
8A	Marine House	11.5%
9A	Pioneer Social Club	10.0%
10A	The Old Dairy	12.0%
11A	Former Coop Brenkley Ave	9.0%
12A	The Railwayman	10.0%

Source: Fordham Research 2009. This table shows an A after each sites since it comes from the database in which these sites are identified as Actual. They are the same sites as listed elsewhere in this chapter and in the report generally.



(v) Abnormal development costs

- 5.17 In some cases where the site involves redevelopment of land which was previously developed, there is the potential for abnormal costs to be incurred. Abnormal development costs might include demolition of substantial existing structures, piling or flood prevention measures at waterside locations, remediation of any land contamination; remodelling of land levels and so on.
- 5.18 The majority of the sites are on previously developed land. On several sites, from the information made available to us and visits to the sites, it appears that exceptional or abnormal development costs would need to be taken into account in preparing appraisals for some of the sites. As pointed out in the previous chapter (4.40) some abnormal costs could also arise in the event of the site's redevelopment with an alternative use.
- 5.19 The schedule below sets out the abnormal costs considered to apply in each case where they arise.

Table 5.4 Abnormal development costs (actual sites only)					
			Resid	dential:	Alt use:
Ref	Site	Item	С	ost	cost
			Total £k	£k per acre	£k per acre
1A	West Chirton South	none	-	-	-
2A	Holyfields	none	-	-	-
3A	Smith's Dock	none	-	-	-
4A	Wideopen UDP	none	-	-	-
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	site clearance	£20k	£31k	-
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	Demolition	£10k	£45k	-
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	Demolition	£15k	£85k	-
8A	Marine House	Demolition/clearance	£75k	£98k	-
9A	Pioneer Social Club	Demolition	£15k	£135k	-
10A	The Old Dairy	site clearance	£15k		
11A	Former Coop Brenkley Ave	none	-	-	-
12A	The Railwayman	none	-	-	-

Source: Fordham Research 2009 This table shows an A after each sites since it comes from the database in which these sites are identified as Actual. They are the same sites as listed elsewhere in this chapter and in the report generally.

5.20 The table also shows that in no case is any adjustment needed to ensure that an alternative land value reflects the costs incurred in developing an alternative use. Therefore the alternative use values set out in Table 4.6 can be used unchanged.

(vi) Fees

5.21 We have assumed professional fees amount to 10% of build costs and 8% of infrastructure costs, in each case.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

(vii) Contingency

5.22 For previously undeveloped and otherwise straightforward sites, we would normally allow a contingency of 2.5%, with a higher figure of 5% on more risky types of development, previously developed land and central locations. The lower figure was used for the fully greenfield site 2A, and an intermediate figure of 3.75% for the mixed greenfield/scrapyard situation at site 4A Wideopen. Otherwise 5% was applied on the other, previously developed sites.

Financial and other appraisal assumptions

(i) VAT

5.23 For simplicity it has been assumed throughout, as with most financial appraisals, that either VAT does not arise, or its effect can be ignored.

(ii) Interest rate

5.24 Our appraisals assume 7.5% pa for both debits and credits. This may seem high given the very low current base rate figure (MLR 0.5% mid July 2009) but has to reflect banks' view of risk for housing developers in the present housing market situation. Credit would in practice only arise for a short period at the end of the scheme

(iii) Developers profit

- 5.25 We normally assume that the developer requires a return of 20% on total costs (or 16.7% of the Net Development Value) to reflect the risk of undertaking the development. That assumes that the costs are estimates of costs, as they are indeed here intended to be, rather than contract prices which would include a profit element.
- 5.26 However, where a guaranteed sale applies, the developer's profit margin ought to be reduced, in order to reflect the reduction in risk. The affordable units will be sold at an agreed price and programme. With a range of affordable provision being tested, it was felt appropriate to reflect the resulting variations in risk with variations in the developer's profit. Consequently a sliding scale of profit margins was used, as shown below. It should be noted that residential developers commonly use a more conservative profit margin of 15% on income, which equates to about 17.5% on costs. Bearing in mind the current financial climate, we see no justification for reducing the profit margins from the levels suggested.



Table 5.5 Profit margins			
% affordable	Profit % on costs		
0%	20%		
20%	19%		
30%	18.5%		
40%	18%		
50%	17.5		

Source: Fordham Research 2009

(iv) Void

- 5.27 On a scheme comprising mainly individual houses, one would normally assume only a nominal void period, as the housing would not be progressed if there was no demand. In the case of apartments in blocks, this flexibility is reduced. Whilst these may provide scope for early marketing, the ability to tailor construction pace to market demand is more limited.
- 5.28 For the purpose of the present study a three month void period is assumed for all sites.

(v) Phasing & timetable

- 5.29 The appraisals are assumed to have been prepared using prices and costs at a base date of June 2009, with an immediate start on site.
- 5.30 A pre-construction period of six months is assumed for all of the sites. Each dwelling is assumed to be built over a nine month period.
- 5.31 The phasing programme for an individual site will reflect market take-up, and would in practice be carefully estimated taking into account the site characteristics and, in particular, size and the expected level of market demand. We have developed a suite of modelled assumptions to reflect site size and development type, as set out in Table 5.6 below.

Site acquisition and disposal costs

(i) Site holding costs and receipts

5.32 Each site is assumed to proceed immediately and so, other than interest on the site cost during construction, there is no allowance for holding costs, or indeed income, arising from ownership of the site.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

Table 5.6 Market takeup assumptions				
	Site	No of dwgs	Ceiling level of completions per qtr	
1Aa	West Chirton South	188	16	
2A	Holyfields	150	14	
3A	Smith's Dock	120	14	
4A	Wideopen UDP	110	12	
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	85	9	
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	38	4	
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	38	5	
8A	Marine House	41	5	
9A	Pioneer Social Club	12	3	
10A	The Old Dairy	10	3	
11A	Former Coop Brenkley Ave	8	3	
12A	The Railwayman	4	2	

Source: Fordham Research 2009

(ii) Acquisition costs

5.33 Acquisition costs include stamp duty at 4% on site values of £0.5 million and above (reduced below this level), together with an allowance of 1.5% for acquisition agents' and legal fees.

(iii) Disposal costs

5.34 For the market housing, sales and promotion and legal fees are assumed to amount to some 3.5% of receipts. For disposals of affordable housing these figures can be reduced significantly depending on the category, we have assumed total allowances of 0.5% for social rented housing and 1.5% for shared ownership.



6. Results of viability analysis

Introduction

6.1 This chapter considers the results of financial appraisals carried out for the identified sites.

Financial appraisal approach and assumptions

- 6.2 On the basis of the assumptions set out in Chapter 5, we prepared financial appraisals for each of the identified sites, using a bespoke spreadsheet-based financial analysis package.
- 6.3 The appraisals use the residual valuation approach that is, they are designed to assess the value of the site after taking into account the costs of development, the likely income from sales and/or rents and an appropriate amount of developer's profit. The resulting valuation is commonly expressed in £s per acre (or hectare). In order for the proposed development to be described as viable, it is necessary for this value to exceed the value from a valid alternative use. We have already seen that, for a greenfield site, where the only alternative use is likely to be agricultural, this figure may be very modest. However, most of the sites have been previously developed, and therefore may have a more substantial existing or competing alternative use value.
- 6.4 As outlined in Chapter 3, our appraisals considered three options for the amount and type of affordable housing provision, plus a zero affordable option.

Appraisal results

- 6.5 We produced financial appraisals based on the stated build, abnormal, and infrastructure costs, and financial assumptions for a range of affordable options, plus all-market.
- 6.6 Detailed appraisal printouts for all the sites are provided at Appendix 6 to this report. To keep to a manageable sized document, only one option, that of 20%, has been provided.
- 6.7 The resulting residual land values for the four options are set out in Table 6.1.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

	Table 6.1 Appraisal results for five affordable options							
		Zero gran	t:					
No	Site	Residual value £k per acre for affordable option:						
	Sile	No aff	10%	20%	30%			
1A	West Chirton South	-22	-92	-161	-233			
1B	Palmersville	68	-8	-87	-167			
1C	Whitley Bay S	287	192	96	0			
2A	Holyfields	323	234	143	54			
2B	Dudley	120	50	-25	-99			
2C	Longbenton	143	67	-11	-92			
3A	Smith's Dock	-86	-411	-934	-1,362			
4A	Wideopen UDP	194	113	33	-51			
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	1,690	1,110	524	-71			
6A	St. Joseph's Training Centre	366	279	192	106			
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	22	-81	-184	-288			
7B	North Shields	582	431	282	129			
7C	Wallsend Town Centre	36	-68	-173	-278			
8A	Marine House	132	56	-23	-103			
9A	Pioneer Social Club	-51	-170	-288	-413			
10A	The Old Dairy	107	39	-31	-101			
11A	Former Co-op, Brenkley Ave	-764	-912	-1,060	-1,212			
12A	The Railwayman	-493	-591	-691	-791			

Source: Fordham Research. As in Chapter 5 the A after site names means its 'Actual'; the B and C suffixes refer to notional

sites derived from them

- 6.8 Table 6.1 shows that with no requirement for affordable housing, thirteen of the 18 sites deliver a positive land value. Those values vary widely, ranging from around £40k per acre (£100k per ha) to almost £1,700k per acre (£3.46m per ha). Most of them however are between about £150k-£350k per acre (£370k-£865k per ha).
- 6.9 Allowing for additional development costs and our planning gain assumptions, values on the remaining sites are broadly in line with but mostly below what the first half 2008 VOA figures indicate for 'oven ready' land in North Tyneside MBC, or what was suggested by small sites actually on the market. This confirms that our appraisal assumptions are, taken as a whole, unlikely to be unduly optimistic.
- 6.10 Table 6.1 confirms that, as increasing amounts of affordable housing are introduced, the land value reduces. In each case the impact is progressive, but at a broadly linear rate. At the maximum affordable contribution shown, 30%, only three schemes still deliver a positive land value.

- 6.11 However, it is clear that land value falls away <u>more quickly</u> for some schemes, than for others. It is the highest priced and most densely developed sites Smith's Dock and Eastbourne Gardens where affordable housing has the greatest negative impact upon land value.
- 6.12 The reason for this is difficult to explain concisely. With the high density schemes, land value is a much lower proportion of the total value of the development, and will not subsidise the same proportion of units as on a lower density scheme.
- 6.13 In order to draw out the implications of these results for the Council's proposed affordable housing policy, as has already been suggested, it will be necessary to consider values from alternative uses for each. This step follows below.

Alternative use benchmarks

- 6.14 The results from Table 6.1 would need to be compared with the alternative use values set out in Table 4.6 in order to form a view about the likely viability of the affordable options for each site. However it does not automatically follow that if the residual value produces a surplus over the alternative use value benchmark, the site is viable. The surplus needs to be sufficiently large to provide an incentive to the landowner to release the site, and cover any other appropriate cost required to bring the site forward for development. We therefore have to consider how large this 'margin' or 'cushion' should be for our sites.
- 6.15 In practice the size of the margin will vary from case to case, depending on how many landowners are involved, each landowner's attitude and his degree of involvement in the current property market, the location of the site and so on. A margin/cushion equivalent to £25k per acre might be sufficient in some cases, whilst in particular cases it could be below or above that figure.
- 6.16 We formed the view that an average figure of £40k per acre (£100k per ha) would serve as a broad indicator of the amount needed to provide an incentive to the landowner for all of the sites in the study. There is no one 'right' figure. However the £40k figure would represent a mark-up of some 25% or so of the highest industrial benchmark land value of £150k per acre, and is therefore felt to constitute a significant incentive on a typical brownfield site.

- 6.17 However after reflection it was decided to adjust this broad figure, in two respects. For greenfield sites in agricultural use the margin was doubled. This was done to allow an added incentive to the landowner - whose awareness and involvement in the property market may be much less than for a typical brownfield site owner – but also to make some allowance for site promotion costs. Secondly for very small sites the per acre/ha figure might not amount to a particularly large sum in absolute terms, by way of providing for the trouble and inconvenience of negotiating and agreeing a sale. Again there is no scientific basis for arriving at the 'right' figure, but something of the order of £10-15k was felt to represent a necessary minimum. Accordingly the basic £40k per acre formula was modified to give a fixed sum of £12,500, plus a £37,500 per acre allowance. On a site of 5 acres/2 ha the two formulae would each give £40k per acre. On larger sites the figure would come down very marginally, and on smaller sites the figure would rise steadily; by 0.2 acres/0.08 ha the allowance would equate to £100k per acre/£250k per ha.
- 6.18 Whether or not this is the right formula, the need for some such allowance seems incontestable. It would not be reasonable to assert that if residential development delivered, in absolute terms, just £1 more than the alternative use value, the scheme was sufficiently viable for the due target to be supported.
- 6.19 The figures resulting from these two changes to the £40k 'base' are set out below and combined with the alternative use values from Table 4.6 to show the resulting benchmark thresholds for viability.



	Table 6.2 Vi	ability margin & thresl	hold values	
Ref	Site	GROSS alt use value	Margin	Viability threshold value
1A	West Chirton South	£125k	£39k	£164k
1B	Palmersville	£130k	£39k	£169k
1C	Whitley Bay S	£140k	£39k	£179k
2A	Holyfields	£10k	£79k	£89k
2B	Dudley	£10k	£79k	£89k
2C	Longbenton	£10k	£79k	£89k
3A	Smith's Dock	£150k	£44k	£194k
4A	Wideopen UDP	£35k	£69k	£104k
5A	Eastbourne Gardens	£105k	£47k	£152k
6A	St. Joseph's	£150k	£41k	£191k
7A	Emperor Hadrian PH	£140k	£47k	£187k
7B	North Shields	£175k	£47k	£222k
7C	Wallsend Town Centre	£150k	£47k	£197k
8A	Marine House	£125k	£43k	£168k
9A	Pioneer Social Club	£125k	£72k	£197k
10A	The Old Dairy	£100k	£57k	£157k
11A	Co-op Brenkley Ave	£175k	£110k	£285k
12A	The Railwayman	£300k	£139k	£439k

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study As in Chapter 5 the A after site names means its 'Actual'; the B and C suffixes refer to notional sites derived from them

6.20 It must be emphasised that these figures are simply a view of what it is reasonable to assume as a minimum residual value for the purposes of assessing viability. The figures do not represent what a landowner or promoter might actually receive. This will quite often be rather more.

Ta	ble 6.3 Capacity	of sampl	e sites to ca	rry affordab	le housing t	argets (zero
				Value £	Ck per acre	
No	Site	Alt use value	No affordable	10%	20%	30%
1 A	West Chirton S	125	-22	-92	-161	-233
		164	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1B	Palmersville	130	68	-8	-87	-167
		169	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1C	Whitley Bay S	140	287	192	96	0
		179	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2A	Holyfields	10	323	234	143	54
		89	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	MARGINAL
2B	Dudley	10	120	50	-25	-99
		89	VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2C	Longbenton	10	143	67	-11	-92
		89	VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-86	-411	-934	-1,362
		194	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	194	113	33	-51
		104	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	1,690	1,110	524	-71
		152	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
6A	St. Joseph's	150	366	279	192	106
		191	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
7A	Emperor Hadrian	140	22	-81	-184	-288
		187	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
7B	North Shields	175	582	431	282	129
		222	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
7C	Wallsend	150	36	-68	-173	-278
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
8A	Marine House	125	132	56	-23	-103
		168	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
9A	Pioneer	125	-51	-170	-288	-413
		197		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
10A	The Old Dairy	100	107	39	-31	-101
	2	157	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
11A	Co-op, Br'y Ave	175	-764	-912	-1,060	-1,212
		285	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
12A	The Railwayman	304	-493	-591	-691	-791
	-	442	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study



Comments on the results

- 6.21 These figures should be seen as minima, which is sensible in terms of the purpose of this study. The actual outturn values are likely to be higher, but unpredictably so because for some sites there will be more bidders, and prices may go above the expected level, and again on a site specific basis, a given bidder may offer more due to landownership where the site in question will add a considerable 'marriage' value to sites he already owns. Thus the values should be conservative, and it would not be wise to add any blanket uplift to them. As and when sold for development site specific factors will come into play.
- 6.22 Residential development as 100% market housing is of course a relatively profitable development option, and in stable market conditions the sites would not be proposed for development otherwise. However market conditions are not stable; house prices have fallen considerably since the autumn of 2007, and so there were a number of sites which could not proceed at April 2009 price levels, even as 100% market housing.
- 6.23 In terms of site performance of the 18 actual and notional sites only eight sites are viable (and two are marginal) with no affordable housing at all. Eight sites are not viable even with no affordable housing. At 10% of affordable housing six sites are viable and two marginal. At 20% these two marginal sites become unviable, and a further two become unviable. By 30%, only one site is left, and even then is marginal. Beyond 30% all the sites are unviable.
- 6.24 These results are summarised in tabular form, and broken down for the four administrative sub-areas, below.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

Tab	le 6.4 Base ap	opraisals: re	esults by area	a	
		No of sites in	category with	affordable at:	
	No aff	10%	20%	30%	40%
Viable	4	2	1	0	0
Marginal	0	2	0	0	0
Not viable	2	2	5	6	6
Total North West	6	6	6	6	6
Viable	3	3	2	0	0
Marginal	0	0	0	1	0
Not viable	1	1	2	3	4
Total Whitley Bay	4	4	4	4	4
Viable	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal	2	0	0	0	0
Not viable	2	4	4	4	4
Total Wallsend	4	4	4	4	4
Viable	1	1	1	0	0
Marginal	0	0	0	0	0
Not viable	3	3	3	4	4
Total North Shields	4	4	4	4	4
Viable	8	6	4	0	0
Marginal	2	2	0	1	0
Not viable	8	10	14	17	18
Total	18	18	18	18	18

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study

- 6.25 The results do suggest that on the basis of current market conditions it does appear that viability would permit a higher target, 20%, in the Whitley Bay sub area.
- 6.26 We will consider the implications of these results for future policy in the next chapter of this document. However before we can do this we should consider how likely changes in our appraisal assumptions might impact upon them.
- 6.27 A key factor to look at will be future movements in prices. The results represent a 'snapshot' of viability as at April 2009. The housing market began to decline very significantly from the beginning of 2008, and whilst it is clear that for the time being that decline has halted; there remains a possibility that viability will continue to deteriorate in the coming months. On the other hand, there is a reasonable expectation that at some point within the Plan period to 2026, viability will recover to something like the levels of October/November 2007.

6.28 In addition we will look at the impact of a revised tenure split, access to grant, and the built form assumption..

Sensitivity: price and cost levels

- 6.29 From about the time of our market survey in April/May 2009 prices appear to have stabilised, and indeed to have risen to some extent. However there is not a consensus amongst the property industry that the decline in prices is over. The view is that a limited supply of properties onto the market, rather than an increase in demand, has been responsible for the modest upturn, and a number of commentators still expect a further period of price decline in 2010.
- 6.30 Given the continuing uncertainty we considered two scenarios in order to illustrate the impact of future price and cost changes. The first took a relatively gloomy view, assuming that prices would fall another 10% from the April 2009 level and costs rise 5%, before a clear recovery gets under way. This combination therefore remains a possible, perhaps 'worst case', scenario for the situation in say late 2010/early 2011.
- 6.31 As an alternative to this we assessed how viability might have looked around the market peak in autumn 2007, essentially reflecting newbuild market prices 15% higher than at April 2009 a conservative view and costs 5% lower. The results from this 'market peak' scenario are considered in the next section. The 'short term fall' scenario results for the 10% and 20% affordable options are compared to the base appraisal results in Table 6.5 below:

	Table 6.5 Sensitivity tests for short term price fall						
				V	alue £k per acr	e	
No	Site	Alt use value	Base ap	praisal		Short ter	m prices
		Value	10%	20%		10%	20%
1A	West Chirton S	125	-92	-161		-290	-346
		164	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1B	Palmersville	130	-8	-87		-216	-279
		169	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
1C	Whitley Bay S	140	192	96		-34	-115
		179	VIABLE	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2A	Holyfields	10	234	143		24	-54
		89	VIABLE	VIABLE		MARGINAL	NOT VIAB
2B	Dudley	10	50	-25		-150	-210
		89	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
2C	Longbenton	10	67	-11		-143	-207
		89	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-411	-934		-1,437	-1,895
		194	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	113	33		-104	-173
		104	VIABLE	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	1,110	524		-66	-583
		152	VIABLE	VIABLE		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
6A	St. Joseph's	150	279	192		84	11
		191	VIABLE	VIABLE		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
7A	Emperor Hadrian	140	-81	-184		-431	-514
		187	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
7B	North Shields	175	431	282		46	-87
		222	VIABLE	VIABLE		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
7C	Wallsend	150	-68	-173		-289	-387
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
8A	Marine House	125	56	-23		-153	-217
		168	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
9A	Pioneer	125	-170	-288		-519	-615
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
10A	The Old Dairy	100	39	-31		-116	-176
	,	157	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
11A	Co-op, Br'y Ave	175	-912	-1,060		-1,419	-1,537
		285	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
12A	The Railwayman	304	-591	-691		-922	-999
		442	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study



6.32 It can be seen that with a further price fall and cost increase, none of the sites is viable, at either 20% or 10%. At 10% one site is marginal.

Sensitivity: the market peak

6.33 The above approach, varying the price level, could also be applied retrospectively to assess viability at the peak viability level of November 2007. At this time prices are believed to have been perhaps 25% higher than those assumed in our study. Costs would have been appreciably lower then, and furthermore Level 3 might not have been assumed to apply throughout. To take account of the lower cost level we reduced costs by 10% (which would take into account a partial relaxation of Level 3). The results are set out below.

	Table 6.6 Sensitivity tests for market peak						
				Va	alue £k per acr	e	
No	Site	Alt use	Base appraisal			Market peak	
		value	20%		20%	30%	40%
1A	West Chirton S	125	-161		259	154	49
		164	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB
1B	Palmersville	130	-87		338	224	110
		169	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
1C	Whitley Bay S	140	96		566	424	284
		179	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
2A	Holyfields	10	143		577	445	313
		89	VIABLE		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
2B	Dudley	10	-25		365	257	148
		89	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
2C	Longbenton	10	-11		387	272	157
		89	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-934		1,963	515	-801
		194	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	33		457	336	214
		104	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	524		2,903	2,091	1,278
		152	VIABLE		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
6A	St. Joseph's	150	192		582	459	333
		191	VIABLE		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
7A	Emperor Hadrian	140	-184		361	207	70
		187	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
7B	North Shields	175	282		925	704	508
		222	VIABLE		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
7C	Wallsend	150	-173		288	146	12
		197	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
8A	Marine House	125	-23		381	267	166
		168	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	MARGINAL
9A	Pioneer	125	-288		388	207	48
		197	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	NOT VIAB
10A	The Old Dairy	100	-31		383	274	176
		157	NOT VIAB		VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE
11A	Co-op, Br'y Ave	175	-1,060		-92	-325	-466
		285	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB
12A	The Railwayman	304	-691		-62	-215	-370
		442	NOT VIAB		NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study



6.34 The results show that at prices and costs equivalent to the late 2007 market peak, viability is greatly improved. A 20% affordable requirement would be viable on all but two sites. At 30% fourteen sites are viable, and one marginal. At 40% nine sites are still viable, and one marginal.

Sensitivity: tenure split

6.35 Sensitivity testing was also undertaken to assess the impact of varying the tenure split from the assumed 80/20 to 40/60. Figures for the 20% target proportion are set out in Table 6.7.

Table 6.7 Sensitivity tests for 40/60 social rent: intermediate						
				Value £k per acre		
No	Site	Alt use	Base = 80/20	Tenure split 40/60		
		value	20%	20%		
1A	West Chirton S	125	-161	-144		
		164	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
1B	Palmersville	130	-87	-69		
		169	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
1C	Whitely Bay S	140	96	122		
		179	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
2A	Holyfields	10	143	170		
		89	VIABLE	VIABLE		
2B	Dudley	10				
		89	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
2C	Longbenton	10	-11	8		
		89	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-934	-864		
		194	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	_ 33 _	50		
	F (1) O (1)	104	NOT VIAB	MARGINAL		
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	524	623		
		152	VIABLE			
6A	St. Joseph's	150	192	207		
	F arman and the define	191	VIABLE			
/A	Emperor Hadrian	140	-184	-165		
78	North Shields	187	NOT VIAB	NOTVIAB		
	North Shields	222				
7C	Wallsend	150				
	Walloona	197				
8A	Marine House	125	-23			
		168	NOT VIAB			
9A	Pioneer	125	-288	-261		
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
10A	The Old Dairy	100	-31	-19		
	-	157	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
11A	Co-op, Br'y Ave	175	-1,060	-1,002		
		285	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
12A	The	304	-691	-751		
		442	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study



6.36 In fact the change has only a modest impact on residual land values, improving them typically by £20-30k per acre (£50-75k per ha) and markedly more for sites with high density schemes. In this particular case the impact is very slight. Only one site changes its viability status – 4A moves up to marginal.

Sensitivity: availability of grant

- 6.37 In addition to future movements in prices and costs it is worth considering the impact of access to grant in the form of Social Housing Grant (SHG) through the HCA's National Affordable Housing Programme. Sensitivity testing was undertaken allowing for grant to be available at £40k per dwelling for social rented homes, and £15k per dwelling for intermediate housing (intermediate rent and shared ownership).
- 6.38 A simple calculation was made to adjust the zero grant appraisal outcomes assuming the whole of the grant sum impacted directly on the upfront residual land value. Whilst crude this is felt to give a reasonable idea of the scale of the impact on viability of grant support at this broad level.
- 6.39 The resulting figures for the 20% target level are compared with the base 20% appraisal results in the Table below.

Table 6.8 Sensitivity test for grant (SHG) availability						
				Value £k per acre		
No	Site	Alt use value	Base appraisal	SHG available		
		Value	20%	20%		
1A	West Chirton S	125	-161	-55		
		164	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
1B	Palmersville	130	-87	20		
		169	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
1C	Whitley Bay S	140	96	202		
		179	NOT VIAB	VIABLE		
2A	Holyfields	10	143	250		
		89	VIABLE	VIABLE		
2B	Dudley	10	-25	81		
		89	NOT VIAB	MARGINAL		
2C	Longbenton	10	-11	95		
		89	NOT VIAB	VIABLE		
3A	Smith's Dock	150	-934	-460		
		194	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
4A	Wideopen UDP	35	33	146		
		104	NOT VIAB	VIABLE		
5A	Eastbourne Gds	105	524	994		
		152	VIABLE	VIABLE		
6A	St. Joseph's	150	192	255		
		191	VIABLE	VIABLE		
7 A	Emperor Hadrian	140	-184	7		
		187	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
7B	North Shields	175	282	474		
		222	VIABLE	VIABLE		
7C	Wallsend	150	-173			
		197	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
8A	Marine House	125	-23	108		
		168	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		
9A	Pioneer	125	-288	-55		
		197	NOT VIAB	NOTVIAB		
10A	The Old Dairy	100	-31			
		15/				
11A	Co-op, Bry Ave	1/5				
		202				
12A	The Railwayman	304				
		442	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB		

Source: Strategic Housing Viability Study



6.40 In fact the change does have an appreciable impact on residual land values, improving them typically by around £125k per acre (£310k per ha) for the less dense sites, and by upwards of £200k plus per acre (£500k per ha) on the higher density sites. At 20% with grant seven sites are viable, and one marginal. That makes 20% more tenable than it would be with zero grant.

Sensitivity: built form

- 6.41 Subsequent to our work on producing the draft version of this report, North Tyneside marketed a number of Council owned housing sites. The results, whilst varied, suggested that on some of the better sites at least, developers were taking an appreciably more optimistic forward view than that in our own study. Alongside this it appeared that applications for some other sites were being progressed, despite our limited assessment of their prospects. The Council asked us to consider these points.
- 6.42 It is the case that landowners may sometimes progress planning applications for other reasons than to enable a workable scheme to move ahead e.g. land and asset management. However clearly there is a need to focus on whether landowners or developers might arrive at a different assessment on a scheme and its prospects, than our own assessments.
- 6.43 In the period from our assessment of market prices, there had been a period of several months where prices and market expectations had staged some degree of recovery. It would not be unreasonable to assume that this, and more particularly a view of <u>future</u> price improvement, explained the more bullish prices offered. However we undertook further analysis to try to account for the differences.
- 6.44 Examination of several of the sites involved led to a tentative hypothesis that in the better areas a slightly more suburban built form, with greater emphasis on two storey houses and a corresponding switch away from flats and three storey town house types, was a contributory factor in generating a more favourable financial outcome.
- 6.45 Consequently we decided to test the impact of an alternative built form on our appraisal outcomes by applying it to site 2C, Longbenton. The effect of the change to built form was to reduce development density from 14,750 to 14,500 sq ft per acre.
- 6.46 The resulting figures for the full range of affordable options are compared with the base appraisal results in the Table below.

Table 6.9 Sensitivity: alternate built form							
		Value £k per acre					
No	Site	Alt use value	No affordable	10%	20%	30%	
2C	Longbenton	10	143	67	-11	-92	
(Bas	se built form)	89	VIABLE	MARGINAL	NOT VIAB	NOT VIAB	
2C	Longbenton	10	434	339	243	146	
(Altern	ative built form)	89	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	VIABLE	



- 6.47 The amended built form has a significant impact as the site, previously marginal at 10% affordable, can now carry a 30% affordable requirement.
- 6.48 This result probably overstates the position somewhat. It results from the 'snapshot' situation at April 2009, when sales values for flats and three storey homes would have been depressed relative to those for two storey houses a situation that would resolve itself over a period of time as a more normal market returned.
- 6.49 The figures do however add confirmation that the eventual permanent upturn will improve viability significantly, and suggest that a small degree of bullishness in deriving a target from the current price level appraisals would not be unreasonable.

Sensitivity: margin

- 6.50 The Council has also asked about the impact of the margin ('cushion') on viability outcomes. It is not necessary to carry out separate sensitivity tests to demonstrate this, however. Removing the margin (replacing it with a nominal £1 surplus) would mean simply that all sites shown in our base appraisals as Marginal, would become Viable. Those that were Not Viable would remain so.
- 6.51 The practical effect of the change would therefore be quite slight. At 10% affordable, eight of the 18 sites would now be viable, rather than six plus two marginals. At 20% affordable there would be no change. At 30% the one marginal site would now become Viable.
- 6.52 The final chapter spells out the implications of the results from the base appraisals and the sensitivity tests above.



7. Stage 1 Conclusions: Implications of the appraisal results

Our approach

- 7.1 The purpose of the Viability Study is to assess the impact of alternative affordable housing requirements upon development viability. In order to provide appropriate guidance, we have produced financial appraisals in respect of residential developments on a range of sites, selected following discussion. Our approach has involved the use of the actual development proposals for the sites with recent planning permissions, and 'model' developments for two sites for which applications have yet to be submitted. In addition to the dozen actual sites we added 8 notional sites, where actual data was adapted to provide indications of developments in parts of the housing market not represented by the dozen actual sites.
- 7.2 Fordham Research's bespoke financial appraisal package has been used to produce residual valuations for each site under a series of affordable housing options and with various other factors used for sensitivity testing.
- 7.3 In order to prepare financial appraisals, whether for a general study like this, or on behalf of a landowner or developer proposing a specific development, it is necessary to make a considerable number of assumptions. We believe that in general the assumptions we have made are fair and reasonable. They reflect considerable experience drawn from a variety of development situations, and are designed to reflect the circumstances of each site which, even in a relatively compact area like North Tyneside, in practice display a considerable degree of diversity. The appraisal results would produce open market land values which, compared to the limited information we have about recent values and prices currently sought for small sites in the area, are consistent and if anything somewhat lower. This suggests that the package of development assumptions is not unduly optimistic.
- 7.4 The relatively low land values emerging also reflect two other factors which we will need to take into account when reflecting on the appraisal results:
 - the combined effect of a serious restriction on credit availability since the early autumn of 2007 and the consequential, more general, business downturn which became increasingly established from the last quarter of 2008.
 - ii) the impact of relatively challenging requirements in respect of sustainability:
 - Level 3 of the Sustainability Code for both market and affordable homes, without any offsetting uplift in values

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD
- a 'Merton rule' requirement as proposed in Regional Spatial Strategy
- 7.5 The financial appraisals produce a series of residual values, showing the value generated for each site for all market housing, and further tested under a range of affordable housing scenarios. In an exercise of this nature, the figures have to be interpreted in order to draw conclusions for LDF policies. We have suggested a basis for interpretation which draws on indicative alternative use values, and sets a standard 'margin' over alternative use value to provide a meaningful incentive for the landowner to bring the site forward. Again, as a strategic approach, we believe this to be reasonable. Producing detailed assessments and valuations for each site would involve resources well beyond the scope of the current exercise, and we suspect would probably still leave room for disputation.
- 7.6 There are substantial variations in house prices between different parts of the study area. Most of the chosen sites are in the main settlements and we feel those areas where prices are likely to be lowest are reasonably well represented. The sites covered the 'worst case', by fully including locations in which viability is (other things equal) likely to be worst. The range of sites includes both smaller and larger sites, straightforward and complex development situations, previously developed land and sites not previously developed.
- 7.7 The appraisals tested various proportions of affordable housing, combined with a proposed tenure split of 80:20 social rented:intermediate housing, with intermediate housing represented by both intermediate rent and shared ownership at 25% share. We assumed that grant would not regularly be available and therefore tested a situation in which zero grant support was provided. In estimating the values which under those terms developers would be likely to achieve from affordable housing of the above types, we have used some information provided by locally active RSLs combined with estimated purchase prices drawn from our experience elsewhere.
- 7.8 We have taken a necessarily strategic approach. This is because the analysis is designed to test and demonstrate Borough-wide deliverability, in line with the requirements in para 29 of PPS3. Thus we used assumptions for developer contributions which we believe reflect the Council's published requirements and broad needs.
- 7.9 We would emphasise that this work has to be seen as a strategic study, designed to inform the development of Plan policy, rather than per se, as an exercise to predict as accurately as possible the actual financial outcomes of development on specific sites. The actual sites used in the study should be regarded as indicating more general patterns of development across the study area.

Basis for the affordable housing target

7.10 The results from the appraisals indicate that at the base date market values and costs, it would be difficult to sustain a target significantly greater than 15% affordable housing, without grant, across the study area as a whole.



- 7.11 In present market conditions only around half of the sites could produce 100% market housing, and remain demonstrably viable.
- 7.12 Two of the sites which are fully viable at zero become marginal at 10% whilst the others remain viable. At 20% the two marginal sites, and two other viable sites, become unviable, leaving only four sites viable.
- 7.13 This suggests that based on April 2009 prices, a target of the order of 15% or so, would be appropriate. As we have seen, subsequent information indicates that the appraisal results may paint a slightly gloomy picture. Prices appear to have risen a little in the ensuing months, and, for the time being at least, a different built form would, in some areas at any rate, improve the outcome.
- 7.14 In setting a target the latter factor suggests that the viability results should be regarded as slightly conservative. However if the target is to be based on an April 2009 base date, as the discussion on the next Chapter goes on to argue, then we cannot really take much account of the price improvements that took place in the period of six months or so from that base date.

Affordable target suggestion

- 7.15 In the past North Tyneside MBC has negotiated significantly more than 15% affordable housing, without grant, on privately developed sites. Table 6.6 shows, using the same valuations but at 2007 market peak prices, targets of 40% would have been viable on half of the sample sites used. The fall in house prices, combined with the additional cost of sustainable development (Level 3 plus 10% renewable), has made things much less favourable nationally as well as locally.
- 7.16 In the present market circumstances, with the 20% target, relaxing the tenure split to 40% social rented: 60% intermediate improves the residual values, though only slightly. Allowing for grant with the 20% target makes a more material improvement in the viability situation; seven sites are viable and one marginal. If that level of grant availability could be supported then it might be possible to consider setting a Borough wide requirement of 20%.
- 7.17 Sensitivity tests show just how responsive viability is to changes in present market conditions, i.e. price and cost levels. Were we facing price and cost levels at the peak, September 2007, a target of 40% would probably have been deliverable.
- 7.18 Taking all the evidence into account we would suggest that 15% would be the highest plan wide target that would be reasonable in present circumstances. This ignores public subsidy, since this is the sensible starting point. Where grant is likely to be available, it clearly adds to the amount of affordable housing that can be produced, and may help to unlock or kick start developments which the market alone could not mobilise. Where grant is expected, it is reasonable to set a higher target. There are two dimensions involved:

- (i) The zero grant level target is useful for negotiations with the private sector over affordable housing subsidised by the land value
- In LDF and Housing Strategy documents a view may be taken as to the provision of grant, which may mean that an outcome target of 20% or more can be envisaged for the plan period. The SHMA suggests a needs-based target of 25%. This would imply a high level of grant unless the housing market improves. In relation to the latter, please see the next chapter, which allows for targets to move with the future market.
- 7.19 It may be decided to set a higher target in parts of North Tyneside with more prosperous housing markets. A figure of 20% appears to be tenable for Whitley Bay.

The threshold for affordable housing

- 7.20 The four smallest sites in the study (sizes 4-12 dwellings) were included to provide guidance on the scope for reducing the size threshold below the default position set out in national guidance. The four sites do relatively badly overall in viability terms; three are unviable at no affordable and the fourth is marginal.
- 7.21 Under more favourable terms the two larger sites do better. At the market peak both are viable at 30% and one viable at 40%. Neither of the two smaller sites can manage 20% at the peak, although then both are probably barely viable with no affordable. The reality is that neither of these sites appears to be a particularly profitable development, and both have comparatively high alternative use values.
- 7.22 Our view is that the appraisal results provide quite limited evidence for lowering the threshold, and accordingly we suggest that the present (national) threshold of 15 dwellings is left unchanged



8. Stage 2: Dynamic Viability

8.1 This chapter takes the results of the viability analysis, the first stage, and provides a basis for policy by providing deliverable affordable housing targets through the plan period.

What Dynamic Viability does

- 8.2 The Dynamic Viability model is designed to provide robust targets at all phases of the housing market during the plan period. This is taken to mean that the full range of possibilities must be set out to the Core Strategy Examination, so that its Inspector can consider and decide on the level of target setting for the whole plan period. The target cannot be left to supplementary guidance, and the alternative would be a costly re-opening of the Core Strategy Examination at each change in the housing market.
- 8.3 The model begins with the viability assessment, based on the residual valuations carried out as part of the main Viability Study (covering a dozen or so sites characteristic of the area). In some cases the data may refer to notional sites, agreed to represent the viability situation of the local authority area.
- 8.4 The Dynamic Viability approach requires that a single benchmark site, or synthetic site, is identified that currently reflects the affordable target level that is deliverable in that area. This site should be consulted with stakeholders to ensure that so far as possible there is agreement that it is representative.
- 8.5 The approach then takes the key factors affecting future viability, and builds their future change into the model. Future change in target levels is purely dependent on published indexes. This means that the process of target setting through the plan period is entirely transparent. The model is set up prior to the Core Strategy Examination, is assessed and approved in whatever form during that Examination, and afterwards is entirely dependent on three published indexes:
 - Price change: We use the Halifax Price Index (HPI) but others are available
 - **Building costs change**: The RICS building cost index based on tenders (BCIS) provides a general index of building costs
 - Alternative use value: The appropriate measure would depend on the specific alternative use applying to the benchmark site but most commonly it is the Valuation Office Agency's Industrial Land index



8.6 Each of the indexes is taken as a range, to produce a reasonably limited number of tabulations. The set of indices is based on the assumption that price and cost are the key changes that affect the viability of a benchmark site, and that alternative use value must be checked in case it has risen above newbuild housing value and thus limits the target in itself. The indexes used for updating are listed in Table 8.1 below:

Table 8.	1 Indices for automatic updating of Dyna	mic Viability
Variable	Proposed index	Starting Value
House Price	Halifax House Price Index	April 2009 = 500.0
	Halifax House Price Index (free, monthly)	
	http://www.lloydsbankinggroup.com/media1/u	research/halifax_api.asp
Build cost	BCIS General Building Cost Index	July 2009 = 284.3 (as at early July 2009)
	BCIS Review Online (subscription only, monthly Institute of Chartered Surveyors	y) Produced by the Royal
	http://www.bcis.co.uk/online	
Alternative use value	Property Market Report (VOA) Average Value of Mixed Agricultural Land (Equipped, with Vacant Possession) for North East Region	July 2009 = figure is £11,115 per ha
	Valuation Office Agency: Property Market Repo	orts (free, six monthly)
	http://www.voa.gov.uk/publications/index.htm	

Sources: As shown in the boxes of the table

8.7 There might be some argument for using regional versions of the Halifax price index, but in practice all regional index numbers have moved in a similar pattern in the period since the market peak, and so it is better to use the national version, which appears monthly rather than quarterly as the regional indices do.

Details of the outputs

- 8.8 The model generates the full plausible range of target variations based on the above three indexes. The following illustration is one of a set of eight (one for each of the values for the Alternative Use values). In the example below it is the 'base' alternative use value. The full set of Dynamic Viability tables is presented in Appendix 5.
- 8.9 As will be noticed, the table below focussed upon the 15% target discussed as being deliverable in the previous chapter: the zero/zero point when looking at the percentage version of the indexes.



	Tab	ole 8.2 M	North T	yneside	Coarse	e Matri>	c with b	ase Alte	ernative	e Use Va	alue	
					Price	e Change	e HPI					
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	
	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0	
	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	
	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
yapı	0%	284.3	0%	0%	15%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%	
IS IL	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%	
BC	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	45%	45%
ange	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	35%	40%	40%
t Ch	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%	35%
Cos	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%	30%
				0	%							

Source: Fordham Research 2009:

Note that the figure shows proposed % target for each cost/price combination, with 0% change in alternative use value. The table also provides, inside the percentages, the actual values of the indexes, so that they can be read off in future

- 8.10 In effect, once the Core Strategy Examination has approved whatever the starting target is, the rest follows automatically from the index changes. There is one further practical point, which is that since the array of possible index changes is extremely large, when viewed as possibilities over a decade or two. To produce a manageable set of figures, the work is done in two stages:
 - *Coarse Matrix*: This is calculated in 10% intervals of the cost & price indexes. The result provides broad coverage, but the change from one cell to another can produce large changes in targets: e.g. from 20% to 35%. But this stage provides wide coverage.
 - *Fine Matrix*: This takes the area around the chosen target and normally uses 4% intervals in the indexes (the intervals could be varied). This produces results for the area around the chosen target that yield much smaller target changes: mostly 5% intervals and sometimes 10%.
- 8.11 Table 8.3 shows the *Fine Matrix* outputs that relate to the Table 8.2 *Coarse Matrix*. Again the full set of tables will be found in Appendix 5. As will be seen from Table 8.3, the intervals in the targets around the base case of 15% are smaller than in Table 8.2. They permit more sensitive adjustments of the target as the index numbers change in future.

	Та	able 8.3	North	Tynesi	de Fine	Matrix	with ba	ise altei	rnative	use val	ue	
					Price	e Change	e HPI					
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%	
	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0	
	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%	
	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%	55%
dex	0%	284.3	5%	15%	15%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%	
s In	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	50%
BCI	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%	45%
nge	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%	40%
Che	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%	35%
Cost	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%	30%
-				00	%		5%					

Source: Fordham Research 2009: Affordable Housing Viability Study 2009

- 8.12 The trajectory shown in *Fine Matrix 1* is from the initial deliverable target of 15%, through various changes in cost and price to a position of a 30% deliverable target in some years time. At that point the trajectory has reached the edge of *Fine Matrix 1*. It is relatively simple then to reset the index base to produce *Fine Matrix 2*, which includes the 30% and allows for further movement to the right. If the trajectory were in any direction that took it outside *Fine Matrix 1*, then *Fine Matrix 2* could be adjusted to include it, and show the onward trajectory, whatever that might be.
- 8.13 The practical point of the *Fine Matrix* can be seen in the much smaller intervals between the targets. In the *Coarse Matrix* outputs the intervals may be 10-15% between adjacent cells. But in the *Fine Matrix* the intervals are usually only 5-10%. Clearly the coverage and fineness of the *Fine Matrix* can be altered by varying the size of the steps, which is 4% of each index in the example. Hence the level of 'close-up' can be varied prior to the Core Strategy Inspector's decision.





8.14 To provide further assistance in visualising how this system works, the following figure provides a step by step guide:



Figure 8.2 How it works in practice

Step 1

The starting point is the 15% in Figure 9.1. For the purpose of the example assume that this is what the Core Strategy Inspector's report has endorsed.

Step 2

In a year, or whatever interval has been set by the Core Strategy Inquiry, check the values of the three indexes. The first one to check is the Alternative Use Value. This will determine which of the 8 pages of Coarse Matrix is to be used.

Step 3

If the Alternative Use Value has changed by enough to move to one of the other seven pages, that may itself result in a target change, up or down. As an example, assume it now goes to 20%

Step 4

Then look at the BCIS and Halifax indexes for this Alternative Use value level and check whether there has been a move from the 0/0 position at which the process started. This may result in another change: say to 25%

Step 5

Then switch from the Coarse Matrix to the Fine one. This will allow a more precise fix on the new target. For example it may be 20%. This is the final step in checking the three indexes.

Step 6

The final target, 35%, would then be published in the Annual Monitoring report. Any interested party could, however, use the tables already published in the Plan to work out the values. This illustration shows a change, in order to show the procedure. It is equally possible that the process may lead to no change at all in the target!

Source: Fordham Research 2009:

Implementing Dynamic Viability

8.15 The Viability is likely to be done as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy Affordable Housing Policy. There will then be a delay of some months until the actual Examination. During that period there may well be changes in the market. Thus it is likely to be necessary to redo the base viability analysis at the time of the Core Strategy Examination to ensure that the Dynamic Viability process starts from the period of the Examination.



8.16 Since the automatic target varying procedure cannot begin until approved by the Inspector's Report, it is desirable to have it as up to date as possible. Figure 8.3 indicates this process schematically.



Source: Fordham Research 2009

8.17 The diagram illustrates the possible change in viability between study and Core Strategy Examination. After that, of course, the Dynamic Viability matrix will take account of future variations in viability. As the diagram suggests, these could be downward as well as upward. The future course of the market is uncertain.

Conclusion

- 8.18 The printouts in Appendix 5 provide the detailed background to the two figures (8.1 and 8.2) presented above. Together they allow for the Core Strategy Examination to set the basis for deliverable affordable housing targets over the plan period. They should achieve the practical maximum of affordable housing without prejudicing the delivery of market housing.
- 8.19 The following diagram shows that when the market eventually recovers (the dotted brown 'viability' line curves up) the gain will be shared between windfall land value gains to the landowner (shown in blue) and gains in affordable housing (shown in stippled red). A key factor is the interval between reviews of the target. We suggest annually, to fit in with the Annual Monitoring process. At all times the landowner receives the basic initial land value and profit, and the housebuilder gets 20% gross profit on cost. In the periods between review both landowner, and if involved in the land value also the

developer, will share increases in land value if planning permission is obtained then. But the target will rise to give additional affordable housing in between periods when windfall land value accrues.





Source: Fordham Research 2009

8.20 The 'broad brush' viability process which leads to the establishment of deliverable targets is, of course, distinct from the site specific issues that may arise at the point of a planning permission. If there are exceptional costs to a particular site, then the policy level of affordable housing may justifiably be reduced. That is the way in which affordable targets have worked since 1991. But the Dynamic Viability results permit the overarching affordable target to be sensitive to market fluctuations while not requiring expensive new Core Strategy consideration.



Appendices

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD



Appendix 1 Site built form data

Site Area	West Ch ha	irton 5 Inett		Locati	ion	Chirton	
lo of dwellings	acres count	<u>12.4</u> 0		Floorspace	e density	0 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha
loorspace		Total floor area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 33,060 153,325 186,385	gross sq ft 38,894 153,325 192,219	net % 17.7% 82.3% 100.0%	gross % 20.2% 79.8% 100.0%	
		Average area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 689 1,095 991	gross sq ft 810 1,095 1,022			
ccommodation		Ave so ft			No of bedr	noms	
		net	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed
		Flats/apartments 660 720	0	25 23	0	0	0
		Houses 3 storey/2.5 stor	ey		Ū	Ū	Ũ
		1080 1160 1290	0 0 0	0 0 0	30 0 0	0 30 15	0 0 0
		Houses 2 storey 650	0	10	0	0	0
		975 1100	0	0	15 19	0 0	0
		1150 1350	0	0	18 0	0 3	0
		Total dwellings	0	58	82	48 TOTAL	0 188

	Site 2						
Site	Holyfields			Locat	ion		
Area	ha	4 nett					
lo of dwellings	acres count	<u>9.9</u> 150		Floorspace	e density	14,752 3,388	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha
loorspace		Total floor area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 16,311 129,500 145,811	gross sq ft 19,189 129,500 148,689	net % 11.2% 88.8% 100.0%	gross % 12.9% 87.1% 100.0%	
		Average area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 604 1,053 972	gross sq ft 711 1,053 991			
ccommodation							
		Ave sq ft net	1 bed	2 bed	No of bedro 3 bed	ooms 4 bed	5+ bed
		Flats/apartments					
		481	6	0	0	0	0
		605	0	9	0	0	0
		665	0	12	0	0	0
		Houses 3 storey/2.5 stor	ey				
		1080	0	0	0	10	0
		1150	0	0	0	10	0
		1250	0	0	0	12	0
		1400	0	0	0	6	0
		Houses 2 storey					
		790	0	0	30	0	0
		925	0	0	20	0	0
		1000	0	0	15	0	0
		1250	0	0	0	10	0
		1350	0	0	0	6	0
		1500	0	0	0	4	0
		Total dwellings	6	21	65	58 TOTAL	0 150



Site	Site 3 Smith's Do	ock		Locati	on	Whitlev Bay		
Area	ha	0.723 nett		Loodi		timeoj baj		
No of dwellings	count	1.8		Floorspace	density	55,415 12,726	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	!
Floorspace			net	gross	net	gross		
		Flats	sq ft 99,000	sq π 116,471	% 100.0%	% 100.0%		
		Houses	0	0	0.0%	0.0%		
		All	99,000	110,471	100.0%	100.0%		
		Average area	net sa ft	gross sa ft				
		Flats	825	971				
		Houses	#DIV/0! 825	#DIV/0! 971				
A a commo dation								
Accommodation		Ave sq ft			No of bed	rooms		
		net Flats/apartments	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	
		700	0	35	0	0	0	
		800	0	35 35	0	0	0	
		1000	0	15	0	Ō	0	
		Total dwellings	0	120	0	0	0	
						TOTAL	120	
							-	
	Site 4					Mida an an		
Site	Site 4 Wideopen			Locati	on	wideopen		
Site Area	Site 4 Wideopen ha	2.75 nett		Locati	on	wideopen		
Site Area No of dwellings	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110		Locati Floorspace	on density	14,943	net sq ft/acre	1
Site Area No of dwellings	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110		Locati Floorspace	on density	14,943 3,432	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area	net sq ft	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft	on e density net %	14,943 3,432 gross %	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats	net sq ft 10,149	Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940	on e density net % 10.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6%	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net	Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flots	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 507	Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983	Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983	net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre	, ,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923	Locati Floorspace 9000000000000000000000000000000000000	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923	Locati Floorspace 900 91,390 103,330 gross 91,390 103,330 902 983 939	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0%	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Average area	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed	on net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	, ,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area All Average area All	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4	Locati Floorspace 9ross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 605	net sq ft 10,149 91,399 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0	Locati Floorspace 9ross 9q ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross 9q ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 2	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storev/2.5 store	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0	Locati Floorspace 9ross 9q ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross 9q ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 29 0	Locati Floorspace 9ross 9q ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross 9q ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0	on e density 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% 100.0%	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 29 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 0 8 8 6	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 29 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	rooms 4 bed 0 0 8 8 8 4 4 6 4	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 700	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 29 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace 9000000000000000000000000000000000000	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 0 8 6 4 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 790 925	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 16	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 15 16 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 8 8 8 6 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000 1250 1350	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 8 8 8 6 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 4	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000 1250 1350 1500	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 29 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 8 8 8 6 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 4 4 2	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000 1250 1350 1500 650	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on e density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 0 8 6 4 0 0 0 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 2 0 0	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000 1250 1350 1500 650 Total dwellings	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% 8 4 bed 0 0 0 8 6 4 0 0 0 4 bed 0 0 0 4 bed 0 0 0 4 bed 0 0 0 36 36	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	,
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 4 Wideopen ha acres count	2.75 nett 6.8 110 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Aves q ft net Flats/apartments 481 605 665 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1080 1150 1250 1400 Houses 2 storey 790 925 1000 1250 1350 1500 650 Total dwellings	net sq ft 10,149 91,390 101,539 net sq ft 597 983 923 1 bed 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Locati Floorspace gross sq ft 11,940 91,390 103,330 gross sq ft 702 983 939 2 bed 0 7 6 0 0 7 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	on r density net % 10.0% 90.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bed 3 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	14,943 3,432 gross % 11.6% 88.4% 100.0% rooms 4 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 36 TOTAL	net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	,

	Site 5						
Site	Eastbour	ne Gardens		Locat	ion	Whitley Bay	
Area	ha	0.51 nett					
	acres	1.3					_
lo of dwellings	count	85		Floorspace	e density	55,546	net sq ft/acre
						12,756	net sq m/ha
loorspace			net	gross	net	gross	
		l otal floor area	sq ft	sq ft	%	%	
		Flats	70,000	82,353	100.0%	100.0%	
		Houses	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	
		All	70,000	82,353	100.0%	100.0%	
			net	aross			
		Average area	saft	sa ft			
		Flats	824	969			
		Houses	#DIV/01	#DIV/0!			
		All	824	969			
Accommodation							
		Ave sq ft			No of bed	rooms	
		net	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed
		Flats/apartments					
		700	0	25	0	0	0
		800	0	25	0	0	0
		900	0	25	0	0	0
		1000	0	10	0	0	0
		Total dwellings	0	85	0	0	0
							05





<u></u>	Site /				. r		
Site	Emp. Had	Irian Pub Site		Locati	on	Battle Hill	
Area	na	0.56 nett					
	acres	1.4		Electropeco	donaity [21 524	not og ft/gorg
ino or uwenings	count	30		FIDUISPACE	e density	4 945	net sq m/ba
					L	4,940	net sy m/na
Floorspace			net	gross	net	gross	
·		Total floor area	sq ft	sq ft	%	%	
		Flats	7,128	8,386	23.9%	27.0%	
		Houses	22.670	22.670	76.1%	73.0%	
		All	29,798	31,056	100.0%	100.0%	
				,			
			net	gross			
		Average area	sq ft	sq ft			
		Flats	594	699			
		Houses	872	872			
		All	784	817			
Accommodation							
Accommodation		Ave sq ft			No of bedro	ooms	
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net	1 bed	2 bed	No of bedro 3 bed	ooms 4 bed	5+ bed
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments	1 bed	2 bed	No of bedro 3 bed	ooms 4 bed	5+ bed
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594	1 bed 0	2 bed 12	No of bedro 3 bed 0	ooms 4 bed 0	5+ bed 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store	1 bed 0 ey	2 bed 12	No of bedro 3 bed 0	ooms 4 bed 0	5+ bed 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 stor 1011	1 bed 0 ey 0	2 bed 12 0	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0	ooms 4 bed 0 13	5+ bed 0 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1011 Houses 2 storey	1 bed 0 ey 0	2 bed 12 0	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0	ooms 4 bed 0 13	5+ bed 0 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1011 Houses 2 storey 665	1 bed 0 ey 0 0	2 bed 12 0 4	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0 0	ooms 4 bed 0 13 0	5+ bed 0 0 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1011 Houses 2 storey 665 763	1 bed 0 ey 0 0 0	2 bed 12 0 4 0	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0 0 9	ooms 4 bed 0 13 0 0	5+ bed 0 0 0 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1011 Houses 2 storey 665 763	1 bed 0 ey 0 0 0	2 bed 12 0 4 0	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0 0 9	ooms 4 bed 0 13 0 0	5+ bed 0 0 0 0
Accommodation		Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 594 Houses 3 storey/2.5 store 1011 Houses 2 storey 665 763 Total dwellings	1 bed 0 0 0 0 0	2 bed 12 0 4 0 16	No of bedro 3 bed 0 0 0 9 9	boms 4 bed 0 13 0 0 13	5+ bed 0 0 0 0 0

1:1 -	Site 8						
site	Marine H	ouse		Locat	lion	Howdon	
Area	ha acres	0.88 nett					
lo of dwellings	count	41		Floorspace	e density	15,502 3,560	net sq ft/acre
						0,000	
loorspace			net	gross	net	gross	
		Total floor area	sq ft	sq ft	%	%	
		Flats	ò	ò	0.0%	0.0%	
		Houses	33,708	33,708	100.0%	100.0%	
		All	33 708	33 708	100.0%	100.0%	
		,	00,100	00,700	100.070	100.070	
			net	gross			
		Average area	sq ft	sq ft			
		Flats	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
		Houses	822	822			
		All	822	822			
Accommodation		Ave sq ft			No of bedr	rooms	
		net	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed
		Flats/apartments					
		Houses 3 storey/2.5 stor	ev				
			<i>.</i> ,				
		995	0	0	8	0	0
		995 Houses 2 storey	0	0	8	0	0
		995 Houses 2 storey 675	0	0 8	8	0	0
		995 Houses 2 storey 675 750	0 0 0 0	0 8 14	8 0 0	0 0	0 0
		995 Houses 2 storey 675 750 850	0 0 0 0 0	0 8 14 5	8 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0
		995 Houses 2 storey 675 750 850 933	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 8 14 5 0	8 0 0 0 6	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0
		995 Houses 2 storey 675 750 850 933 Total dwellings	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 8 14 5 0 27	8 0 0 6 14	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0

	Site 9						
Site	Pioneer S	Social Club		Locat	tion	Dudley	
Area	ha	0.15 nett					
	acres	0.4					-
No of dwellings	count	12		Floorspace	e density	21,854	net sq ft/acre
						5,019	net sq m/ha
Floorspace			net	gross	net	gross	
		Total floor area	sq ft	sq ft	%	%	
		Flats	3,630	4,271	44.8%	48.9%	
		Houses	4,470	4,470	55.2%	51.1%	
		All	8,100	8,741	100.0%	100.0%	
			not	aross			
			net	gioss			
		Average area	SQIL	SQ IL			
		Flats	005	712			
		Houses	745	745			
		All	675	728			
Accommodation							
		Ave sa ft			No of bed	rooms	
		net	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed
		Flats/apartments					
		605	0	6	0	0	0
		Houses 2 storey	-	-	-	-	-
		650	0	3	0	0	0
		840	0	0	3	0	Ō
		Total dwellings	0	9	3	0	0
		1				TOTAL	12



Site	Former Co	oop Brenkley Ave		Locat	ion	Shiremoor		
Area	ha acres	0.07 nett 0.2						
No of dwellings	count	8		Floorspace	e density	30,988 7,116	net sq ft/acr net sq m/ha	e
loorspace			net	gross	net	gross		
		l otal floor area	sq ft 5,360	sq ft 6,306	% 100.0%	% 100.0%		
		Houses	0	0	0.0%	0.0%		
		All	5,360	6,306	100.0%	100.0%		
		A	net	gross				
		Average area Flats	sq π 670	sq π 788				
		Houses	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!				
			670	788				
Accommodation		Ave so ft			No of bed	rooms		
		net	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5+ bed	
		Flats/apartments	Ω	8	0	٥	n	
		605	0	0	0	0	õ	
		665	0	0	0	0	0	
		1005es 3 storey/2.5 store 1090	с у 0	0	0	0	0	
		1145	0	0	0	0	0	
		1230 1335	0 0	0 0	0	0 0	0	
		Houses 2 storey	, ,	Ŭ		Ŭ	, in the second s	
		750 817	0	0	0	0	0	
		1165	0	0	0	0	ő	
		1265	0	0	0	0	0	
		10/0	U	U	U	U	U	
		0	0	0	0	0	0	
		0 Total dwellings	0	0 8	0 0	0 0	0 0	
		0 Total dwellings	0	0 8	0 0	0 0 TOTAL	0 0 8	
		0 Total dwellings	0	0 8	0	0 0 TOTAL	0 0 8	
Site	Site 12 The Railw	Total dwellings	0	0 8 Locat	0 0	0 0 TOTAL	0 0 8	
Site Area	Site 12 The Railw ha acres	/ayman	0	0 8 Locat	0 0 ion	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total dwellings	0	0 8 Locat	0 0 ion	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total face and	0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace	0 0 ion e density	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	7 Total floor area	0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	ayman 0.05 0.1 4 Total floor area Flats Houses	0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2 200	0 0 ion e density 100.0% 0.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All	0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988	0 0 ion e density <u>net</u> % 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All	0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Average area Flats	0 0 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747	0 0 ion e density <u>net</u> % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All	0 0 0 sq ft 2,540 0 2,540 0 2,540 net sq ft 635 #DIV/0 635	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All	0 0 0 sq ft 2,540 0 2,540 net sq ft 635 #DIV/0! 635	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total dwellings	0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747	0 0 ion e density 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All	0 0 0 2,540 net sq ft 635 #DIV/0! 635	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747 2 bed	0 0 ion e density 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace Accommodation	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 605	0 0 0 2,540 net sq ft 635 #DIV/0! 635 1 bed 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747 #DIV/0! 747	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0% 0.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total dwellings ayman 0.05 0.1 0.1 4 Total floor area Flats Houses All Average area Flats Houses All Ave sq ft net Flats/apartments 605 665	0 0 0 1 1 bed 0 0 0 0	0 8 Eloorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747 2 bed 2 2	0 0 ion e density 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% No of bedr 3 bed 0 0	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total dwellings ayman 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.1 4 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.1 4 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.1 4 Nett 0.05 Nett 0.1 4 Nett Nett 0.05 Nett 0.1 4 Nett Nett 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 1 Nett 1 1 Nett 1 1 Nett 1 1 Nett 1 Nett 1 Nett 1 Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett Nett S S S Total dwellings Nett N	0 0 0 1 1 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747 2 bed 2 2 2 bed 2 2 4	0 0 ion e density net % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0	
Site Area No of dwellings Floorspace	Site 12 The Railw ha acres count	Total dwellings vayman 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.05 0.1 0.1 4 Vayman 0.05 0.1 0.1 4 Vayman 0.05 0.1 0.1 4 Vayman 0.05 0.1 0.1 4 Vayman 0.05 0.1 4 Vayman 0.05 0.1 4 Vayman Vayman Vayman Vayman 4 Vayman Vayman Vayman 4 Vayman	0 0 0 1 1 bed 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 8 Locat Floorspace gross sq ft 2,988 0 2,988 0 2,988 gross sq ft 747 #DIV/0! 747 #DIV/0! 747 2 bed 2 2 4	0 0 ion e density 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 TOTAL Percy Main 20,558 4,721 gross % 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	0 0 8 net sq ft/acre net sq m/ha 5+ bed 0 0 0	



Appendix 2 Newbuild schemes

A2.1 The schedules below provide details of a number of current newbuild developments and other comparable housing in North Tyneside area and immediate surrounds.

	Table A2.1 Newb	uild sche	mes	
SITE / LOCATION	BUILDER	No. of Dwgs	RANGE OF AVAILABLE Dwgs	PRICES
East Farm Mews, Backworth	Charles Church		2, 3 & 4 bed houses	£199k- £399k
Rosehill, Wallsend	Persimmon		3 & 4 bed houses	£132k- £220k
Earsdon View, Shiremoor	Miller Homes		3 bed town houses	£199k- £214k
Greenside, Kenton Bank Foot	Persimmon		4 & 5 bed houses	£315k- £495k
Melbury, Netherwitton Way, Gosforth	Persimmon		4 bed houses	£409k- £439k
Wrendale Court Gosforth	Persimmon		1 bed apartment	£119k
Hadrian Mews, Wallsend	Bellway		3 & 4 bed houses	£165k- £185k
Hadrian Village, Wallsend	Bellway		3 & 4 bed houses	£165k- £245k
Hibernia Village, Walker	Bellway		3 bed houses	£145k- £152k
Wyedale, Walker	McInerney		3 & 4 bed houses	£139k- £177k
Northumberland Park, Shiremoor	Bellway		3 & 4 bed houses	£172k- £317k
Earsdon View, Shiremoor	Bellway		3, 4 & 5 bed houses	£176k- £337k

Table A2.	.2 Other comparabl	e secondh	and properties	
SITE / LOCATION	BUILDER	No. of Dwgs	RANGE OF Dwgs	PRICES
***Shiremoor Area			apartments	£80k
*** Dolphin Quay area			apartments	£140k
***Whitley Bay coastal			apartments	£175k- £250K
***Denewood area			4 bed	£340k- £390k
***Alexandria Way, Wallsend area			apartments	£90k
*** Faraat Oata area Dalmarravil	1-			£210k/
Forest Gate area, Paimersviii	le		3 bed/ 4 bed	£140k
				£110k/
***Dudley area			2 bed/ 3 bed/ 4 bed	£150k/
				£200k
***l anchantan araa			2 had anart/2 had	£110k/
Longbenion area			2 beu aparti 3 beu	£145k
***North Shields (general)	Walton Park		2 bed	£145k
			1 6 6 6	£260k-
	The Wynd		4 bed	£350k
	Renaissance Point		2 bed	£150k
***14/bitlov Boy (concrol)	Hillboodo Court		2 bed house/ 2 bed	£125k/
vvinuey bay (general)	niineaus Coun		apart	£110k



Appendix 3 House price variations

- A3.1 The indices in the table which follows compare prices in each postcode sector in the study area with an England and Wales 'average' figure actually the median postcode value.
- A3.2 The indices are standardised, to eliminate the effect of variations in type mix; separate indices for each house type are combined with weightings based on the mix of overall sales.

	Table A3.1 Price variat	ions by po	ostcode s	ector		
Postcode sector	Areas covered in sector	Q4 07	Q2 08	Q4 08	Q2 09	AVG
NE29 7	West Chirton	65.6%	63.5%	66.2%	49.4%	61.2%
NE28 7	Willingdon	65.6%	71.7%	58.1%	61.5%	64.2%
NE28 0	Howdon	61.3%	62.1%	60.1%	74.9%	64.6%
NE28 9	Battle Hill	69.1%	68.0%	61.1%	66.1%	66.1%
NE29 6	Royal Quays	67.9%	72.8%	69.3%	54.5%	66.1%
NE28 6	Rosehill	60.8%	60.5%	66.9%	77.3%	66.4%
NE25 0	New Hartley		66.8%		68.5%	67.7%
NE23 7	Dudley(+Annitsford + Seghill)	64.7%	66.1%	68.6%	74.7%	68.5%
NE28 8	Little Benton	76.8%	62.7%	78.6%	62.3%	70.1%
NE29 8	Billy Mill Lane	69.6%	74.1%	78.7%	61.3%	70.9%
NE12 6	Killingworth	76.5%	68.5%	81.6%	80.7%	76.8%
NE13 6	Wideopen	74.6%	80.8%		79.5%	78.3%
NE12 5	Camperdown	68.8%	98.8%		68.9%	78.8%
NE29 0	North Shields	81.2%	79.7%	77.2%	94.2%	83.1%
NE27 0	Shiremoor	85.5%	88.2%	85.0%	98.3%	89.3%
NE12 7	Palmersville	95.4%	88.6%	83.3%	90.2%	89.4%
NE12 9	Forest Hall	86.3%	96.3%	95.1%	82.7%	90.1%
NE26 2	Whitley Bay	111.2%	105.2%	52.4%	100.6%	92.3%
NE12 8	Longbenton	77.3%	85.1%	127.1%	87.0%	94.1%
NE30 1	Union Quay	82.7%	93.8%	109.2%	115.5%	100.3%
NE7 7	High Heaton	96.8%	109.0%	119.6%	91.6%	104.2%
NE26 4	New Hartley	106.3%	114.6%	98.7%	113.2%	108.2%
NE30 3	Marden	99.3%	113.3%	95.3%	125.7%	108.4%
NE25 8	Monkseaton	118.2%	109.1%	87.7%	123.6%	109.7%
NE29 9	Preston Grange	92.0%	98.7%	168.9%	94.0%	113.4%
NE30 2	Northumberland Park	117.3%	106.2%	112.9%	125.0%	115.3%
NE25 9	Earsdon	103.0%	108.7%	173.8%	101.6%	121.8%
NE26 1	Whitley Sands	130.1%	116.3%	101.1%	145.4%	123.2%
NE26 3	Monkseaton Drive	128.1%	156.3%	96.9%	129.7%	127.8%
NE30 4	Tynemouth	134.7%	183.1%	103.8%	125.9%	136.9%

Notes 1. Where a postcode sector includes areas inside and outside the Borough, the areas outside are shown in brackets e.g. Dudley (+Annitsford + Seghill)

2. Data has been mix adjusted to remove differences in house type mix between postcode sectors; individual indices have been calculated for each house type, and combined using weights reflecting the nation-wide type mix. A worked example is provided below.

Table A3.2 Worked example for NE28 8 at Q4 2008											
		Land I	Registry data G	4 2008							
	Detached	Semi	Terraced	Flat	Total						
England & Wales - median price	£271,583	£161,250	£135,995	£142,688							
England & Wales - no of sales	22,381	28,916	31,005	19,775	202,268						
NE28 8 – avg price	£159,166	£132,890	£140,000	£82,312							
NE28 8 price as % E & W median value	58.61%	82.41%	102.95%	57.69%							
Weighted average index for NE28 8 =	[(22,381 x 102.9	58.61%) + (2 95%) + (19,77	8,916 x 82.41% 5 x 57.69%)] / 2	6) + (31,005x 202,268							
-		=	78.9%								

Source: Analysis of Land Registry data





Appendix 4 Small plots for sale

Table A4.1 Asking prices for building sites/plots: values											
Location	No	site area	Asking price	Land value							
Location	dwgs	acres (ha)	Asking price	per acre	per ha						
Whitley Bay	1	0.08 (0.03)	£120k	£1,500k	£3,713k						
Whitley Bay	1	0.07 (0.03)	£70k	£1,049k	£2,592k						
North Shields	4	0.04 (0.16)	£100k	£2,500k	£6,178k						
North Shields	20	0.38 (0.15)	£550k	£1,455k	£3,595k						

Source: Internet listings March 2009





Appendix 5 Dynamic Viability Analysis printouts

Benchmark Site

- A5.1 It is proposed that the benchmark site appraisal should be based upon an amended version of Site 2A Holyfields. The amendment is necessary to ensure it is just viable at the proposed target level of 15%.
- A5.2 The alternative use value for Site 2A is agricultural.

Index Numbers for automatic updating

A5.3 The periodic review would be initiated by a specifically constituted forum including stakeholders. It would involve establishing current values of the indices in the Table below. For information the table shows the 'starting' values for each index.

Table A5	.1 Indices for automatic updating of Dyna	amic Viability						
Variable	Proposed index	Starting Value						
House Price	Halifax House Price Index	April 2009 = 500.0						
	Halifax House Price Index (free, monthly)							
	http://www.lloydsbankinggroup.com/media1/research/halifax_api.asp							
Build cost	BCIS General Building Cost Index	July 2009 = 284.3 (as at early July 2009)						
	BCIS Review Online (subscription only, monthly) Produced by the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors							
	http://www.bcis.co.uk/online							
Alternative use value	Property Market Report (VOA) Various uses, but typically industrial use value: Average Value of Mixed Agricultural Land (Equipped, with Vacant Possession) for North East Region	July 2009 = figure is £11,115 per ha						
	Valuation Office Agency: Property Market Report <u>http://www.voa.gov.uk/publications/index.htm</u>	orts (free, six monthly)						

Sources: As shown in the boxes of the table

*Reproduction of Table 8.1

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

Tabulated results for all index outcomes

- A5.4 The results from the sequence of appraisals are set out in the following table(s).
- A5.5 After values of indices for price/cost/alternative use value have been determined, these would be rounded to 2% intervals (price/cost) and 10% intervals (alternative use value). The tables show what revised percentage target would apply to the particular price/cost/alternative use value combination.
- A5.6 The following are two sets of 8 tabulations of the Coarse and Fine Matrices described in Chapter 8. They provide for the full range of possible targets and also the Alternative Use value check in 8 bands of alternative use value indexes.



North Tyneside Benchmark Site Appraisal

Coarse Matrix

	Table C1 Base Alternative Use Value: 0% Change - £10,000 Per Acre												
	Price Change HPI												
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%		
ex	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0		
e BCIS Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%		
	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%		
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	15%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%		
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%		
Cha	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	45%		
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	35%	40%		
ŭ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%		
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%		

	Table C2 Alternative Use Value: -60% Change - £4,000 Per Acre													
					Pric	e Change	e HPI							
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%			
ex	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0			
Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%			
e BCIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%			
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	55%	55%	55%			
inge	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%			
Cha	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	40%	45%			
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%			
ŏ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%	30%			
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%			

Table C3 Alternative Use Value: - 40% Change - £6,000 Per Acre												
Price Change HPI												
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	
ка	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0	
e BCIS Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	
	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	55%	55%	55%	
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	
Cha	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	40%	45%	
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	
ŭ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%	30%	
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%	

	Table C4 Alternative Use Value: - 20% Change - £8,000 Per Acre												
					Pric	e Change	e HPI						
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%		
ex	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0		
Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%		
e BCIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%		
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	55%	55%	55%		
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%		
Cha	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	45%		
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%		
Ŏ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%		
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%		

Table C5 Alternative Use Value: + 20% Change - £12,000 Per Acre

_					Pric	e Change	e HPI				_
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%
ex	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0
Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
e BCIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%
Cha	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	45%
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	35%	40%
ပိ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%



Table C6 Alternative Use Value: + 40% Change - £14,000 Per Acre											
					Pric	e Change	e HPI				
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%
éx	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0
Ind	-20%	227.4	25%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
CIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%
e B(0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%
Che	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	20%	25%	35%	40%	45%
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%	40%
ŭ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%

	Table C7 Alternative Use Value: + 60% Change - £16,000 Per Acre													
					Pric	e Change	e HPI							
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%			
ex	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0			
Ind	-20%	227.4	20%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%			
CIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%			
BO	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%			
ange	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	55%			
Châ	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	35%	40%	45%			
ost	30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%	40%			
ŭ	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%			
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%			

Table C8 Alterna	ative Use Value:	+ 80% Change -	- £18,000 Per Acre

_					Pric	e Change	HPI				
		%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%
é	%		400.0	450.0	500.0	550.0	600.0	650.0	700.0	750.0	800.0
pul	-20%	227.4	20%	40%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%	55%
e BCIS	-10%	255.9	0%	20%	35%	45%	50%	55%	55%	55%	55%
	0%	284.3	0%	0%	20%	30%	40%	45%	50%	55%	55%
inge	10%	312.7	0%	0%	5%	20%	30%	35%	45%	50%	50%
Che	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	35%	40%	45%
Cost (30%	369.6	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%	40%
	40%	398.0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	25%	30%
	50%	426.5	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	25%



North Tyneside Benchmark Site Appraisal

Fine Matrix

	Table F1 Base Alternative Use Value: 0% Change - £10,000 Per Acre													
	Price Change HPI													
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%			
ка	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0			
Inde	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%			
SIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%			
e B(0%	284.3	5%	15%	15%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%			
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%			
Ch	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%			
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%			
C	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%			
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%			

	Table F2 Alternative Use Value: - 30% Change - £7,000 Per Acre														
	Price Change HPI														
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%				
ка	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0				
Ind	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%				
SIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%				
e B(0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%				
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%				
Cha	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%				
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%				
Ŭ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%				
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	20%				



	Table F3 Alternative Use Value: - 20% Change - £8,000 Per Acre														
	Price Change HPI														
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%				
ка Ка	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0				
Ind	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%				
SIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%				
B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%				
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%				
Cha	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%				
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%				
Ŭ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%				
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	10%	15%	20%	20%				

	Table F4 Alternative Use Value: - 10% Change - £9,000 Per Acre														
	Price Change HPI														
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%				
X	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0				
Ind	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%				
CIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%				
e B(0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%				
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%				
Châ	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%				
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%				
Ŭ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	25%	25%				
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%				

Table F5 Alternative Use Value: +10% Change - £11,000 Per Acre

					Pric	e Change	e HPI				
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%
BCIS Index	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0
	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%
	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	50%
	0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%
Cha	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%
ŏ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%	25%
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%


	Т	able F6	Alterna	ative Us	e Value:	+ 20%	Change	- £12,00	00 Per A	cre	
					Pric	e Change	e HPI				
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%
ка	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0
Ind	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%
SIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	45%
B	0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%	40%
Cha	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%
Ŭ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%	25%
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%

Table F7 Alternative Use Value: + 30% Change - £13,000 Per Acre Price Change HPI % -8% -4% 0% 4% 8% 12% 16% 20% 24% % 460.0 480.0 500.0 520.0 540.0 560.0 580.0 600.0 620.0 Cost Change BCIS Index -8% 261.6 20% 25% 30% 35% 40% 45% 45% 50% 50% -4% 45% 272.9 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 40% 40% 45% 0% 284.3 5% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 35% 40% 45% 4% 295.7 0% 5% 15% 20% 25% 30% 30% 35% 40% 8% 307.0 0% 0% 5% 15% 20% 25% 30% 30% 35% 12% 318.4 0% 0% 0% 5% 15% 20% 25% 25% 30% 16% 329.8 0% 0% 0% 0% 10% 15% 20% 20% 25% 20% 341.2 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 10% 15% 20% 20%

Table F8 Alternative Use Value: + 40% Change - £14,000 Per Acre

					Pric	e Change	e HPI				
		%	-8%	-4%	0%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	24%
é	%		460.0	480.0	500.0	520.0	540.0	560.0	580.0	600.0	620.0
lnd	-8%	261.6	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	45%	50%	50%
SIS	-4%	272.9	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	40%	45%	45%
B B	0%	284.3	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	35%	35%	40%	45%
ange	4%	295.7	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	30%	30%	35%	40%
Cha	8%	307.0	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%	35%
ost	12%	318.4	0%	0%	0%	5%	15%	20%	25%	25%	30%
ŏ	16%	329.8	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%	25%
	20%	341.2	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	15%	20%	20%

Appendix 6 Financial appraisal summaries

A6.1 The development viability **summaries** contained in the following pages set out the assumptions and outputs of the viability appraisals for a 20% affordable 'zero grant' scenario.

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD



SITE 1A: West Chirton South Trading Estate



] [8									
		sales value per sa ft	156.00	71.00	91.00	00.66	0.00	£26,075,66									
		build INDEX = 1.000	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	88.00	£16,907,968									
		build cost per sa ft [88.00	88.00	0.0% 88.00	0.0%	0.0%										
		space net sa ft	991	991	991	991	0	186,308	ere Cre		lling	lling	lling				
ntermediate		ave floor : gross sa ft	1,022	1,022	1,022	1.022	0	192,136	et sq ft per a		£ per dwe	£ per dwe	£ per dwe				
rented 20% i			80.00%	16.00%	2.00%	2.00%	0.00%	100.00%	= 15,080 ne		503.2	500	0	7.50%			
80% social			150.4	t 30.1	ent 3.8	3.8 3.8	8: 	188.0							_		
Affordable 20% =	Dwellings	Dwellings	Market housing	Affordable soc ren	Aff intermediate re	Aff shared oship	Aff other	Total	Floorspace densit		Other costs Planning	Survey	Marketing	Interest % per annum	Notes		
ption			1														
enario & o	/ study	rton South						а́	845		2,574	0		1,775	206	389	
IS Sc	ite viability	IA West Chi Chirton	5.00	188	37.6				5.00%		14.50%	0.0%	15%	10.0%	8%	2,070	
Input assumption	North Tyneside s	Site details Site Location	Area ha E	No dwgs	Density dw/ha			Contingency	allowance	Development costs	standard % build	plus abnormals	Total	Design fees on build costs	on dev costs	Planning gain ₤ per dwelling	

North Tyneside Council Affordable Housing Site Viability Study

		Land																			
									E	terate	to a	chiev	e 20.	0% pr	ofit						
									J							1		Hect	are		
										Affo	rdable		N	affor	dable	Af	ordab	e	No af	fordat	ble
		Land p	urcha	se pric	Ð				ч	-1,96	9,35	8	-	401,7	796						
		RVper	r acre						ы С	-16	1,826			-32,5	21	ដុ	3666	72	-£8	0,359	0
		Dev pr	ofit						દ્ય	4,16	5,186	(0)	4	810,	527						
		Total c	osts						દ્ય	21,9	11,83	2	24	1,042	,480						
		profit a	as % o	f costs					<u> </u>	19.	01%			20.01	%						
Program	не	Year 1 Q1 Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 5 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4 TC	DTALS
Units	Mark et housing		9.6	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.4
starte d	Affordable soc rent		4 0	26	26	26	2.6	26	2.6	2.6	26	26	26	26	00	0 0	0.0	00	00	0 0	30.1
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship		0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8 3.8
	Att other TOTAL	0 0	12 0.0	0.0	16	16	0.0	16	16	0.0 16	0.0 16	16	16	0.0 16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 188.0
Units built	Mark et housing		0	0	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	0	0	150
+20	Affordable soc rent		0 0	00	20	ი ი	<i>с</i> с	<i>т</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>т</i> с	с с	<i>с</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>с</i> с	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	30
	Aff shared oship				000	000	000	000	000			000	000	000	000		000				4 4 6
Units	Mark et housing		2	0	0	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	0 0	150
+3Q	Affordable soc rent			00	00	~ ~	<i>т</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>т</i> с	<i>т</i> с	<i>с</i> о с	<i>т</i> с	<i>т</i> с	<i>с</i> с	<i>т</i> с	<i>с</i> о с	<i>т</i> с	00	00	0 0	30
	Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000	000		000	000	000				000	000		000	000	000	140
Units	Mark et housing				0	0	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	150
+40	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship				00	00	0 0	т 0	т 0	т 0 1	ю 0	т О	т 0	ю 0	т 0	<i>т</i> о	т 0	т 0	00	0 0	30
	Aff shared oship Aff other				00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	00	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	00	4 0

SITE 1A LAND COST & PHASING

		Year 1			Ye	ar 2			Ye	ar 3			Year 4				Year 5				
	rate	61	Q2	0 3	Q4	6 2	22	533	24	21 0	02 Q3	Q4	α1	Q2	8	Q4	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q 4	OTALS
les Mark et housing		0	0	0	0	0	0 1.	484 1.5	979 1.5	979 1.9	1.97	9 1.979	1.979	1.979	1.979	1.979	1.979	1.979	0	0	23.251
Affordable soc rent		0	0	0	0	0	0	35 1	80 1	80 16	30 180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	0	0	2,116
Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	0	0	22	53	29 2	29 29	29	53	29	53	29	29	29	0	0	339
Aff shared oship Aff other		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	24	0.31	31 0	31 31	- 3 - 3	6 0	31			31	31 0	0 0	0 0	369 0
Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	54	- 12	- 12	12- 12	-71	-71	-71	-71	-71	-71	-71	0	0	-839
me		0	•	0	•	0	1	564 2.2	219 2.2	219 2.2	19 2.21	9 2.2.19	2.219	2.219	2.219	2.219	2.219	2.219	0	•	26.076
2		,	,	,	,	,		Ì	Ì		Î		ì				2		,	,	2 2 2
_																					
Land acquisition		-1,999																			-1,999
Stamp duty		0																			0
Purchase fees		-55																			-55
Total																				<u> </u>	-2.054
Mark et housing		0	0	0	0	363 1.	151 1.	151 1.	151 1.	151 1.1	151 1.15	1 1.151	1.151	1.151	1.151	1.151	0	0	0	0	13.526
Affordable soc rent				0	0	173 2	30 2	30 2	30	30 25	30 230	230	230	230	230	230					2 705
Affordable sh oshin		• c				22	04	50	00	6	90 20	29	n de	29	50	29	• c	, c	, c		338
Aff a horsed on his													1 8		9 6			, c			0000
All silared Using		5 0	5 0	5 0		77	67			N 0	Ry C	R7 0	Ry C	R7 0	R7 0	6 C		5 0			°,
All other		5 0	5 0	- 0		-							>	- ;	- i	⊃ ¦	5 0				5
Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	54	12	12	22	12	2 12	72	72	72	12	72	0	0	0	0	845
Total					-															<u> </u>	17,753
Upfront	7.3%	322	322	322	322						077	011	077	0.77	c	c	c	c	c	0	1,287
Build related	1.3%	0	5	22	011	011	01	L 0L	0	01	DLL DL	0LL 0	011	011	0	0	D	D	0	0	1,28/
Abnormals	%0	0	0																	_	0
Food on build anote	10.00/	c	~	c		c 7			1	4	104	101	101	464	464	4 6 4	c	c	c	~	2,5/4
rees on build costs	10.U%	- 6	- ²	- e	- L	5	0.0	-	-	- C	101 10	0	<u>0</u>	0	<u>0</u>	0	- 0				0/ / I
Totol	0.0%	07	07	32	ŝ	n	n	'n	n	'n	מ	ת	ת	מ	5	>	5	-	•	>	1001
Diamina anin				30	00	00		0	°	c	cc .	00	5	00	c	c	c	c	c	0	106,1
				2	ŝ	22	ŝ	,	, ,		3	5	3	ŝ	5	>	þ	>	>	>	000
Dianing	5503	30	30	30																	0 5
Suntav	5500	5 8	5	5	<u> </u>																04
Marketing	2 2 2	5		c	c	c	c	c	0	0	0	c	c	c	c	c	c	C	c	0	5 0
Total	2			>	>	>	>		,		>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	189
b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	4	54 7	7 17	7 17	1 71	71	71	71	71	71	71	71	0	0	839
s		-1,581	379	493 4	1,1	398 1,	813 1,	867 1,8	885 1,8	885 1,8	385 1,88	5 1,885	1,885	1,885	1,733	1,733	71	71	0	-	21,671
		1 504	020	007			0 010			00 00	100	100	100	100	100	100	0 4 40	0110	4	4	1 105
loss from quarter		1,561	-3/9	-493	4 88	1- 286	813 -2	203 3	34 34	54	34 334	4 334	334	334	486	486	2,148	2,148	-	-	4,405
of from last quarter		0	1,611	1,255 7		283 -1	.136 -3,	004 -3,	267 -2,	.987 -2.7	703 -2,41	3 -2,117	-1,816	-1,509	-1,197	-724	-243	1,941	4,165	4,165	
and filling		1 601	1 222	C 022	170	116	010	C 200	c	6E2 2	20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	C02 F 0.	100	1 175	74.4	020	1 0.05	000	4 106	1 105	
proliniose		100.1	1,202	707	- 0/7	, IIJ	0- 0+0.	·2- 102	, ^{2,2}	,	10'7- 000	0 / 1- 0	-1,402	- 1, - 20	-	BC7-	c0e'i	1 ,000	29 *	t, 100	
Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50% 7.	50% 7.	50% 7.	50% 7.5	50% 7.5	50% 7.5	50% 7.5	0% 7.50	% 7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	%00.0	0.00%	
Total		30	23	14	5	-21	55	909	55	50 4	14 -39	-33	-28	-22	-13	4	36	77	0	0	-241
developer profit		1611	1 255	C 117	1.	136 -3	3	267 -2	987 -2	703 -2 F	113 -2 11	7 -1 816	-1 509	-1197	477-	-243	1 941	4 165	4 165	4 165	4 164
ward to RV calc		2	2224		3	<u>8</u>	5	i i	4 22	Ĩ	4 2	2	2221- 2221-	5		P.	5	2 F	B F	2 F	5 F

SITE 1A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 1B: Notional site Palmersville





		La	pu																			
										Ξ	erate	to acl	hieve	20.0%	6 prof	it						
																			Hecta	re		
											Affol	rdable		No	afforc	lable	Affc	ordable	ے ہ	lo affo	rdabl	e e
		Lai	nd pur	chase	price					Ъ	-1,07	74,662		~	11,2	04						
		л Л	' per a	cre						ы	-86	,982			57,56	4	£3	14,93	2	£142	241	
		De	v profit							с и	4,37	6,916		Ð,	080,5	524						
		To	tal cos	ts						ц	23,04	41,519	6	25	,415,	720						
		pro	ofit as	% of (costs						19.	%00			19.99	%						
Programm	le	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4 Ve.	ar 5 21 Q	2	3 Q4	TOTA	TA
Units	Market housing			9.6	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	.0 0.	0.0 0.0	150	20.4
started	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			1.9 0.2	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	2.6 0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	00 Sec.	3.8
	Aff shared oship Aff other			0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	ri G (3.8
	IUIAL	Þ	5	71	9 <u>1</u>	9 <u>1</u>	9]	10	9]	01	9]	91	10	0[91	5	5			-	186	20.0
Units built	Market housing			0	0	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	0	15	150
+20	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			00	00	0 0	<i>т</i> о	т 0 М	т 0 М	т 0 М	т 0 М	т 0 М	т 0 0	ю 0	т 0 М	т 0 М	т 0 0	0.0	00	00	90 4	6 4
	Aff shared oship Aff other			00	0 0	00	00	0 0	0 0	00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	00	00	40	40
Units	Market housing				0	0	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	15	150
+3Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship				0000	0000	000	m o o a	~ 0 0 0	m 0 0 0	~ 0 0 0	m 0 0 0	~ 0 0 0	~ 0 0 0	m 0 0 0	m 0 0 0	m 0 0 0	000	0000	0000	<u>6440</u>	8440
Units	Market housing				5	00	00	10	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	3	3	0	15	50
ourchased +4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship					000	000	000		<i>m</i> 0 0	<i>m</i> 0 0		<i>т</i> о с	<i>m</i> 0 0	<i>m</i> 0 0	е O С	е O С		800	000	<u>6</u> 4 4	6 4 4
	Aff other					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	50	50	0 0	0 0	0 0		00	00	10	4 0

TOTALS			24,593	2, 1 10 339	369	-886	27,417		100	G/0,1- 0	-30	-1,104	13,526 2 705	338	338	0	845	17,753	1 287	0,407	2,574	1,775	206	1,981 389	389	95 38	0	132 886	22,612	4,805			-430	4 376	4,5,4 0
Q4			0 0		000	0	0	ľ					0 0	• •	0	0	0		c	5		0	0	0			0	0	•	0	4,377	4,377	0.00%	4 377	4,514
63			0 0		000	0	0						0 0	00	0	0	0		c	5		0	0	0			0	0	0	0	4,377	4,377	0.00%	4 377	4,0,4
Q2			2,093	180	31	-75	2,333						0 0	00	0	0	0		c	5		0	0	0			0	75	75	2,258	2,038	4,296	7.50% 81	4 377	4,0,4
Year 5 Q1			2,093	1 <u>8</u> 0	۶	-75	2,333						0 0	0 0	0	0	0		c	5		0	0	0			0	75	75	2,258	-257	2,001	7.50% 38	2 038	2,000
Q4			2,093	18U 29	31	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		c	5		151	0	0			0	75	1,737	596	-849	-253	7.50% -5	-257	107-
Q3			2,093	180 29	31	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		c	5		151	0	0			0	75	1,737	596	-1,429	-833	7.50% -16	-849	640
8			2,093	180	۶	-75	2,333	Î					1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	თ	33			0	75	1,889	445	-1,847	-1,403	7.50% -26	-1 429	-1,443
Year 4 Q1			2,093	29	- £	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	75	1,889	445	-2,258	-1,813	7.50% -34	-1 847	- 1,041
Q4			2,093	180	31	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	75	1,889	445	-2,661	-2,217	7.50% -42	-2 258	007'7-
0 3			2,093	180	۶	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	თ	33			0	75	1,889	445	-3,057	-2,612	7.50% -49	-2 661	- 2,00
õ			2,093	180	- £	-75	2,333	Î					1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	75	1,889	445	-3,445	-3,001	7.50% -56	-3 057	100.0-
Year 3 Q1			2,093	180	- £	-75	2,333						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	75	1,889	445	-3,826	-3,382	7.50% -63	-3 445	5 1 1 1 1 1 1
Q4			2,093	180	31	-75	2,333	Î					1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	75	1,889	445	-4,201	-3,756	7.50% -70	-3 876	- 2,040
Q 3			1,570	22	54	-57	1,750						1,151 230	29	29	0	72		110	2		151	ი	33			0	57	1,870	-120	4,003	4,123	7.50% -77	4 201	- R f
Q2			0 0		000	0	0						1,151 230	50	59	0	72		110	2		151	ი	ß			0	0	1,813	-1,813	-2,116	-3,930	7.50% -74	4 003	200 †
Year 2 Q1			0 0		000	0	0						863 173	22	22	0	54		110	2		113	ი	33			0	0	1,398	-1,398	-679	-2,077	7.50% -39	-2 116	-2,110
Q4			0 0		000	0	0	,					0 0	0	0	0	0	000	322 110	2		0	35	33			0	0	499	-499	-168	-667	7.50% -13	679	6 / O-
63			0 0		000	0	0						0 0	0	0	0	0	000	222 87	70		0	32	25		32	0	0	493	-493	328	-165	7.50% -3	-168	001-
Q2			0 0			0	0						0 0	00	0	0	0	000	220		,	0	26			32		0	379	-379	701	321	7.50% 6	378	070
Year 1 Q1			0 0			0	0	,		G/0,1- 0	-30		0 0	00	0	0	0	000	222		b	0	26			32 38	3	0	-688	688	0	688	7.50% 13	704	ē
rate								ļ									5.0%) 00 F	7 20%	/.3%	20	10.0%	8.0%			£503 £200	£0						7.50%		
	-	ME	ing sales Market housing	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship	Aff shared oship	Sales fees	income		-	Land acquisition Stamp duty	Purchase fees	Total	costs Market housing	Affordable sh oship	Aff shared oship	Aff other	Build contingency	Total	OSIS Uptront	build related Ahnormals	Total	Fees on build costs	Fees on dev costs	l otal Planning gain	Total	Planning	Marketing	Total fees b/forward from above	costs	rofit/loss from quarter	loss bf from last quarter	lative profit/loss	ist Charged at Total	ulative developer profit	ad forward to RV calc

SITE 1B CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 1C: Notional site Whitley Bay South



Input assumptions Sc	enario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% so	cial rented 20% inte	ermediate					
Noth Turnella offer offer									
North I yneside site vlability	study	Dwellings							
Site details				ave floor spa	ace	build	build	sales	
Site 1C notional		Dwellings		gross	net	cost	INDEX =	value	
Area ha 5.00		Market housing	50.4 80.00%	1.022	991	88.00	88.00	189.00	
acres 12.36		0				0.0%			
No dwgs 188		Affordable soc rent 3	0.1 16.00%	1,022	991	88.00	88.00	71.00	
Density dw/ha 37.6		Aff intermediate rent	3 8 2 00%	1 022	001	0.0%	88.00	101 00	
			0.00.2	1,022	- 66	0.0%	00.00	00.101	
		Aff shared oship	3.8 2.00%	1,022	991	88.00	88.00	111.00	
		Aff other	0.0	C	С	0.0%	88.00	00.0	
	£k								
Contingency	0.45	Total 18	88.0 100.00%	192,136	186,308	ł	16,907,968	£31,076,174	
allowance 0.00%	040	Floorspace density	= 15,080 net	t sq ft per acre					
Development costs									
standard % build 14.50%	2,574	Other costs							
		Planning	503.2	£ per dwellin	ŋ				
		Survey	500	£ per dwellin	ŋ				
plus abnormals 0.0%	0								
		Marketing	C	f ner dwellin	c				
Total 15%		D	,		ņ				
Design fees	1 775	Interact							
		% per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	206								
		Notes							
Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	389								

		Land																		
									Itera	te to a	chiev	e 20.0	% pro	fit						
									Δţ	fordab	<u>a</u>	Z	n affor	aldeb	Δff	ordah	Hect	are No aff	ordah	٩
		Land pur	chase p	orice					- - -	188,45	l R		3,367,	077			2	5	500	2
		RV per a	icre						ц ц	96,195]		272,5	527	27 7	37,69	œ	£67	3,415	10
		Dev profi	ţ.						بہ 4	967,76	80	4,	5,820,	169						
		Total cos	sts						£ 26	,109,7	56	2	9,102	,752						
		profit as	% of c	osts						9.03%	,0		20.00	%(
Programm	e	Year 1			Year 2			Yea	r 3			Year 4				Year 5				
5		Q1 Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	03	4 0	1 Q2	0 3	Q4	<u>6</u>	Q2	63	Q4	61	Q2	Q 3	Q4 TI	OTALS
Units started	Market housing		9.6	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8 12	2.8 12	.8 12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	12.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.4
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other		1.9 0.2 0.0	2.6 0.3 0	2.6 0.3 0.3	2.6 0.3 0.0	2.6 0.3 0.3 0.3	0000	6 2.6 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3	2.6 0.3 0.3	2.6 0.3 0.3	2.6 0.3 0.3	2.6 0.3 0.3	0.0	0.0 0 0	0.0 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.1 3.8 3.8 0.0
	TOTAL	0	12	16	16	16	16 1	6 1(3 16	16	16	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	188.0
Units 'built'	Market housing		0	0	10	13	13 1	3 10	3 13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	0	0	150
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship		000	000	N O O	m 0 0			m 0 0	m 0 0	m 0 0	moo	m 0 0	m 0 0	<i>m</i> 0 0	000	000	000	000	30 4 4
Units	Aff other Market housing		0	00	00	0	13 1.	0 22	13	13	13	13	0	0	13	0 13	00	0 0	00	0 150
completed +3Q	Affordable soc rent			0	0	5	. m	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	т	ო	ო	ო	ო	ო	ო	ო	0	0	0	30
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000	000		000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	440
Units	Market housing				0	0	10 1	3 10	3 13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	0	0	150
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship				000	000	N 0 0		m 0 0	m O O	~ 0 0	m o o	m 0 0	m 0 0	~ o o		m 0 0	000	000	30 4 4
	Aff other				~	•	•			•	•	•	~	~		<		<		•

SITE 1C LAND COST & PHASING

TOTALS	28,170 2,116 376 414	-1,013	31.076		1,188 48 33 1,269	13,526 2 705	338	338	845	17,753 1,287	0	2,5/4 1,775	206 1,981 389	389	0 95 0 45 0	189 1,013	25,168		5,908			-942	4,966
Q4	00000	0	c			00	0	0 0	00	¢	>	0	0 0)	0	0	0		•	4,968	4,968	0.00% 0	4,968
Q3	00000	Ð	c			0 0	0	0 0	0	c	5	0	o c	,	0	0	0		•	4,968	4,968	0.00% 0	4,968
Q2	2,397 180 32 35 0	92 22	2.645			00	0	0 0	00	c	5	0	0 0	•	0	86	86		2,559	2,318	4,876	7.50% 91	4,968
Year 5 Q1	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645			0 0	0	0 0	00	c	5	0	0 0	,	0	86	86		2,559	-284	2,275	7.50% 43	2,318
Q4	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645			1,151 230	29	29	72	¢	5	151	0 0	>	0	86	1,748		897	-1,175	-279	7.50% -5	-284
Q3	2,397 180 32 35 0	99	2.645			1,151 230	29	50	72	c	5	151	0 0	,	0	86	1,748		897	-2,050	-1,154	7.50% -22	-1,175
Q2	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645	ſ		1,151 230	29	59	72	011	0	151	ი წ	8	0	86	1,900	:	745	-2,758	-2,013	7.50% -38	-2,050
Year 4 Q1	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645			1,151 230	29	59	72		2	151	ი წ	8	0	86	1,900	1	745	-3,452	-2,707	7.50% -51	-2,758
Q4	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645	r F		1,151 230	29	5 ² 0	72		011	151	6 E	3	0	86	1,900	1	745	-4,134	-3,389	7.50% -64	-3,452
Q3	2,397 180 32 35 0	99 99	2.645			1,151 230	29	50	72		2	151	6 E	8	0	86	1,900	1	745	-4,803	-4,058	7.50% -76	4,134
0 2	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645	ľ		1,151 230	29	50	72		2	151	6 E	8	0	86	1,900	1	745	-5,460	4,715	7.50% -88	-4,803
Year 3 Q1	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645			1,151 230	29	50	72		2	151	6 E	8	0	86	1,900	1	745	-6,105	-5,359	7.50% -100	-5,460
Q4	2,397 180 32 35 0	-86	2.645	ſ		1,151 230	29	29	72	0.11	0	151	9 33	2	0	86	1,900	1	745	-6,738	-5,992	7.50% -112	-6,105
Q3	1,798 135 24 26 0	-65	1.984			1,151 230	29	50	72		2	151	6 E	8	0	65	1,878		106	-6,719	-6,614	7.50% -124	-6,738
Q2	00000	0	c			1,151 230	8	°2	72		2	151	6 E	3	0	0	1,813		-1,813	-4,782	-6,595	7.50% -124	-6,719
Year 2 Q1	00000	0	c			863 173	22	52	54		2	113	6 E	8	0	0	1,398		-1,398	-3,296	-4,694	7.50% -88	-4,782
Q4	00000	0	o	•		00	0	0 0	00	322	011	0	35 33	2	0	0	499		-499	-2,737	-3,236	7.50% -61	-3,296
Q3	00000	0	c			00	0	0 0	00	322	82	0	32 25	2	32	0	493		-493	-2,194	-2,686	7.50% -50	-2,737
Q2	00000	0	c			00	0	0 0	00	322 2	00	0	8		33	0	379		-379	-1,774	-2,153	7.50% -40	-2, 194
Year 1 Q1	00000	0	c		1,188 48 33	0 0	00	0 0	00	322 2	00	0	26		32 94	0	1,742		-1,742	0	-1,742	7.50% -33	-1,774
rate									5.0%	7.3%	/.3% 0%	10.0%	8.0%		£503 £500 £0							7.50%	
	 Market housing Affordable soc rent Affordable so sohip Aff shared oship Aff other 	Sales tees	g		Land acquisition Stamp duty Purchase fees Total	Market housing	Affordable sh oship	Aff shared oship	Build contingency	Total Upfront	Build related Abnormals	Fees on build costs	Fees on dev costs Total Planning gain	Total	Planning Survey Marketing	Total b/forward from above			oss from quarter	f from last quarter	orofit/loss	Charged at Total	e developer profit vard to RV calc
	IN COME Housing sale		Total incom	COSTS	Land	Build costs				Dev costs		Fees	C A	0	Other	Sales fees	Total costs	-	Net profit/lc	Profit/loss b	Cumulative p	Interest	Cumulative carried forv

SITE 1C CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 2A Holyfields





		Land																			
									E	erate	to act	nieve	20.0%	o prof	ij			:			
										Affor	dable		No	afford	lable	Affc	rdabl	Hecta e	are No affo	rdab	le
		Land pu	urchase	price					£	1,41	7,602		, Э	056,7	'90						
		RV per	acre						ч	143	,424		(*)	309,20	96	£3	54,40	-	£764	.,197	
		Dev pro	lit						£	3,77	7,513		4,	412,1	21						
		Total co	sts e % of						ц Ц	19,81	11,11	~ [. 22	,057,	686						
				2000							212				2						
Programm	ø	Year 1 Q1 Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	ď3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4 Y	ear 5 Q1	Q2	23 Q	4 10	DTALS
Units	Market housing		8.0	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	120.0
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship		1.6 0.2 0.2	2.2 0.3 0.3	0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0.0	0.00	000	24.0 3.0 3.0									
	Aff other TOTAL	0	0 <u>.</u> 0	14	0.0	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	0.0 150.0
Units 'huilt'	Market housing		0	0	œ	11	1	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0	0	0		120
+20	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship		000	000	N 0 C	NOC	000	N 0 0	N 0 0	N 0 0	000	N 0 0	N 0 0	N 0 0	N 0 0	000	000	000	000	0.0.0	24 3 9 5
Units	Aff other Market housing		0	00	00	00	0	0	0 [0	0	0 [1	0	11	0	00	00	00		0 120
completed +3Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable soc rent			00	00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	00	00		24 3
	Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	00	000	000	00	0 0		0 0 0
Units	Market housing				0	0	ω	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0		120
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship				00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0.0	24 3
	Aff shared oship Aff other				00	00	00	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0.0	т 0 М

SITE 2A LAND COST & PHASING

Matrix Matrix<		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	03	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4 Y	ear 4 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4 Y6	ear 5 Q1 C	22 0	33	14 TC	TALS
1 1																							
1 0			c	c	c	c	c	c	423	1 002	1 00.7	1 992	1 992	1	1	1	aa2	1	002	-	_	ć	1 345
I I			0	0	0	0	0	0	109	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	0		1	,633
Image: black Image: black <th< td=""><th>_</th><td></td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>20</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>27</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td><td>295</td></th<>	_		0	0	0	0	0	0	20	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27	0	0		295
I I			0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 C	0g c	08 0	0 c	0g c	<u> </u>	08 0	02 0	09 C		80				321
1 1			0	0	0	0	0	0	-51	-72	-72	-72	-72	-72	-72	-72	-72 -	-72 -	-72	0	0		768
1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 0																							
1 1			•	0	0	•	0	0	,573 2	,202 2	2,202	2,202 2	202 2	202 2	,202 2	202 2	202 2,	202 2,	,202	0		3	3,593
1 1																							
144 144 25% 6 </td <th></th> <td></td>																							
57 57<			1,418							_												-	,418
10 10<			57																				57
1 0			39																				39
1 0																						-	,513
0 0			0	0	0	0	682	955	955	955	955	955	955	955	955	955 (955	0	0	0	0	= 0	0,227
20% 0 0 0 1 24 <th></th> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>136</td> <td>191</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>,045</td>			0	0	0	0	136	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	191	0	0	0	0	0	,045
25% 0			0	0	0	0	17	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	0	0	0		256
28% 0			0	0	0	0	17	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	256
258 0							: c			; -	; <		; -	; <	; <		; -						
4.50 0		101 0		- c			5 6	0.00	5 6	5	0 0	5 6	0.00	5 6			0.00						
6 6% 2 1 <th></th> <td>%0.7</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>17</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>ۍ ۲</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>30</td> <td>-</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> <td>•</td> <td>320</td>		%0.7	5	5	5	5	17	30	30	30	30	30	30	ۍ ۲	30	30	30	-	5	5	5	•	320
0000 0		5 80/	224	100	100	100																-	001,00
		0.0%	- - -	- 	59	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	83	C	0	0	C	0	0		884
		%0		- c	8	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	8	3	8	5	b	,	,	b	, ,	,	
0 0		2	,	,																		-	769
10% 18 19 2 2 2 1 7 7 7 7 7 7 0 <th>ş</th> <td>10.0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>87</td> <td>122</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>, L</td> <td>310</td>	ş	10.0%	0	0	0	0	87	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	122	0	0	0	0	, L	310
kto 22 23 24	6	8.0%	18	18	22	24	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0		142
																						-	,452
					21	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0		311
																							311
E200 30 10 0 <th></th> <td>£480</td> <td>24</td> <td>24</td> <td>24</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td>72</td>		£480	24	24	24					_													72
60 0		£200	30																				30
we 0		£0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$										-	-	1	1		;	;			1				102
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	ove		0,00	0			0.0	0	1.0	7/	71	7/ 1/2	12	1 202	7/	12	12		12				/68
1 1			1,806	263	347	35/	1,079	,463	,515 1	, 535	1,535	1,535 1	1,535 1	,535 1	,535 1	,41/ 1,	417	27	12	D		Ê	9,018
1 1.806 -263 -347 -357 -1,079 -1,463 58 667 667 667 667 785 785 21,30 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3																							
0 -1,840 -2,142 -2,636 -5,947 -4,101 -5,669 -5,144 -4,560 -3,966 -3,961 -2,745 -1,1366 -582 1,578 3,778			-1.806	-263	-347	- 357 -	1.079 -	1.463	58	667	667	667	667	367	. 299	785	785 2.	130 2.	130	0		4	576
0 -1,840 -2,142 -2,536 -2,947 -4,101 -5,669 -5,144 -4,560 -3,966 -3,961 -2,145 -1,156 -682 1,578 3,778																							
7.50% 2.410 2.611 5.041 <td< td=""><th></th><td></td><td>0</td><td>-1,840</td><td>-2,142 -:</td><td>2,536</td><td>-2,947</td><td>4,101 -</td><td>5,669 -5</td><td>5,716 -</td><td>-5,144 -</td><td>4,560 -:</td><td>3,966 -3</td><td>1,361 -2</td><td>2,745 -2</td><td>.,117 -1</td><td>,356 -{</td><td>582 1,</td><td>,578 3,</td><td>778 3,7</td><td>778 3,</td><td>78</td><td></td></td<>			0	-1,840	-2,142 -:	2,536	-2,947	4,101 -	5,669 -5	5,716 -	-5,144 -	4,560 -:	3,966 -3	1,361 -2	2,745 -2	.,117 -1	,356 -{	582 1,	,578 3,	778 3,7	778 3,	78	
7.50% 7.50% <td< td=""><th></th><td></td><td>-1 806</td><td>-2 103</td><td>-2 489</td><td>2 803</td><td>4 026</td><td>5 565</td><td>5 611 _F</td><td>5 040</td><td>4 477</td><td>3 804</td><td>3 290 -2</td><td>604 -2</td><td>- 11</td><td>330</td><td>571 1</td><td>548 3</td><td>708 3</td><td>778 3.7</td><td>78 3.</td><td>78</td><td></td></td<>			-1 806	-2 103	-2 489	2 803	4 026	5 565	5 611 _F	5 040	4 477	3 804	3 290 -2	604 -2	- 11	330	571 1	548 3	708 3	778 3.7	78 3.	78	
7:50% 0:00% 0:00% <td< td=""><th></th><td></td><td>0001</td><td></td><td>00t't-</td><td>2000</td><td>070't</td><td>2000</td><td></td><td>25.5</td><td></td><td>500</td><td>0.400</td><td>500</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td></td><td>ŝ</td><td>, ,</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>2</td><td></td></td<>			0001		00t't-	2000	070't	2000		25.5		500	0.400	500	0	-		ŝ	, ,	5	5	2	
-34 -39 -47 -54 -75 -104 -105 -95 -84 -73 -62 -51 -39 -25 -11 29 70 0 0 0 79 -1,840 -2,142 -2,536 -2,947 -4,101 -5,669 -5,716 -5,144 -4,560 -3,361 -2,745 -2,117 -1,356 -582 1,578 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,776 3,776		7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50% 7	.50% 7	7.50% 7	.50% 7	.20% 7.	.50% 7	7.50% 7	7.50% 7	.50% 7.	50% 7.	50% 7	50% 7.	50% 7.	50% 7.	50% 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0%	
-1,840 -2,142 -2,536 -2,947 -4,101 -5,669 -5,144 -4,560 -3,966 -3,361 -2,745 -2,117 -1,356 -582 1,578 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,776			-34	-39	-47	5	-75	-104	-105	-95	-84	-73	-62	-51	-39	-25	÷	50	70	0	0		799
-1,840 -2,142 -2,536 -2,947 -4,101 -5,669 -5,716 -5,144 -4,560 -3,966 -3,361 -2,745 -2,117 -1,356 -582 1,578 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,778 3,776 3,776																							
			-1,840	-2,142	-2,536 -;	2,947 -	4,101	5,669 -	5,716 -£	5,144 -	4,560 -	-3,966 -3	3,361 -2	,745 -2	.,117 -1	,356 -	582 1,	,578 3,	,778 3,	778 3,	778 3,	78 3	,776
														_									

SITE 2A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 2B: Notional site Dudley



Input assumptions s	Scenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% socia	I rented 20% inte	ermediate					
North Tyneside site viability	y study	Dwellings							
Site details Site 2 notional	il Dudley	Dwellings		ave floor sp gross	ace net	build cost	build INDEX =	sales value	
Area ha 4.00		Market housing 120.	0 80.00%	<u>sq π</u> 991	<u>sq п</u> 972	<u>per sq π</u> 86.00	1. <i>00</i> 0 86.00	рег sq п 161.00	
Acres 9.88 No dwgs 150		Affordable soc rent 24.0	16.00%	991	972	0.0% 86.00	86.00	70.00	
Density dw/ha 37.5		Aff intermediate rent 3.0	2.00%	991	972	0.0% 86.00	86.00	91.00	
		Aff shared oship 3.0	2.00%	991	972	0.0% 86.00	86.00	00.66	
		Aff other 0.0	0.00%	0	0	0.0% 86.00	86.00	00.0	
Contingency	£K	Total 150.	0 100.00%	148,650	145,800		212,783,900	£20,966,040	
allowance 2.50%	320	Floorspace density	= 14,751 net	t sq ft per acre	6				
Development costs									
standard % build 13.50%	1,769	Other costs Planning	480.0	£ per dwellir	Ď				
plus abnomals 0.0%	0	Survey	200	£ per dwellir	Ď				
Total 14%		Marketing	0	£ per dwellir	D				
Design fees on build costs 10.0%	1,310	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	142	Notes							
Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	311								

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

		Lan	σ																			
										E	terate	to ac	hieve	20.0	% pro	lit			Hort tot	c.o		
											Affo	rdable		N	affor	dable	Aft	ordab	le le	No aff	ordab	ole
		Land	d purc	hase p	rice					£	-24	2,269			,120,	933						
		RVF	ber ac	Ð						ч	-24	1,511			113,4	60	မု	60,56	~	£28(0,233	~
		Dev	profit							ч	3,36	1,169	•	(Y)	,884,	675						
		Tota	l cost	<i>с</i> о 2						ц	17,6	06,14	ဖြ	÷[9,409	608	_					
		prot	It as	% OT C	OSIS						L I S	.U3%			20.02	2/0						
ogramm	9	Year 1 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	d 3	Q4	Year 5 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4 T	OTALS
Units	Market housing			8.0	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	120.0
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			1.6 0.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0 3.0
	Arr snared osnip Aff other TOTAL	0	•	10	0.0	0.0 14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 14	0.0 14	0.0 14	0.0	0.0 14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0 0.0 150.0
Units	Market housing			0	0	œ	11	11	7	1	1	1	7	11	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	120
+20	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other			0000	0000	N 0 0 C	N O O C	N 0 0 C	N 0 0 C	N O O C	N 0 0 C	N O O C	N 0 0 C	N O O C	0000	NOOC	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	24 0 3 3 24
Units mpleted	Market housing				0	0	ω	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	120
+30	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other				0000	0000	0000	0000	0005	0005	0000	0000	0005	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	24 3 0
Units urchased	Market housing					0	0	ω	11	1	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0	0	120
44Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other					0000		N O O O	~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~	N O O O	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~ ~	~ ~ ~ ~	0000	0000	0000	54 0 % %

SITE 2B LAND COST & PHASING

TOTALS	18,779 1,633 265 289 0	-677	20,966	-242 0	-7 -249	10,227	2,045 256	256	320	13,103 884	884 0	1,769 1,310	142 1,452	311 311	30	0 102	677	17,165	3,802			-442	3,360
Q4	00000	0	0			0 1	00	00	00		0	0	0	0		0	0	•	0	3,361	3,361	0.00% 0	3,361
Q3	00000	0	0			0	00	00	00		0	0	0	0		0	0	•	0	3,361	3,361	0.00% 0	3,361
Q2	00000	0	0			0	00	00	00		0	0	0	0		0	0	•	0	3,361	3,361	0.00% 0	3,361
Year 5 Q1	1,753 152 25 27	-63	1,957			0	0 0	00	00		0	0	0	0		0	63	63	1,894	1,406	3,299	7.50% 62	3,361
Q4	1,753 152 25 27	-63	1,957			0	00	00	00		0	0	0	0		0	63	63	1,894	-514	1,380	7.50% 26	1,406
Q 3	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	30		0	122	0	0		0	63	1,408	548	-1,053	-505	7.50% -9	-514
Q2	1,753 152 25 27	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	30		0	122	0	0		0	63	1,408	548	-1,582	-1,034	7.50% -19	-1,053
Year 4 Q1	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	3 0		83	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-1,983	-1,553	7.50% -29	-1,582
Q4	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	30		833	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-2,377	-1,947	7.50% -37	-1,983
Q3	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	54	3 0		83	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-2,764	-2,333	7.50% -44	-2,377
Q2	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	3 0		83	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-3,143	-2,713	7.50% -51	-2,764
Year 3 Q1	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	3 0		83	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-3,516	-3,085	7.50% -58	-3,143
Q4	1,753 152 25 27 0	-63	1,957			955	191 24	24	30		83	122	2	29		0	63	1,527	430	-3,881	-3,451	7.50% -65	-3,516
Q 3	1,252 109 18 0	45	1,398			955	191 24	24	3 0		83	122	2	29		0	45	1,509	-111	-3,699	-3,810	7.50% -71	-3,881
Q2	00000	0	0			955	191 24	24	8		ŝ	122	2	59		0	0	1,463	-1,463	-2,168	-3,631	7.50% -68	-3,699
Year 2 Q1	00000	0	0			682	136	4	21		83	87	2	29		0	0	1,079	-1,079	-1,049	-2,128	7.50% -40	-2,168
Q4	00000	0	0			0	00	00	00	221	83	0	24	29		0	0	357	-357	-673	-1,030	7.50% -19	-1,049
Q3	00000	0	0			0	00	00	00	221	20	0	22	21	24	0	0	347	-347	-313	-660	7.50% -12	-673
Q2	00000	0	0			0	00	00	00	221	00	0	8		24		0	263	-263	-45	-307	7.50% -6	-313
Year 1 Q1	00000	0	0	-242 0	L-	0	00	00	00	221	00	0	18		24 30		0	44	4	0	44	7.50% -1	45
rate									2.5%	6.8%	6.8% 0%	10.0%	8.0%		£480 £200	£0						7.50%	
	Market housing Market housing Affordable so crent Affordable sh oship Aff other	Sales fees		Land acquisition Stamp duty	Purchase fees Total	Market housing	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship	Aff shared oship	Build contingency	Total Upfront	Build related Abnormals	Fees on build costs	Fees on dev costs Total	Planning gain Total	Planning Survev	Marketing Total	b/forward from above		trom quarter	om last quarter	fit/loss	Charged at Total	eveloper profit rd to RV calc
	IN COME Housing sales		Total income	COSTS Land		Build costs				Dev costs		Fees		PG	Other		Sales fees	Total costs	Net profit/loss	Profit/loss bf fr	Cumulative pro	Interest	Cumulative du carried forwar

SITE 2B CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 2C: Notional site Longbenton



And Transmission And Transmission And Transmission And Transmission Image: Section of the sectin of the secting of the section of the section of the se	Input assumptions	Scenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% so	cial rented 20% inte	srmediate					
	Notth Tunneldo efter vite		Duralline							
Statution Statution <t< th=""><th>North I yneside site vlabill:</th><th>rty study</th><th>Dwellings</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></t<>	North I yneside site vlabill:	rty study	Dwellings							
$ \begin{array}{cccc} \mbox{in classes} & in classe$	Site details	ol anchonton	Ducollinee		ave floor sp	ace	build	build - >= Carton	sales	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} \mbox{is} & \mbo$	Longbent		spinner		gruss sq ft	sq ft	per sq ft	1.000	value per sq ft	
$ \begin{array}{cccccc} \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0$	Area ha 4.00		Market housing 12	20.0 80.00%	991	972	86.00	86.00	167.00	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	No dwore acres 9.88	_	Affordable coc rent	10 16 00%	001	070	0.0%	BE DD	20.00	
$ \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Density dw/ha 37.5	_		N/00/01	100	216	0.0%	00.00	00.07	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} E_{\rm classical control cont$			Aff intermediate rent	3.0 2.00%	991	972	86.00	86.00	91.00	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $				/000 C	100	020	0.0%	00.00	0000	
$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$				0.0 2.00%	991	312	0.0%	00.00	99.00	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			Aff other	0.0%	0	0	86.00	86.00	00.0	
allowance 500% Bowloment costs Porspace density Density 1.812 Density 1.82	Contingency	£K	Total	20.0 100.00%	148.650	145.800		£12.783.900	£21.665.880	
Portopment costs Portopment (13.50%) 1.812 Portopment (13.50%) Development (13.50%) 1.812 Portopment (13.50%) 1.812 Development (13.50%) 1.812 Portopment (13.50%) 1.812 Development (13.50%) 1.812 Portopment (13.50%) 1.812 Development (13.50%) 1.812 200 E per dweling Dial 1.942 200 E per dweling Dial 1.342 Marketing 0 Dial 1.342 Der dweling Dial 2.003 1.35 Dial 2.003 1.35 Dial 2.003 1.35	allowance 5.00%	639		2000	0000	0000			00000	
Development costs sandard % build 1312 Development costs sandard % build 1,312 Development costs sandard % build 1,312 Defense also abromation 0.0 Deal 1,45 Deal 200 E per dweling Data 0.0 Deal 0.0 <th></th> <th></th> <th>Floorspace density</th> <th>= 14,751 net</th> <th>t sq ft per acr</th> <th>(I)</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>			Floorspace density	= 14,751 net	t sq ft per acr	(I)				
$ \begin{array}{cccc} \mbox{Periodication} & 1:12 & \mbox{Pariator} & \mbox{Pariator} & 1:12 & \mbox{Pariator} & Pari$										
sindard % build 1,812 1,812 1,812 0% 0 E per dwelling plus abromats 0.0% 0 E per dwelling plus abromats 0.0% 0 E per dwelling plus abromats 0.0% 0 E per dwelling rotation 1,342 Marketing 0 E per dwelling no dev costs 0% 1,342 0% 20% E per dwelling no dev costs 0% 1,342 0% 2.0% E per dwelling Planting gain 2.070 3.1 3.19 0 0	Development costs									
Other costs Other costs 480 E per dweling Pus ahomals 0% 20 E per dweling Pus 14% 20 E per dweling Total 14% 0 E per dweling Pasign fea 0 E per dweling on dev costs 8% 1,342 modev costs 8% 1,342 Planing gain 2,070 3,13 Planing gain 2,070 3,13	standard % build 13.50%	1,812								
plus abnormals 00% 0 Survey 200 E per dweling Total 14% Markeing 0 E per dweling Total 14% 0 E per dweling Design fees 0 E per dweling On dev costs 8% 145 Planning gain 2.070 311			Other costs Planning	480.0	£ per dwelli	DL				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			5		-)				
Total 14% Marketing D E per dwelling Design feas on buid costs 1.342 Marketing 0 E per dwelling on buid costs 10% 1.342 Marketing 0 on dev costs 8% 145 7.50% Panning gai 311 Notes	plus abnormals 0.0%	0	Survey	200	£ per dwelli	вu				
Total 14% Total 14% Design fees Interest on build costs 100% 132 Interest on dev costs 8% 145 7.50% Planning gain 2.070 319 Notes		,								
Total 14% Beign fest on build costs 10.0% 1.342 Interest on dev costs 8% 145 T.50% On dev costs 8% 145 T.50% Planning gain 2.070 311 Otots			Marketing	0	£ per dwelli	bu				
Design fees Index costs I.342 Interest on build costs 10.0% 1.342 Interest on dev costs 8% 145 Interest on dev costs 8% 145 Interest Planning gain 2.070 311 Interest	Total 14%									
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Design fees									
on dev costs 8% 145 Planning gain 2.070 311	ON DUIID COSTS 10.0%	1,342	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
Planning gain Notes £ per dwelling 2.070 311 311	on dev costs 8%	145								
Planning gain 2.070 311 £ per dwelling 2.070 311			Notes							
	Planning gain 2,070 £ per dwelling 2,070	311								

		-																		
		Land																		
									Itera	te to a	chiev	e 20.0	% pro	fit						
									Ąf	fordabl	<u>e</u>	ž	o affor	dable	Aff	ordabl	Hecta e	ure Vo affo	rdabl	٩
		Land pur	chase p	rice				4		08,27			,342,	319						
		RV per a	cre					4		10,955			135,8	207	ૡ૽ૣ	27,070	~	£335	580	
		Dev profi	Ŧ					4	ຕົ	160,06	0	7	l,030,	149						
		Total cos	ts					4	۲ 18,	207,0	95	2	0,121	,438						
		profit as	% of c	osts					-	9.00%	•		20.03	8%						
Due a se		Veer 1			Voor 0			Vacu	c			Voce 4			2	Sour E			_	
Programm		q1 Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2 (ð 33		о С С	0 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1 0	22	23 Q4	тот.	TALS
Units	Market housing		8.0	11.2	11.2	11.2 1	1.2 11.	2 11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12(0.0
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship		1.6 0.2 0.2	2.0 0.3 0.3	2.2 0.3 0.3	00.3 2	23332	0.3 2	2.2 0.3 0.3	0.3 0.3 0.3	2.2 0.3 0.3	2.2 0.3 0.3	0.0 0.0	0.0 0 0	0.0	0.000	0.0.0	0.0.0	25 m m c	4.0
	TOTAL	0	10	14	14	14	14 14	14	14	14	14	14	0	0	0	0	-	0		0.0
Units 'built'	Market housing		0	0	ω	11	11 11	-1	11	1	11	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	12	20
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship		00	0 0	0 0	0 13	0 2	00	NC	~ 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	00	00	Ň ^{e,}	54
	Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000			000	000	000		000	000	000	000	000			0.00
Units	Market housing		b	0	0	ω	11 11		7	7	11	1	4	7) [0			12	20
+30	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			0 0	0 0	0 0	0 7	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	00	00	۳ 'n	34
	Aff shared oship Aff other			00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	<i></i> 0	<i>т</i> 0
Units	Market housing				0	0	8 11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0	12	20
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship				0 0	00	0 2	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	00	° °	34
	Aff shared oship				0 0	00	00	00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	00	0	0		

SITE 2C LAND COST & PHASING

Q4 TOTALS	0 19,479 0 1,633 0 265 0 289 0 289 0 289	0 21,666	-108 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30 -30		13,423 906 906	1,812 0 1,342 0 145	0 0 3311 311 311 311 311	0 701 0 17,725	0 3,941	3,460 3,460	0.00% -482	3,460 3,459
Q 3	00000	• •		000000	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	0	3,460 3,460	0.00% 0	3,460
Q2	00000	• •		000000	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	0	3,460 3,460	0.00% 0	3,460
Year 5 Q1	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		000000	0	00	0 0	65 65	1,957	1,440 3,396	7.50% 64	3,460
Q4	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		000000) O	00	0 0	65 65	1,957	-544 1,413	7.50% 26	1,440
Q 3	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 955 24 0 60	3 0	125 0	0 0	65 1,444	579	-1,112 -534	7.50% -10	-544
Q2	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 955 24 60 0	3 0	125 0	0 0	65 1,444	579	-1,671 -1,092	7.50% -20	-1,112
Year 4 Q1	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 955 24 0 60	85 0	125 7	0 58	65 1,564	458	-2,098 -1,640	7.50% -31	-1,671
Q4	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 191 24 60	85 0	125 7	0 50	65 1,564	458	-2,518 -2,060	7.50% -39	-2,098
Q 3	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 191 24 0 60	82 00	125 7	0 50	65 1,564	458	-2,930 -2,472	7.50% -46	-2,518
Q2	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 191 24 60	85 0	125 7	0 70	65 1,564	458	-3,334 -2,876	7.50% -54	-2,930
Year 3 Q1	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 191 24 0 60	85	125 7	0 50	65 1,564	458	-3,731 -3,273	7.50% -61	-3,334
Q4	1,818 152 25 27 0	2,022		955 191 24 0 60	82 G	125 7	0 50	65 1,564	458	-4,121 -3,663	7.50% -69	-3,731
Q 3	1,299 109 19 0	1,444		955 191 24 0 60	85 00	125 7	0 50	47 1,545	-101	-3,945 -4,045	7.50% -76	-4,121
Q2	00000	• •		955 24 60 0 24	8 8	125 7	0 53	0 1,498	-1,498	-2,374 -3,872	7.50% -73	-3,945
Year 2 Q1	00000	• •		682 136 17 0 43	85 6	89 7	0 50	0 1,105	-1,105	-1,225 -2,330	7.50% -44	-2,374
Q4	00000	• •		000000	227 85	0 25	0 50	0 365	-365	-838 -1,203	7.50% -23	-1,225
Q 3	00000	• •		000000	227 60	23 0	21 24 0	0 355	-355	468 -823	7.50% -15	-838
Q2	00000	• •		000000	557 ¢	9 0 8	24	0 269	-269	-191 -459	7.50% -9	-468
Year 1 Q1	00000	• •	-108 -3	000000	227 0	9 0 9	24 30	0 187	-187	0 -187	7.50% -4	-191
rate				5 00%	6.8% 6.8% 0%	10.0% 8.0%	£480 £200 £0				7.50%	
	Market housing Market housing Affordable so oship Aff shared oship Aff other Safes fees	0000	Land acquisition Stamp duty Purchase fees	Lotal Market housing Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff other Build contingency	Total Upfront Build related Abnormals	Total Total Fees on dev costs Total	Planning gain Total Planning Survey Total	b/forward from above	s from quarter	om last quarter ftt/loss	Charged at Total	eveloper profit
	IN COME Housing sales	Total income	COSTS Land	Build costs	Dev costs	Fees	PG Other	Sales fees Total costs	Net profit/loss	Profit/loss bf fr Cumulative pro	Interest	Cumulative d

SITE 2C CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 3A: Smith's Dock





		Land																
									terate	to achi	eve 20	.0% pr	ofit	—	=	octaro		
									Affor	dable		No affc	ordable	Affe	ordable		afford	able
		Land pu	rchase	price				£	-1,66	2,005		-285	,666					
		RV per	acre					ч	-934	,172		-160	,566	-£3,	308,34(44 0	396,7	59
		Dev pro:	IJ					પ્ર	2,840	0,386		3,345	5,565					
		Total co	sts					ધ	14,93	9,363		16,72	4,245					
		profit a	s % of	costs					19.(01%		20.(%00					
an meriora		Voor 1				Voor 2				Voor 3				Voor A				
B BO L	D	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	TOTALS
Units	Market housing			6.4	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	96.0
Statied	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			1.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.2 2.4
	Aff shared oship Aff other			0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4
	TOTAL	0	0	ω	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	0	0	-	-	0	120.0
Units bit	Market housing			0	0	9	11	4	11	11	4	11	11	11	0	0	0	96
+2Q	Affordable soc rent			0 0	0 0	← (0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	N	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	19
	Allorable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other					000												N (N C
Units	Market housing				0	0	9	-1	11	11	11	11	-1	1	, [0	0	96
+3Q	Affordable soc rent				0 0	0 0	← (0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	20	0 0	0 0	19
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other						000	000		0 0 C			000	o o c	000	o o c	000	2 0 0
Units	Market housing					0	0	9	11	1	11	11	1	4	1	11	0	96
purcnased +4Q	Affordable soc rent					0	0	~	0	7	2	N	2	2	0	2	0	19
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	~ ~
	Aff other					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SITE 3A LAND COST & PHASING

											0								
		rate	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	rear∠ Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	vear 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Unicipal calo	e Market housing		c	c	c	c	c	c	1 081	1 802	1 802	1 802	1 80.2	1 802	1 802	1 802	1 807	c	16 216
ane fillenoli	Affordable soc rent		00	00	00	0 0	00	00	78	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	00	1,171
	Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	0	188
	Aff shared oship		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	204
	Aff other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-39	89-	98	-68	-68	99	-68	-68	-68	0	-581
Total incom	9		0	0	0	0	0	0	1,185	2,074	2,074	2,074	2,074	2,074	2,074	2,074	2,074	0	17,779
COSTS																			
	1																		
Land	Land acquisition		-1,662																-1,662
	Stamp duty		0 4																0 96
	rurcriase rees		-+0																-40 -1 708
Build costs	Market housing		C	C	0	C	667	1.167	1.167	1.167	1.167	1.167	1.167	1.167	1.167	C	С	С	10.000
	Affordable soc rent		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	133	233	233	233	233	233	233	233	233	0 0	0 0	0 0	2.000
	Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	17	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	250
	Aff shared oship		0	0	0	0	17	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	250
	Affother		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	42	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	73	0	0	0	625
	Total																		13,125
Dev costs	Upfront	4.0%	131	131	131 Pr	131	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		c	c	c	c	525
	build related Abnormals	4.0%			ŝ	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	D	5	070 0
	Total	20	5	>															1.050
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	88	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	153	0	0	0	1,313
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	1	11	13	15	5	£	5	5	5	5 L	5	0	0	0	0	0	84
	Total				ļ						ŝ				¢		,		1,397
ЪС	Planning gain Total				17	67	67	67	58	67	67	67	67	Ð	Ð	c	0	0	248 248
Other	Planning	£451	18	18	18														54
	Survey	£500	60		c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	09 0
	Marketing Total	7.0 7			Ð	5	þ	Ð	Ð	þ	5	þ	þ	þ	þ	þ	5	5	- 1
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	39	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	0	581
Total costs			-1,488	160	214	237	1,058	1,780	1,818	1,847	1,847	1,847	1,847	1,752	1,752	68	68	0	14,808
Net profit/lo	ss from quarter		1,488	-160	-214	-237	-1,058	-1,780	-633	227	227	227	227	322	322	2,006	2,006	0	2,971
Profit/loss bf	from last quarter		0	1,516	1,382	1,189	970	-89	-1,903	-2,584	-2,401	-2,215	-2,025	-1,832	-1,538	-1,239	782	2,840	
Cumulative p	rofit/loss		1,488	1.356	1,167	953	-87	-1,868	-2,536	-2.357	-2.174	-1,988	-1.798	-1,510	-1,216	767	2,788	2.840	
Interest	Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50% (%00.c	557
	1 0tal		07	C7	77	<u>o</u>	7	ç ?	4 0	ŧ	1	10-	+0-	Q7-	62-	<u>+</u>	70	5	-122
Cumulative	developer profit		1,516	1,382	1,189	970	6 8	-1,903	-2,584	-2,401	-2,215	-2,025	-1,832	-1,538	-1,239	782	2,840	2,840	2,839

SITE 3A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 4A: Wideopen UDP





	U						DTALS		2.00	17.6 2.2	2.2 0.0	110.0	88	ç	ہم <u>ا</u> 8	0 0	88	18	20 20	0	88	o 18	~ ~
	affordabl		157,847				04 10		0.00	0.0	0.0	0	0	c	00	0 0	0	0	00	0	10	0 0	0 0
	ectare No a		£				03		0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0	c	- 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	00
	H. ordable		31,055				02		0	0.0	0.0	0	10	c	0 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	00
_	₽# ₽		£		_		Year 4 01		0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0	0	10	c	0 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	0 0
Ę	rdable	,080	288	,569	0,559	3%	04	а. С.	9.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	0 0	10	2	00	0	10	0 7	0 0
.0% pre	No affo	1,259	185,	2,856	14,26	20.0	03	96	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	0 0	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	0
ve 20							02	96	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	0 0
o achie	able	901	02	,959	0,271	4%	Year 3 01	, 90 96	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	0 0
erate to	Afford	222,	32,8	2,451	12,88(19.0	04	ч	9.0 0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	00	10	2	00	0	10	0 0	0 0
브	J	ц ц	ч	દ્ય	ц Ц		03	99	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	00	10	7	00	0	2	00	0 0
							02	96	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	10	c	0 0	00	5	0	00	0	0	00	0 0
							Year 2 01	90	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	2	c	00	0 0	0	0	00	0	0	00	0 0
							04	99	0.0	1.9 0.2	0.2 0.0	12	0	c	00	00	0	0	00	0			
		rice			,	osts	03	4	2	0.3 0.0	0.0	2	0	c	- 0	0 0							
		chase p	cre	÷	ts.	% of c	02	ł				0											
and		and pur	εV per a	Jev profi	otal cos	profit as	Year 1 01	ŕ				0											
_			Ľ		F	٩		Market housing	Mar Net Trousing	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship	ff shared oship ff other	TOTAL	Market housing		Affordable sh oship	ff shared oship ff other	Market housing	Affordable soc rent	Affordable sh oship ff shared oship	ff other	Market housing	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship	ff shared oship
							Programme	l Inits	started		A A		Units	'built'	074	AA	Units	+3Q	A	A	Units purchased	+4Q	A

SITE 4A LAND COST & PHASING

		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	OTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		0	0	0	0	0	0	251	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506	13,808
	Affordable soc rent		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	21	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	124	1,137
	Affordable sh oship		5 0	0 0	5 0	0 0	5 0	ə c	το -	2 2	50	20	07 6	0, 2	07 6	50	07 6	20	185
	Aff other		00	00	00	00	00	00	t 0	77 0	77 0	77 0	77	0	77 0	0	77	77 0	0
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	6-	-54	-54	-54	-54	-54	-54	-54	-54	-54	-497
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	279	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	1,672	15,331
COSTS																			
-	l and non-initian		000																000
Land	Ctomp district		647 C																(77 (77
	Stamp duty Purchase fees		0 10																9 0
	Total		,					·	·	i				i	i	i			231
Build costs	Market housing		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	128	111	111	111	171	111	11	171	111	11	0 0	0 0	7,065
	Affordable soc rent		5 0		-	> <	9 r	401 104	104 1	4 <u>0</u>	401 104	4CI	4 <u>0</u>	40 T	4 <u>0</u>	4 <u>0</u>			1,413
	Aff shared oshin) e.	<u>o</u> <u>o</u>	0 0	<u>, 6</u>	<u>, 6</u>	0 0	0 0	<u>o</u> o	0 0	0 0		, c	177
	Aff other			00	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	0 0	0	0
	Build contingency	3.8%	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	9 9	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	0 0	0 0	331
	Total																		9,162
Dev costs	Upfront	6.8%	155	155	155	155 0-	į	Į	ľ	ľ	Į	į	Ŀ	Į	¢				618 010
	Build related	6.8%	0 0	0 0	11	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	67	0	0	0	0	618
	Total	%)	5	5															1.237
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	17	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	0	916
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	12	12	13	18	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	66
2	Total					L	Ľ	Ľ	L	Ľ	Ľ	L	L	Ľ	c	c	c		1,015
9	Planning gain Total				4	07 7	ŝ	ŝ	07 7	ŝ	ß	07 V	07 V	ŝ	5	D	þ	5	228 278
Other	Planning	£438	16	16	16														48
	Survey	£350	39																39
	Marketing Total	£0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 87
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	6	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	54	497
Total costs			453	183	199	265	281	1,197	1,206	1,251	1,251	1,251	1,251	1,251	1,154	1,154	54	54	12,457
Net profit/loss	from quarter		-453	-183	-199	-265	-281	-1,197	-927	421	421	421	421	421	519	519	1,618	1,618	2,874
Profit/loss bf fro	om last quarter		0	-461	-656	-872	-1,158	-1,465	-2,712	-3,708	-3,349	-2,982	-2,609	-2,229	-1,842	-1,348	-844	788	
			C L 7		010	007 7	007 7	0000	0100	100 0	100 0		007.0	000	000 1	000		101 0	
cumulative pro	III/IOSS		403	-044	000-	-1,130	-1,438	-4,003	-3,040	-3,281	-2,921	-2,50T	-4,188	-1,808	-1,323	R78-	1/4	2,407	
Interest	Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	1
	Total		φ	-12	-16	-21	-27	-50	-68	-62	-55	48	4	-34	-25	-16	15	45	-423
Cumulative de carried forward	eveloper profit d to RV calc		461	-656	-872	-1,158	-1,465	-2,712	-3,708	-3,349	-2,982	-2,609	-2,229	-1,842	-1,348	-844	788	2,452	2,451

SITE 4A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 5A: Eastbourne Gardens


Input assumptions Sce	nario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% so	ocial rented 20% int∈	ermediate					
North Tyneside site viability s	tudy	Dwellings							
Site details Site 5A Eastbourn Location	e Gardens	Dwellings		ave floor spi gross sa ft	ace net so ft	build cost per sa ft	build INDEX = 1.000	sales value per so ff	
Area ha 0.51]	Market housing	68.0 80.00%	696	824	109.50 0.0%	109.50	260.00	
No dwgs Density dw/ha 166.7		Affordable soc rent	13.6 16.00%	696	824	109.50 0.0%	109.50	74.00	
		Aff intermediate rent	1.7 <u>2.00</u> %	696	824	109.50	109.50	105.00	
		Aff shared oship	1.7 2.00%	696	824	109.50	109.50	114.00	
	į	Aff other	0.0	0	0	0.0% 109.50	109.50	0.00	
Contingency	τ Έ	Total	85.0 100.00%	82,365	70,040		£9,018,968	£15,704,369	
allowance 5.00%	451	Floorspace density	= 55,578 ne	t sq ft per acre	0				
Development costs									
standard % build 8.00%	758	Other costs Planning	392.1	£ per dwellir	Ð				
plus abnormals 0.3%	24	Survey	500	£ per dwellir	b				
Total 8%		Marketing	0	£ per dwellir	D				
Design fees on build costs 10.0%	947	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	63	Notes						Γ	
Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070	176								
]	

Page 128

	_	Land																
								E	terate to	o achie	ve 20.	0% pro	Ę			Careto Careto		
									Afford	able	2	lo affor	dable	Affor	dable	No a	fordab	ole
	_	and purc	shase p	orice				ъ	660,(031		1,996,	773					
	L	RV per ac	cre					ц	523,	746		1,584,	477	£1,29	4,178	£3,9	15,24	2
		Jev profit						ц	2,512	,262		3,009,	898					
		Fotal cost	ş					દ્મ	13,193	3,306		14,997	,185					
	~	orofit as	% of c	osts					19.0	4%		20.0	7%					
Programm	Ð	Year 1 Q1	Q2	63 G	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	0 2	Q 3	Q4	TOTAL
Units	Market housing			3.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.0
started	Affordable soc rent			0.6	4.0	4.1 4.0	4.L 4.C	4. C	1.4	4.1	4.0	4. C 4. C	4. C 4. C	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.6
	Aff shared oship Aff other			0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
	TOTAL	0	0	4	6	σ	6	0	, თ	σ	6	о	6	0	0	0	0	85.0
Units huilt'	Market housing			0	0	e	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	68
+2Q	Affordable soc rent			00	00	← c	<i>←</i> c	← c	← C	← c	<i>←</i> c	← c	c	← c	← c	00	0 0	4 c
	Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	100
Units	Market housing				0	0	ę	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	68
+30	Affordable soc rent				0 0	0 0	<i>←</i> 0	← 0	 (← (<i>←</i> 0	← ((← 0	, , ,	~ (0 0	4
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other														000		000	0 0 0
Units	Market housing					0	0	e S	7	2	2	7	7	7	7	7	7	68
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship					00	00	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	4 0
	Aff shared oship Aff other					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	0 0

SITE 5A LAND COST & PHASING

Page 129

		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4 7	OTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		0	0	0	0	0	0	686	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	1,543	14,568
	Affordable soc rent		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	39	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	88	829
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oshin		ə c	0 0	ə c	э с	э с	0 0	~ α	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16 17	16	147 160
	Aff other		00	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	0	0	0	: 0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-24	-55	-55	-55	-55	-55	-55	-55	-55	-55	-520
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	739	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	1,663	15,704
COSTS																			
200	I and accuricition		660																660
Land	Land acquisition Stamp duty		26 000																26
	Purchase fees		18																18
	Total																,		705
Build costs	Market housing		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	340	764	764	764	764	764	764	764	764	764	0 0	0 0	7,215
	Affordable soc rent		2 0	5 0	2 0	э с	χgα	103	153	153	153	153	153 0	153	153	153 10	5 0	5 0	1,443 180
	All oldavic Sir Usilip Aff charad ochin						οα	0 0	0 0	<u>0</u> q	0 0	0 0	0 0	<u></u> 5	0 0	o q			180
	Aff other		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	0 0	0	000
	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	21	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	0	0	451
	Total																		9,470
Dev costs	Upfront	4.0%	95	95	95 7 0	95		9		ç	ç			ç	c	c	c	c	379
	Build related	4.0%	⊃ ¢	о с	18	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	Э	Э	Ð	5	3/9
	Total	%)	2	2															24 781
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	45	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	0	0	947
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	б	6	თ	5	ი	ო	ო	ო	e	ო	ი	ო	0	0	0	0	63
0	Total Diapping gain				α	10	0	Ó	0	10	01	Ó	10	10	c	c	c	c	1,009 176
2	Total				D	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>n</u>	5	5	5	>	176
Other	Planning	£392	1	1	11														33
	Survey	£500	43																43
	Marketing Total	£0			Ð	Ð	Э	Ð	Ð	þ	Ð	Ð	Ð	5	Э	þ	þ	0	0 76
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	24	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	520
Total costs			873	126	141	164	552	1,165	1,189	1,220	1,220	1,220	1,220	1,220	1,158	1,158	55	55	12,737
Net profit/loss	from quarter		-873	-126	-141	-164	-552	-1,165	-450	443	443	443	443	443	505	505	1,608	1,608	2,967
Profit/loss bf fr	om last quarter		0	-890	-1,035	-1,198	-1,387	-1,976	-3,199	-3,718	-3,337	-2,948	-2,552	-2,149	-1,738	-1,256	-765	858	
Cumulative pro	fit/loss		-873	-1 016	-1 176	-1362	-1 939	-3 141	-3.650	-3 275	-2 894	-2 505	-2 109	-1 706	-1 233	-751	842	2 466	
			5	2				5	2) I) Î			-	ļ	Î	
Interest	Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	155
	1 Old I		2	<u>0</u>	77-	07-	20	6 7	000	P	ţ	Ŧ	ł	20-	C2-	<u>+</u>	2	2	Pot
Cumulative de carried forwar	eveloper profit d to RV calc		-890	-1,035	-1,198	-1,387	-1,976	-3,199	-3,718	-3,337	-2,948	-2,552	-2,149	-1,738	-1,256	-765	858	2,512	2,511

Page 130

SITE 5A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 6A: St Joseph's Training Centre





Page 132

	_	-and																
								E	lerate t	o achie	ve 20.	0% pro	Lit		Ţ	oreto.		
									Afford	able	2	lo affor	dable	Affor	dable	No a	ffordat	ole
		-and purc	chase p	orice				ц сц	817,	784		1,490,	268	ľ		Č		
		3V per a	cre					.	192,	4 4		350,6	41	£47	,456	7 8	06,43t	0
	J	Jev profit						દ્મ	1,448	802		1,705,	339					
	-	otal cost	S					ы С	7,613	,227	l	8,525,	950					
	4	profit as	% of c	osts					19.0	3%		20.00	%					
Programm	e	Year 1	ć	ő	3	Year 2	ç	ő	2	Year 3	ő	ç	3	Year 4	0	ç	2	10
		Q1	62	C2	Q4	Q1	62	с, С	Q4	Q1	02	ŝ	Q4	Q1	4 2	C 3	Ω4	IOIAL
Units started	Market housing			1.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.4
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			0.3	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.6 0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1 0.8
	Aff shared oship			0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
	TOTAL	0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	38.0
Units	Market housing			0	0	2	ę	e	с	ε	с	ε	ε	ς	с	0	0	30
+2Q	Affordable soc rent			0	0	0	~	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	۲	0	0	9
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	c
Units	Market housing			>	0	0	5	n N		n N		n N		n N	n N		0	8
+30	Affordable soc rent				00	00	00	← c	← c	~ c	← c	~ c	← c	ر د	← c	← c	0 0	9 +
	Aff shared oship Aff other				000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	0
Units	Market housing					0	0	2	с	б	с	с	с	с	с	ю	e	30
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship					00	00	00	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	, 0 7	9 -
	Aff shared oship Aff other					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	- 0

SITE 6A LAND COST & PHASING

Mathematical functions Incrementations Inc		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4 1	TOTALS
0 0																			
Control 0 </th <th>larket housing #ordable soc rent</th> <th></th> <th>00</th> <th>00</th> <th>00</th> <th>00</th> <th>00</th> <th>00</th> <th>435 31</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>870 63</th> <th>8,266 595</th>	larket housing #ordable soc rent		00	00	00	00	00	00	435 31	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	870 63	8,266 595
frammerication 0	ffordable sh oship		00	00	00	00	00	00	- - - -	9.6	96	36	9 6	9 6	96	9 6	9 6	36	96
matrixe 0 </td <th>off shared oship</th> <td></td> <td>00</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>00</td> <td>0 0</td> <td>ы</td> <td>÷.</td> <td>£ 0</td> <td>£ ¢</td> <td>£ 0</td> <td>÷.</td> <td>τo</td> <td>£ (</td> <td>£ (</td> <td>÷ 0</td> <td>104</td>	off shared oship		00	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	ы	÷.	£ 0	£ ¢	£ 0	÷.	τo	£ (£ (÷ 0	104
	an ourer Sales fees		0	00	00	0	00	00	-16	-31	-31	-31	-31	-31	-31	-31	-31	-31	-296
Image: 1																			
Independent transformer betwerkensen interversen interv			0	0	0	0	0	0	477	954	954	954	954	954	954	954	954	954	9,061
entendention constraintsB constraints																			
monolity transmer 30 bit transmer 31 bit transmer 31 bit t	and acquisition		818																818
momentane 22 momentane 23	caria acquisiuori Stamn dritv		33.0																33
Instrument Instrum	Purchase fees		52																22
	Total																		873
Montalise sort interaction 0 </td <th>Market housing</th> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>193</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>387</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>3,676</td>	Market housing		0	0	0	0	193	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	0	0	3,676
Manualize scale in the constrained of the con	Affordable soc rent		0	0	0	0	39	77	17	77	77	77	77	77	77	77	0	0	735
Matrix Matrix<	Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	2	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	92
Monterimetry (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2)	Aff shared oship		0	0	0	0	2ı	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	92
	Aff other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 538 75 <th< td=""><th>Build contingency</th><td>5.0%</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>12</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>24</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>230</td></th<>	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	12	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	0	0	230
Uniformiated 63% 75	Total																		4,825
Image 6.3% 0 0 16 32	Upfront	6.3%	75	75	75	75				1									302
Anomals 05 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 6 6 7 Anomals 0.0% 6 7 9 3	Build related	6.3%	0	0	16	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	0	0	0	0	302
Fease net indicates 10.0% 0	Abnormals	%0	Q	Ð															10
Function Discription	rotar Fees on huild costs	10.0%	c	c	C	c	26	л 1	л.	д 1	54	5,	Б1	Б1	5	51	C	0	482
Total Total <t< td=""><th>Fees on dev costs</th><td>8.0%</td><td><u>ہ</u> د</td><td>ی د</td><td>0 F</td><td>ი თ</td><td>ς κ</td><td><u>5</u> e.</td><td>5 ო</td><td>5</td><td><u>5</u> m</td><td>5 ო</td><td>5 ო</td><td>5 ო</td><td>50</td><td>5 0</td><td>- c</td><td></td><td>49</td></t<>	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	<u>ہ</u> د	ی د	0 F	ი თ	ς κ	<u>5</u> e.	5 ო	5	<u>5</u> m	5 ო	5 ო	5 ო	50	5 0	- c		49
Penning gain Each state 4 8 8 8 8 0	Total	2/0/0	>	>		>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	<u> </u>	532
Total Total <t< td=""><th>Planning gain</th><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>4</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>80</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>79</td></t<>	Planning gain				4	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	0	0	0	0	79
	Total																		79
	Planning	£515	~	7	7														20
Markening ν_0 ν <t< td=""><th>Survey</th><td>£500</td><td>19</td><td></td><td>c</td><td>¢</td><td>¢</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td></td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>c</td><td>19</td></t<>	Survey	£500	19		c	¢	¢	c	c	c	c	c	c		c	c	c	c	19
Definition above 0	marketing Total	F 0			5	>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	>	5	Þ	Þ	>	⊃ °
(1) 985 93 109 124 322 601 617 632 632 632 632 630 31 31 7,266 from quarter 1 -985 -33 -109 -124 -322 -601 -140 321 321 321 364 364 923 923 1,805 mines quarter 0 -1,004 -1,117 -1,249 -1,339 -1,753 -2,304 -2,023 -1,733 -1,438 788 432 499 1,425 itloes -1,007 -1,226 -1,373 -1,721 -2,354 -2,538 -2,023 -1,717 -1,117 -1,226 -1,373 -1,412 -1,117 -1,424 490 1,422 Charged at 7.50%	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	296
from quarter 88 -33 -109 -124 -322 -601 -140 321 321 321 321 364 323 323 1,805 mlast quarter 0 -1,004 -1,117 -1,226 -1,733 -1,733 -1,733 -1,138 -784 923 935 1,805 it/loss -985 -1,097 -1,226 -1,373 -1,721 2,398 -2,538 -2,023 -1,731 -1,117 -774 -424 490 1,422 t/loss 750% 7,50%			985	93	109	124	322	601	617	632	632	632	632	632	590	590	31	31	7,256
from quarter																			
om last quarter 0 -1,004 -1,117 -1,249 -1,733 -2,398 -2,303 -2,307 -2,023 -1,733 -1,438 -788 -432 499 1,422 fittloss -985 -1,007 -1,226 -1,373 -1,717 -774 -424 490 1,422 -350% 750%	s from quarter		-985	-93	-109	-124	-322	-601	-140	321	321	321	321	321	364	364	923	923	1,805
om last quarter 0 -1,004 -1,117 -1,249 -1,539 -2,536 -2,307 -2,023 -1,733 -1,438 -738 -432 499 1,422 fit/loss -985 -1,097 -1,226 -1,373 -1,733 -1,438 -7,88 -432 499 1,422 fit/loss -985 -1,097 -1,226 -1,373 -1,721 -2,354 -2,538 2,565 -1,986 -1,701 -1,412 -1,117 -774 -424 490 1,422 Charged at 7,50%<																			
Itilitions	om last quarter		0	-1,004	-1,117	-1,249	-1,399	-1,753	-2,398	-2,586	-2,307	-2,023	-1,733	-1,438	-1,138	-788	-432	499	
Charged at Total 7.50% <th>fit/loss</th> <td></td> <td>-985</td> <td>-1,097</td> <td>-1,226</td> <td>-1,373</td> <td>-1,721</td> <td>-2,354</td> <td>-2,538</td> <td>-2,265</td> <td>-1,986</td> <td>-1,701</td> <td>-1,412</td> <td>-1,117</td> <td>-774</td> <td>-424</td> <td>490</td> <td>1,422</td> <td></td>	fit/loss		-985	-1,097	-1,226	-1,373	-1,721	-2,354	-2,538	-2,265	-1,986	-1,701	-1,412	-1,117	-774	-424	490	1,422	
Charged at 7.50%																			
Total -18 -21 -23 -26 -31 -32 -26 -21 -15 -8 9 27 -357 veloper profit -1,004 -1,117 -1,249 -1,339 -1,753 -2,338 -2,023 -1,733 -1,438 -1,138 -788 -499 1,449 1,448 10 RV calc 11 RV calc 21 -1,733 -1,733 -1,438 -1,138 -788 -499 1,449 1,448	Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	
veloper profit -1,004 -1,117 -1,249 -1,399 -1,753 -2,398 -2,586 -2,307 -2,023 -1,733 -1,438 -1,138 -788 -432 499 1,449 1,448 d to RV calc	Total		-18	-21	-23	-26	-32	-44	48	42	-37	-32	-26	-21	-15	φ	თ	27	-357
to RV calc	veloper profit		-1.004	-1.117	-1.249	-1.399	-1.753	-2.398	-2.586	-2.307	-2.023	-1.733	-1.438	-1.138	-788	-432	499	1.449	1.448
	d to RV calc																		

Page 134

SITE 6A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

1

SITE 7A: Emperor Hadrian PH



Input assumptions	Scenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% soc	ial rented 20% inte	srmediate					
North Tyneside site viabili	ity study	Dwellings							
Site details Site 1 contects	ror Hadrian PH	Dwellings		ave floor sp gross	ace net	build cost	build INDEX =	sales value	
Area ha 0.56		Market housing 30	.4 80.00%	817	784	86.50	86.50	155.00	
acres 1.38		Affordable and some	16 000/	247	107	0.0%	00 50	74 00	
Density dw/ha 67.9	_		×00.01	/10	104	0.0% %0.0	00.00	00.17	
		Aff intermediate rent 0.	.8 <mark>2.00%</mark>	817	784	86.50	86.50	86.00	
		Aff shared oship 0.	.8 2.00%	817	784	0.0% 86.50	86.50	91.00	
		Aff other 0.	.00.0	0	0	0.0% 86.50	86.50	0.00	
Contingency	Ę	Total 38	3.0 100.00%	31,046	29,792		£2,685,479	£4,138,109	
allowance 5.00%	134	Floorspace density	= 21,530 net	t sq ft per acr	n)				
Development costs standard % build 10.00%	282								
		Other costs Planning	515.0	£ per dwelli	bu				
	ſ	Survey	500	£ per dwelli	bu				
plus abnormals 0.5%	15								
Total 11%		Marketing	0	£ per dwelli	бu				
Design fees on build costs 10.0%] 282	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	24								
Planning gain £ per dwelling	62	Notes							

Page 136



SITE 7A LAND COST & PHASING

n cu		Voce 4				Vacan				Voor o				Voce A				
	D	01 -	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Q1 +	Q2	Q3	Q4	TOTALS
Units started	Market housing			2.4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.4
	Affordable soc rent			0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1
	Affordable sh oship			0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
	Aff shared oship			0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
	Aff other	¢	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	IOIAL	þ	5	'n	n	ß	ß	ß	n	n	ß	5	5	5	5	5	5	38.U
Units	Market housing			0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	30
-+20	Affordable soc rent			0	0	0	.	÷	0	0	0	0	9
	Affordable sh oship			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Aff shared oship			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Aff other			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Units	Market housing				0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	30
complete	p				c	¢	c	Ţ		Ţ				Ţ	c	c	c	¢
75+	Arrorable soc rent				-	5 0	5 0	- c	- c	- c	- c	- c	- c	- c	5 0	5 0		0 •
	Affordable Shi Ushing Aff shared oshin																	
	Aff other				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Units	Market housing					0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	30
purchase	q																	
+4Q	Affordable soc rent					0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	9
	Affordable sh oship					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Aff shared oship					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
	Aff other					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q	OTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		0	0	0	0	0	0	292	486	486	486	486	486	486	486	0	0	3,694
	Affordable soc rent		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	27	45	1 45	1 45	45	45	45	45 -	0 0	0 0	338 - 1
	Attordable sh oship		5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	5 0	4 4	- 1	- 1	- 1	- 1		- 1	- 1	5 0	5 0	L0 1
	Aff other			00	00	00	00	00	4 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	00	00	⁵ 0
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-11	-18	-18	-18	-18	-18	-18	-18	0	0	-133
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	327	544	544	544	544	544	544	544	0	0	4,138
COSTS																			
	1																		
Land	Land acquisition		-255																-255
	Stamp duty		-																0 r
	Total		ĩ																-1-
Build costs	Market housing		0	0	0	0	170	283	283	283	283	283	283	283	0	0	0	0	2.148
	Affordable soc rent		0	0	0	0	34	57	57	57	57	57	57	57	0	0	0	0	430
	Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	54
	Aff shared oship		0	0	0	0	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	54
	Aff other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	11	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	0	0	134
	Total				-	-													2,820
Dev costs	Uptront	5.0%	35	35	35	35	ç	0	0	ç	0	ç	c	c	c	c	c	c	141
	Ahnormals	0.0%		- -	=	<u>n</u>	<u>מ</u>	<u>מ</u>	<u>מ</u>	2	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	5	>	5	5	5	>	<u>+</u> +
	Total	n/ 1	-																297
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	22	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0	282
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	ო	ო	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
0	Total				¢	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	c	c	c	c	c		306
9	rianning gain Total				٥	2	<u>2</u>	0	0	2	2	<u>2</u>	Ð	D	D	D	D	5	67 67
Other	Planning	£515	7	7	7														20
	Survey	£500	19																19
	Marketing	£0			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	39 133
Total costs			-190	53	63	68	275	439	449	456	456	456	426	426	18	18	0	0	3,411
Net profit/lost	s from quarter		190	-53	-63	-68	-275	-439	-122	88	88	88	119	119	527	527	0	0	727
Bundedland he	and another		c	101	144	0	7	JEE	747	055	704	705	003	610	100	100	564	66.4	
	rom last quarter		5	- 24 -	<u>+</u>	3	<u>0</u>	C07-	11.1-	0.00	10/-	CO./-	070-	0 - -	-400	771	100	- 00	
Cumulative pro	ofit/loss		190	141	81	14	-261	-704	-839	-767	-692	-617	-509	-400	119	649	661	661	
).		1001		,			2001	,00L		2001	2001	2001			,000 0	,0000	
Interest	Charged at Total	7.50%	7.50% 4	7.50% 3	7.50% 2	%0 <u>9</u> .7	7.50% -5	7.50% -13	7.50% -16	7.50% -14	7.50% -13	7.50% -12	7.50% -10	7.50% -8	7.50% 2	r.50% 12	0.00%	0.00%	-67
Cumulative d	eveloper profit		101	144	83	Å	285	747	855	-784	-705	628	510	801	122	661	661	661	GEN
carried forwa	ird to RV calc		1 -	ŧ	3	2	C07-	-	200	0.7-	8	070-	2	<u>P</u>	77	B	8		000

SITE 7A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 7B Notional site North Shields



Input assumptions Sci	enario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% {	social rented 20% ir	ntermediate					
North Tyneside site viability s	study	Dwellings							
		2							
Site details				ave floor sp	ace	build	build	sales	
Site 7B notional No.44 Shirles	orth Shields	Dwellings		gross	net	cost	INDEX =	value	
Area ha 0.56		Market housing	30.4 80.00%	817	54 II 784	86.50	1.000 86.50	196.00	
acres 1.38		5]			0.0%			
No dwgs 38 Deneity dw/ha 67 0		Affordable soc rent	6.1 16.00%	817	784	86.50	86.50	71.00	
		Aff intermediate rent	0.8 2.00%	817	784	86.50	86.50	91.00	
						0.0%			
		Aff shared oship	0.8 2.00%	817	784	86.50 0.0%	86.50	<u> 66.00</u>	
		Aff other	0.0 0.00%	0	0	86.50	86.50	0.00	
Contingency	£k	Total	38.0 100.00%	31,046	29,792		£2,685,479	£5,123,032	
allowance 5.00%	134	Floorspace density	= 21.530 n	het so ft per acre	۵.				
Development costs									
standard % build 10.00%	282	Other costs							
		Planning	515.0	£ per dwelli	ng				
plus abnormals 0.5%	15	Survey	500	£ per dwelli	bu				
Total 11%		Marketing	0	£ per dwelli	бu				
Design fees									
on build costs 10.0%	282	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	24							ſ	
		Notes							
E per dwelling $2,070$	62								
]	

		Land																
								2	Iterate	to achie	eve 20	.0% pr	ofit			ortoo		
									Affor	dable		No affo	rdable	Affc	ordable		afford	able
		Land pul	chase	price				Ъ	389	,614		776,	375					
		RV per a	Icre					с л	281	,562		561,	062	£6	95,739	£	,386,	384
		Dev prof	ij					ц	817	986		963,	651					
		Total cos	sts					ч	4,30	5,096	L	4,818	3,835	F				
		profit as	% of c	costs					19.(%00		20.0	%0					
Programme	6	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				-
		Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	0 2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	TOTALS
Units started	Market housing			2.4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.4
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			0.5 0.1	0.8 0.1	0.8 0.1	0.8	0.8 0.1	0.8 0.1	0.8 0.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1 0.8
	Aff shared oship Aff other	c	c	0.1	0.1 0.0	0.1 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1 0.0	0.1 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0
	IUIAL	5	5	ν	ß	n	o	ß	n	G	n	5	5	5	5	5	5	38.0
Units 'built'	Market housing			0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	30
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			00	00	00	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	00	00	00	00	9
	Aff shared oship Aff other			00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	- 0
Units	Market housing				0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	30
+30	Affordable soc rent				0 0	0 0	0 0	← (← (~ 0	 (ر م	÷ ((0 0	0 0	0 0	9
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other									000		000	000	000		000	000	0
Units	Market housing					0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	30
+4Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin					00	00	00	c	c	c	← C	← c	← C	← C	00	00	9
	Aff other					000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	. – 0

SITE 7B LAND COST & PHASING



Page 142

/																			
		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	 Market housing Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship 		0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	369 27 5	615 45 7 8	615 45 7	615 45 7 8	615 45 8	615 45 8	615 45 8	615 45 7 8	0000	0000	4,671 338 54 59
	Aff other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Sales rees		Ð	D	D	5	D	D	-13	77-	77-	77-	77-	77-	77-	77-	þ	5	-16/
Total income			c	c	c	-	c	c	404	674	674	674	674	674	674	674	c	-	5.123
COSTS			5		5	,	5		5		5	5		5		5	,	,	01.0
Land	Land acquisition Stamp duty Purchase fees		390 12																390 12 11
	Total		:																412
Build costs	Market housing		00	00	00	00	170	283 57	283 57	283 57	283 57	283 57	283 57	283 57	00	00	00	00	2,148 430
	Affordable sh oship			000			54.	5 ~ 1	5~1	5 ~ 1	5 ~ 1	5 ~ 1	5 ~ 1	5 ~ 1		000	000	000	ç 2 :
	Aff shared osnip Aff other		00	00	00	00	4 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	00	00	00	00	¥ 0
	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	7	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	0	0	134 2 820
Dev costs	Upfront	5.0%	35 2	35	35	35	ç	ç	0	ç	ç	ç	¢	ç	¢	c	c	c	141
	Build related Abnormals	5.0% 1%	7 0	7 0	F	<u>ת</u>	<u>ה</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>ה</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>.</u>	<u>5</u>	5	5	5	Þ	Þ	>	141 15 207
Food	Fees on huild costs	10.0%	C	C	C	c	22	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	c	C	C	c	782
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%) m		9 4	o 4		5 -	5	5 -	5 -	5 -	; 0	; 0	0 0	00	00	0	24
PG	Total Planning gain				9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	306 79
Other	Total Planning	£515	7	7	7														79 20
	Survey	£500	19		c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	19
	marketing Total	r0			D	5	D	5	5	5	D	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	⊃ 6 2
Sales fees Total costs	b/forward from above		0 484	53	0 3	0 89	0 275	0 439	13 452	22 461	22 461	22 461	22 430	22 430	22 22	22 22	• •	• •	167 4.119
Net profit/los	s from quarter		-484	-53	-63	-68	-275	-439	-47	214	214	214	244	244	652	652	0	0	1,004
Profit/loss bf1	rom last quarter		0	-493	-555	-630	-711	-1,005	-1,470	-1,546	-1,357	-1,165	-969	-739	-504	151	818	818	
Cumulative pr	ofit/loss		-484	-545	-618	-698	-986	-1,443	-1,517	-1,332	-1,144	-951	-725	-495	148	803	818	818	
Interest	Charged at Total	7.50%	7.50% -9	7.50% -10	7.50% -12	7.50% -13	7.50% -18	7.50% -27	7.50% -28	7.50% -25	7.50% -21	7.50% -18	7.50% -14	7.50% -9	7.50% 3	7.50% 15	0.00% 0	0.00%	-187
Cumulative o	leveloper profit		-493	-555	-630	-711	-1,005	-1,470	-1,546	-1,357	-1,165	696-	-739	-504	151	818	818	818	817
carried forwa	ird to RV calc																		

SITE 7B CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 7C: Notional site Wallsend Town Centre



Anti-Translet start	Image: contraction in the contracti	Input assumptions	Scenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% s	social rented 20% inte	ermediate				
Sterial integrity integ	Steptistic Andreading Andread	North Tyneside site viabili	ty study	Dwellings						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccc} \label{eq:constraint} & \begin{tabular}{cccccc} & \begin{tabular}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccc} \operatorname{cond} & con$	Site details Site Control	al Wallsend Town Centre	Dwellings		ave floor space gross	net	build cost	build INDEX =	sales value
$ \begin{array}{cccccc} & \overrightarrow{13} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	$ \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mbox{Non} & \mbox{Interval} & \mb$	Area ha 0.56		Market housing	30.4 80.00%	817 8	784	86.50	1.000 86.50	156.00
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	acres 1.38 No dwgs 38		Affordable soc rent	6.1 16.00%	817	784	0.0% 86.50	86.50	71.00
$ \begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Density dw/ha 67.9		Aff intermediate rent	0 8 0 %U	817	78.4	0.0% 86.50	86 50	86 OD
$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	$ \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{E} & \mathbb{E} & \mathbb{E} \\ \begin{array}{cccc} \mathbb{E} & \mathbb{E} \\ \mbox{ontinence} & \mathbb{E} \\ ontinence$						t D	0.0%	00.00	00.00
K Marther 0.0 0.00% 0 0.0 0.00% 0 0.0 0.00% 0 0.0 </td <td>$\begin{array}{ccccc} & &$</td> <th></th> <th></th> <td>Aff shared oship</td> <td>0.8 2.00%</td> <td>817</td> <td>784</td> <td>86.50 0.0%</td> <td>86.50</td> <td>91.00</td>	$ \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$			Aff shared oship	0.8 2.00%	817	784	86.50 0.0%	86.50	91.00
Contrigenty LK Total 36.0 100.00% 31.046 29.792 E2665.479 E4161.942 Powlownent costs 134 Postpace density 21.500 Retered 21.500 Retered Powlownent costs 282 Other costs 282 Other costs 282 Powlownent costs 282 Other costs 282 Other costs 282 Pushing ain 1% 55.0 E per dwelling Posts 1% 55.0 E per dwelling Posts 1% 0 2.00 E per dwelling Posts 0 0 2.00 2.00 Posts 0 0 2.00 2.00 Posts 0 0 0 2.00 Posts 0 0 0 0	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c } \hline Cluigerty & Total Box T$		ā	Aff other	0.0	0	0	86.50	86.50	0.00
allowance 5.0% 134 Development costs Development costs Development costs 222 Development costs 500 E per dweling 500 Data 11% Data 11% Data 11% Data 0	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Contingency	Ϋ́Υ	Total	38.0 100.00%	31,046 29	9,792	3	£2,685,479	£4,161,942
Period Development costs Period Standard % build Standard % build 100% Standard % build 100% Planning 550 Planning 500 Planning 500 Planning 500 Planning 500 Planning 0 Planning 7.50%	Overloament cost stanteard % build Cost stanteard % build Cost Stanteard % build Distribution 0.5% 15 Cher costs Distribution 0.5% 15 E per dwelling Distribution 0.5% 15 E per dwelling Distribution 0.5% 15 E per dwelling Distribution 0 E per dwelling Distribution 200 E per dwelling Distribution 200 E per dwelling Participation 0 E per dwelling E per dwelling 200 200	allowance 5.00%	134	Floorspace density	= 21,530 ne	t sq ft per acre				
Development costs standard % build 282 (10.0%) Cher costs standard % build 10.00% 282 plus abnormals 0.5% 15 plus abnormals 0.5% 515.0 plus abnormals 55.0 £ per dwelling plus abnormals 0.0 £ per dwelling rotal 11% 0 £ per dwelling on dev costs 8% 23 Interest on dev costs 8% 7.5% F per dwelling 7.0%	Periodiament costs standard % build 282 tendard % build 100% standard % build 15 build 0 pus abromats 0.5% pus abromats 0.5% provey 500 pus abromats 0.5% provey 500 provey 70% provey 70% provey 70% provey 70%									
standard % build 100% 282 Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling plus abnomats 0.5% 15 Planning plus abnomats 0.5% 15 Planning 500 plus abnomats 0.5% 15 Planning 500 £ per dwelling Planning 0.6% 10.0% 20 200 £ per dwelling on dev costs 8% 24 7.50% 7.50% £ per dwelling .070 70 7.50%	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Development costs								
Planing 51.0 E per dweling plus abnormals 0.5% 15 Survey 500 E per dweling Total 11% Marketing 0 E per dweling Total 11% 0 E per dweling On locots 10.0% 282 Interest On dev costs 8% 24 F per dweling 7.50%	Planing 51.0 £ per dweling plus abnormals 0.5% 15 Survey 500 £ per dweling Total 11% Marketing 0 £ per dweling Total 11% Marketing 0 £ per dweling On build costs 0.0% % per anum 7.50% Planning gain 20 7.80%	standard % build 10.00%	282	Other costs	[
Plus abnormals 0.5% 15 Survey 500 £ per dwelling Total 11% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Total 11% 0 £ per dwelling Oesign fees 0 £ per dwelling on dev costs 8% 24 F per dwelling 750%	pus abnormals 0.5% 15 Survey 500 E per dveling Total 11% 0 E per dveling 0 E per dveling Total 11% 0 E per dveling 0 E per dveling Ordat 10% 282 Interest 0 E per dveling On dev costs 10% 282 Interest 750% On dev costs 8% 24 750% Flanning gain 70 70%			Planning	515.0	£ per dwelling				
Total 11% Total 11% Design fees 0 n build costs 100% 0 E per dwelling 0 8% 24 7.50% Panning gain 7.0 29 Notes	Total 11% Marketing 0 E per dwelling Total 11% 0 E per dwelling 0 Design fees 0 E per dwelling 0 E per dwelling 0 0 E per dwelling 0 E per dwelling	plus abnormals 0.5%	15	Survey	500	${\mathfrak E}$ per dwelling				
Total 11% 0 € per dwelling Total 11% 0 € per dwelling Design fees 0 11% 0 Design fees 0 0 € per dwelling 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 7.5% 0 0 7.5% 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 10% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <	Total 11% Design fes Design fes 0 E per dwelling 0 n build costs 100% 282 Interest 0 n build costs 100% 282 Interest 0 n dev costs 8% 24 7.50% Planning gain 79 7.50%									
Design fees 10.0% 282 Interest on build costs 10.0% 282 Interest on dev costs 8% 24 7.50% Planning gain 7.9 Notes	Design fease on build costs Total on build costs 10.0% 282 Interest % per annum on dev costs 8% 24 7.50% Planning gain £ per dwelling 79	Total 11%		Marketing	0	£ per dwelling				
for the costs 8% 7.50% on dev costs 8% 24 on dev costs 8% 24 Planning gain 79 £ per dwelling 2.070	Remind Single Notes Notes F per dwelling 2,070 79	Design fees	282	Interest						
on dev œsts 8% 24 Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070 79	on dev costs 8% 24 Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070 79		N 0 1	% per annum	7.50%					
Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070	Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070 79	on dev costs 8%	24	Notes						
		Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	62							

	Ľ	and															
								Iterat	te to ac	hieve 2	20.0% p	rofit		-	orton.		
								Afi	fordable		No afi	ordable	Aff	ordable		afforda	ble
	£ لا	and purcl V per aci	hase pr re	e				Ч Ч	39,161 72,834	٦.	24	,828 <mark>,943</mark>	4 4 7	127,073	4	:44,33(
	ă	ev profit						9 ب	65,280		768	3,383					
	Ţ	otal costs	(0					£ 3,4	197,71;	~	3,84	1,489	Г				
	īd	rofit as 9	% of co	sts				-	9.02%		20	%00					
Programr	e	Year 1 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	63	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4
Units started	Market housing			2.4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Statica	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin			0.5	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Aff shared oship Aff other			0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	0	0	ę	5	5	5	5	ъ	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Units 'built'	Market housing			0	0	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin			00	00	00	← C	← c	c	← C	← C	← C	← C	00	00	00	00
	Aff shared oship																
Units	Market housing				0	0	50	94	9 4	94	04	94	o 4	94	0	0	0
+3Q	Affordable soc rent				0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0	0
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship				00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	Aff other				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Units purchased	d d					0	0	N	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0
+4Q	Affordable soc rent					00	00	00	c	← C	← c	← c	~ c	← c	← C	00	00
	Aff shared oship					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
	Aff other					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		0	0	0	0	0	0	294	489	489	489	489	489	489	489	0	0	3,718
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	27	45	45	45	45	45	45	45	0 0	0 0	338 51
	Aff shared oship		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4	7	7	7	7	7	-	7	0 0	0 0	54
	Aff other		0	0	00	0	00	00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00	00	0
	Sales rees		D	D	D	5	D	5		Ω	-18	-18	QI-	<u>عا</u> د	ΩI	Q	D	5	-134
				,						1						1			
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	329	548	548	548	548	548	548	548	0	0	4,162
COSTS	_																		
Land	Land acquisition		-239																-239
	Stamp duty		0																0
	Purchase fees		-7																-7
Build coete	l otal Market housing		C	c	c	c	170	283	283	283	283	283	283	283	c	C	c	- -	-246 2 148
	Affordable soc rent		- c	0 0			34	57	57	22	57	57	27	27		- C			430
	Affordable sh oship		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 4	5 ~	. ~	5 ~	5 ~	. ~	5 ~	5 ~	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	54
	Aff shared oship		0	0	0	0	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	54
	Aff other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Build contingency	5.0%	0	0	0	0	4	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	0	0	134
	Total		.,																2,820
Dev costs	Uptront Build related	5.0%	35	35 0	35	35 10	10	10	10	10	10	10	c	c	c	c	c	c	141 141
	Abnormals	1%	~ ~	~~	=	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	>	, ,	5	,	5	>	15
	Total	2																	297
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	22	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0	282
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	ო	ო	4	4	-	-	-	.	-		0	0	0	0	0	0	24 206
Ca	Planning gain				œ	10	10	0	10	10	10	0	C	c	c	C	c	c	anc
2	Total				>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	5	>	>	>	>	>	2 6 2
Other	Planning	£515	7	7	7														20
	Survey	£500	19		((¢	¢	¢		¢	¢	c		¢	c			19
	Marketing Total	£0			Э	5	Э	Ð	Э	5	Э	Э	Ð	5	Ð	Ð	Ð	5	0.05
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	134
Total costs			-174	53	63	68	275	439	449	456	456	456	426	426	18	18	0	0	3,428
Net profit/los:	s from quarter		174	-53	-63	-68	-275	-439	-121	91	91	91	122	122	530	530	0	0	734
Profit/loss bf fi	rom last quarter		0	178	127	66	5	-283	-735	-871	-794	-716	-636	-524	-409	123	665	665	
Cumulative pro	ofit/loss		174	125	65	ကု	-278	-721	-855	-780	-703	-624	-514	402	121	653	665	665	
Interest	Charged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	0.00%	0.00%	
	Total		ო	7	-	0	φ	-14	-16	-15	-13	-12	-10	φ	7	12	0	0	-70
Cumulative d	eveloper profit		178	127	99	5	-283	-735	-871	-794	-716	-636	-524	-409	123	665	665	665	664
carried forwa	rd to RV calc																		

SITE 7C CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 8A: Marine House Howden

Notes	n dev costs 8% 32	Off build costs TO:U/h Zoo Mileters T.50% % per annum 7.50% <th></th> <th>Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre</th> <th>t assumptions Scenario & option Affordable 20% = 80% social rented 20% intermediate</th>		Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre	t assumptions Scenario & option Affordable 20% = 80% social rented 20% intermediate
on build costs 10.0% 280 interest 7.50% % per annum 7.50%	on build costs 10.0% 280 interest 7.50%		velopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 standard % build 11.50% 322 other costs Other costs 515.0 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 marketing 500 £ per dwelling marketing 0 £ per dwelling	velopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 tanana % build 11.50% 322 Cher costs Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling Survey 500 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling	$\begin{array}{ c $
sign fees on build costs 10.0% 280 Interest We per annum 7.50%	sign fees on build costs 10.0% 280 Interest 7.50%	sign fees	velopment costs 322 standard % build 11.50% standard % build 11.50% fill 515.0 Planning 515.0 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 500 8 500 8 500 9 500	velopment costs 322 Other costs standard % build 11.50% 322 other costs Other costs E per dwelling plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Moritoring 515.0 £ per dwelling	1 Ymosicide site viability studyDesingsI WeilingMarine HouseDesingsacresAmerican HouseDesinganAmerican HouseDesinganAmerican HouseDesinganAmerican HouseDesinganAmerican HouseDesinganAmerican HouseDesingandAmerican HouseDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesingAmerican HouseDesingDesing
al 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14%	al 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14% 14%	al 14%	elopment costs 322 standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs Planning 515.0 Planning 515.0 Planning 515.0 Planning 515.0	relorment costs standard % build 11.50% standard % build 11.50% standard % build 11.50% Planning 515.0 Plus abnormals 2.7% 74 500 £ per dwelling	$\begin{array}{ c $
al 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling ign fes on build costs 10.0% 280 Interest 7.50% ber annum 7.50%	al 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling ign fees 0 interest 0 280 Interest 7.50% // 7.50%	al 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling ign fees	elopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Cher costs Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling Survey 500 £ per dwelling	elopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling Survey 500 £ per dwelling	$\begin{array}{ c $
plus abnormals 2.7% 74 14% 2.7% 74 14% 0 ε per dwelling 0 0 ε per dwelling 0 0 ε per dwelling 0 0 ε per annum 7.5%	plus abnormals 2.7% 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 750% 74 7.50% 74 7.50% 74 7.50% 74 7.50% 74 7.50% 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75	plus abnormals 2.7% 74 74 Marketing 2.1% 74 Marketing 0 £ per dwelling 11% 74 Marketing 0 £ per dwelling 2.1% 74 Marketing 0 2 Per dwelling 10.0% 10.0\% 10.0	elopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling	elopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling	$\belowned to the transmission of the transmi$
plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 500 E per dwelling al 14% Marketing 0 E per dwelling sign fest on build costs 10.0% 280 Merest on build costs 8% 32	plus ahormals 2.7% 74 Survey 500 £ per dwelling al 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling sign fest on build costs 10.0% yer annum 7.50%	plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 500 £ per dwelling al 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling	relopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs	elopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs	$\begin{array}{ c $
plus abnormals 2.7% 74 515.0 £ per dwelling Planning 515.0 £ per dwelling Survey 500 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Marketing 7.5% 74 7.5%	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	plus abnormals 2.7% 74 515.0 £ per dwelling Burvey 500 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling	velopment costs	velopment costs	Tyneside site viability studyDvellingsdailsExampleDvellingsadailsExampleDvellingsadailsExampleDvellingsadailsExampleDvellingsadailsExampleDvellingsadailsExampleExampleadailsExampleadails
standard % build 11.50% 32 that a hormals 2.7% 74 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 plus abnormals 2.7% 76 plus abnormal 2.7% 76	standard % build 11.50% 32 the costs 2.7% 74 Chaning 515.0 E per dwelling 515.0 E per dwelling all 14% 500 E per dwelling 515.0 E per	standard % build 11.50% 322 Cher costs Planning 2.7% 74 plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Blanning 515.0 £ per dwelling Survey 500 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling Marketing 0 £ per dwelling			Tyneside site viability studyDwellingsetailsetailsave floor spacebuildbuildsalesetailsMarine HouseOwellingsSM floor spacebuildbuildsalesonhaSM floor spacebuildsalesgrossper saft1000binMarket housing2.860.00%82285.5085.50165.60gsarcres2.11Affordable soc rent6.66.2285.5085.5085.50gsarcres2.01%82282.585.5085.5085.5085.50gencyframediate rent0.82.00%82285.5085.5085.5085.00fillframediate rent0.82.00%82285.5085.5085.5085.50gencyfillforther0.00.00%13.70233.70233.7022.81.621fillfillforther1.34forther1.34forther1.54.90not sqlit per acter
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	atomate 5.0/v 1.34 Velopment costs Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre velopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 velopment costs Cher costs 55.0 £ per dwelling blus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 500 £ per dwelling tal 14% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling sign fees nbuild costs 0 £ per dwelling	allowance 5.0.% 1.34 Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq. ft per acre velopment costs 322 Cher costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs 515.0 £ per dwelling plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey blus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey fal 1.4% Marketing 0 £ per dwelling	allowance 5.00% 1.34 Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre		Tyrneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build sales on Howden ost Index ave floor space build sales on Howden Owellings ave floor space build sales on Howden Ost NDEX = value on Howden Ost S22 85.50 85.50 165.00 grass acres 2.17 Ref threediate rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 70.00 grass 46.6 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 70.00 grass 46.6 Aff other 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 85.00 fk Aff other 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 85.00 fk Aff other 0.0 0.0% 822 85.50 85.50 10.50 fk Aff other 0.0 822 85.50 85.50 10.50 fk Aff other 0.0 822 85.50 10.50 fk Aff other 0.0 0.0% 822 85.50
IntrigencyTotal 41.0 10000% 33.702 33.702 124 alowance 5.00% 134 Floorspace density $= 15,490$ net sq ft per actevelopment costs 322 Other costs 515.0 ϵ per dwellingvelopment 2.7% 74 Survey 500 ϵ per dwellingbits abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 500 ϵ per dwellingal 1.4% 0 ϵ per dwellingal 0 ϵ per dwellingal 0 ϵ per dwelling ϕ costs 32 0 ϕ per anum 7.5%	Intrigency Total 41.0 1000% $\overline{33.702}$ $\overline{2381.521}$ $\underline{2494.083}$ allowance $\overline{5.00\%}$ 134 Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acce velopment costs standard % build 11.50% 322 Other costs E per dwelling velopment costs 322 Other costs $\overline{515.0}$ £ per dwelling plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey $\overline{500}$ £ per dwelling dat 14% 0 280 therest 0 sign fees 0 0 £ per dwelling	Intrigency Total 410 1000% 33,702 33,702 E2,881,521 E4,944,003 S3,702 E2,881,521 E4,944,003 S3,702 S3,702 E4,944,003 S3,702 S3,702 S3,702 S4,944,003 S3,702 S3,702 S4,944,003 S3,702 S4,944,003 S4,944,003 S3,702 S4,944,003 S4,944,003 S4,944,003 S4,944,003 S4,944,003 S4,944	ntingency Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 £2,881,521 £4,944,083 allowance 5.00% 134 Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre	ntingency Total Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 E2,881,521 E4,944,083	I Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails etails ave floor space build build build sales on ha 0.88 moviden ave floor space build build sales on ha 0.88 ave floor space build build sales on ha 0.88 ave floor space build build sales on Howden 32.8 80.00% 822 85.50 85.50 70.00 gs 41 0.0% 822 82.50 85.50 70.00 gs 46.6 16.00% 822 82.50 85.50 85.50 off intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.50 85.50 85.50 off shared oship 0.8 2.00% 82.5 85.50 85.50
Ek Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0 0.0 0.00 Intigency 134 Total 41.0 100.00% 33.702 33.702 12.381.521 54.944.083 velopment costs 322 Other costs 33.702 33.702 2.281.521 54.944.083 standard % build 15.0% 75.0 E per dwelling 2.381.521 54.944.083 Plus abnomals 2.7% 74 E per dwelling 51.0 E per dwelling all 14% 7.6% E per dwelling 51.0 E per dwelling all 14% 0.0 0 E per dwelling 51.0 E per dwelling all 14% 0 E per dwelling 50.0 E per dwelling 50.0 E per dwelling all 14% 0 0 E per dwelling 50.0 E per dwelling	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ek Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0 0.0 0.00 Itiligency Ek Total 41.0 100.00% 33.702 33.702 23.702 E36.90 0.00 allowance 5.00% 134 Floorspace density = 15,499 nets of ther acre 137.702 33.702 129.44.083 eloppment costs 322 Other costs 510.0 E per dwelling 515.0 E per dwelling Plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 550 E per dwelling E per dwelling Plus abnormals 2.7% 74 Survey 550 E per dwelling E per dwelling on biuld 1.4% 0 0 E per dwelling E per dwelling E per dwelling	Aff other 0.0 0.0% 0 85.50 85.50 0.00 Rt Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 249,44,083 allowance 5.00% 134 13,702 33,702 124,944,083 Floorspace density = 15,499 net sq ft per acre 15,21 £4,944,083	Aff other 0.0 0.0% 0 0 85.50 85.50 0.00 ntingency 133,702 33,702 33,702 124,944,083	I Tyneside site viability study Dvellings etails ave floor space build build build sales on Howden Oss net cost INDEX = value on Howden 0.88 net cost INDEX = value on Howden 0.88 net cost INDEX = value of th 0.88 net cost 0.0% B5.50 165.00 gs 41 0.0% B2.2 B5.50 B5.50 165.00 of th oto 822 B5.50 85.50 165.00 of th oto 822 B5.50 85.50 165.00
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Ek Ek Colors Ex Colors Ex	Ek Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% allowance 5.00% 134 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 15,494,083 Floorspace density $= 15,499$ net sq ft per acre	Ek Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% Intingency E Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 85,50 944,083	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build build build build build sales on Howden Narket housing 32.8 80.00% 82.7 85.50 165.00 gs 41 0.0% 82.7 85.50 85.50 165.00 gs 41 0.0% 82.2 85.50 165.00 gs 46.6 16.00% 82.2 85.50 70.00 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.2 85.50 85.50 70.00
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccc} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Aff shared oship 0.8 2.00% 82.5 85.50 90.00 Aff other 0.0 0.0 0.0% 85.50 90.00 Aff other 0.0 0.0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Iningency fk Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 12,494,083 Iningency 134 Floorspace density $= 15,499$ net sq ft per acre	Aff shared oship 0.8 2.00% 0.0%	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails etails etails ave floor space build on Howden ha 0.08 acres 2.17 of dwha 46.6 ov dwha 6.6 ov dwha 0.0%
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.2 85.50 85.00 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.50 85.50 85.00 Aff other 0.8 2.00% 82.50 85.50 90.00 Image: 1.0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0.0% 0.0% Image: 1.0 100.00% 33.702 33.702 12,434,083	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build build sales etails ave floor space build build sales on Howden gross net cost INDEX = value on Howden 32.8 80.00% 822 85.50 85.50 165.00 acres 2.17 0.0% 827 827 87.5 85.50 165.00
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Figure 1 Ex Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.5 85.50 85.00 90.00 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.50 85.50 85.00 85.00 90.00 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.2 85.50 85.50 85.00 90.00 Aff other 0.0 0.0 0.0% 0.0% 90.00 90.00 90.00 Innerview Ek Total 41.0 100.00% 33.702 33.702 1244.083 Innerview 134 Floorspace density = 15,499 net of ther acre 15,494 net of ther acre	Affinitemediate rent 0.0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 82.5 85.50 85.00 0.0% 0.0% Aff shared oship 0.8 2.00% 82.2 85.50 85.50 90.00 Fk Aff other 0.0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0 131 Total 41.0 100.00% 33,702 33,702 85.50 0.00 0.0	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build sales etails BA Marine House build build sales on Howden 32.8 80.00% 82.2 85.50 85.50 165.00
$ \begin{array}{cccccc} & 2.17 \\ \text{bit} \ \text{during} \\ \text{during} \\$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	More and Signation of the source of the		$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	n Tyneside site vlability study Dwellings Dwellings ave floor space build build sales ave floor space build build sales gross net cost INDEX = value on Howden sq.ft sq.ft per sq.ft 1.000 per sq.ft sq.ft sq.ft per sq.ft 1.000 per sq.ft
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	a 0.88 Market housing 32.8 80.00% 822 85.50 165.00 Jwgs 2.17 0.0% 82.55 85.50 70.00 Jwgs 41 0.0% 82.5 85.50 85.50 70.00 Jwgs 46.6 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.00 Jwgs 46.6 Aff intermediate rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.00 Aff for the rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 90.00 Aff for the rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 90.00 Aff for the rent 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 90.00 Aff other 0.0 0.00% 822 85.50 85.50 90.00 Aff other 0.8 2.00% 822 85.50 85.50 90.00 Aff other 0.0 0.00% 0.0 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% </td <td>Tyneside site viability study Dwellings Tyneside site viability study avelfoor space etails ave floor space build BA Marine House Dwellings</td>	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings Tyneside site viability study avelfoor space etails ave floor space build BA Marine House Dwellings
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tion ha <u>Howden</u> we have $\frac{217}{213}$ Market housing 28 <u>80.00%</u> $\frac{82.1}{6.00}$ $\frac{82.1}{6.00}$ $\frac{82.1}{6.00}$ $\frac{82.1}{6.00}$ $\frac{65.00}{6.00}$ we have $\frac{213}{6.0}$ Affordable so rent 6.9 16.00% $\frac{21.00\%}{6.0}$ $\frac{82.1}{6.00}$ $\frac{82.00\%}{6.00}$ $\frac{65.00}{6.00}$ we have $\frac{213}{6.0}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.000}$ $\frac{16.00\%}{6.00\%}$	Internation Market housing 228 8000% error fit 1000 Market housing 228 8000% error fit 1000 Market housing 228 850 1550 <t< td=""><td>tion to be 100^{10} to 100^{10} be 100^{10} by 100</td><td>tion Howden acres 2.17 Warket housing 32.8 80.00% $\frac{9 \text{ fr}}{822}$ $\frac{87 \text{ fr}}{8250}$ $\frac{1.000}{8550}$ $\frac{\text{per sq fr}}{165.00}$ Affordable soc rent 6.6 (16.00%) $\frac{822}{82}$ $\frac{85.50}{85.50}$ $\frac{70.00}{85.0}$ Market housing 32.8 $\frac{10.0\%}{822}$ $\frac{1.000}{822}$ $\frac{1.000}{825}$ $\frac{10.0\%}{825}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ Market housing 32.8 $\frac{1.00\%}{822}$ $\frac{1.00\%}{825}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.0$</td><td>Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build build sales</td></t<>	tion to be 100^{10} to 100^{10} be 100^{10} by 100	tion Howden acres 2.17 Warket housing 32.8 80.00% $\frac{9 \text{ fr}}{822}$ $\frac{87 \text{ fr}}{8250}$ $\frac{1.000}{8550}$ $\frac{\text{per sq fr}}{165.00}$ Affordable soc rent 6.6 (16.00%) $\frac{822}{82}$ $\frac{85.50}{85.50}$ $\frac{70.00}{85.0}$ Market housing 32.8 $\frac{10.0\%}{822}$ $\frac{1.000}{822}$ $\frac{1.000}{825}$ $\frac{10.0\%}{825}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ Market housing 32.8 $\frac{1.00\%}{822}$ $\frac{1.00\%}{825}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.00}$ $\frac{1.000}{85.0$	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings etails ave floor space build build sales
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tion ha $\frac{\text{BA Marine House}}{100 \text{ Howden}}$ ha $\frac{\text{BA Marine House}}{100 \text{ Howden}}$ ha $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{1000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{10000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{1000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{1000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{1000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{1000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{1000 \text{ Howden}}{10000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{10000 \text{ Howden}}{10000 \text{ Howden}}$ $\frac{10000 \text{ Howden}}{100000 \text{ Howden}$	tion ha 0.88 marine House 1.000 market housing 3.28 80.00% 822 85.50 1000 market housing 3.28 80.00% 822 85.50 165.00 market housing 3.1700 market housing 3.28 80.00% 822 85.50 165.00 market housing 4.1 0.0% 165.00 market housing 4.1 0.0% 165.00 market housing 3.170 0.0% 165.00 165.00 market housing 3.172 3.702 3.702 3.702 3.702 3.702 3.702 3.702 12.001 165.00 165.00 165.00 market housing 3.172 3.702 3.702 12.00% 165.00 0.00	Tyneside site viability study Dwellings
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Indiatis Amine House Ovellings are floor space build ades in Houde are floor space build ades in floor Affected cosin 2.8 80.00% 82.0 85.0 10.00 information Affected cosin 0.8 2.0% 85.0 85.0 10.00 information 1.4 0 0.00 0 0.00 0 0.00 information 1.4 1.4 1.0 0.00 0.0 0.00 information 2.0% 1.4 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 information 3.0% 1.4 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 information 3.0% 1.4 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 information 3.0% 1.4 0 0.0 0.0 0.0 information 3.3 1.4 1.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 information 3.3 1.4 1.0 0.0	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	details And the for space build sales tion Howden Owellings gross not NDEX value tion Howden 0.88 market housing 32.8 80.00% 822 85.50 71.000 per soft 1.000 per soft 1.65.00 per soft	n Tyneside site viability study Dwellings
etals Administration Administration </td <td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td> <td>tills</td> <td>etails are from the build allow Ina SMarine House Deline Deline Deline Deline Deline Deline Safet Deline Safet Safet</td> <td>etails on ha 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.0</td> <td></td>	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	tills	etails are from the build allow Ina SMarine House Deline Deline Deline Deline Deline Deline Safet Deline Safet	etails on ha 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.88 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.98 0.98 0.90 0.0	
MotorsAnomale to the procession of the p	Monton Design of the relation o	Montan Contract exists and a properties of the section of the se	Contract of the value Contract of the value Description Side site value Description Description <thdescription< th=""> Description D</thdescription<>	Solution Solution Annualization Solution Dwellings Solution Dwellings Amouden Dwellings	mutione I Coonstin & Attordable 20% = 80% cooled ranted 20%, intermediate

		Land																
									Iterate	to ach	ieve 2	0.0% p	rofit			Hacts	o r	
									Affc	rdable	,	No af	fordabl	⊲ ₀	ffordabl		No affo	rdable
		Land pu	urchase	price				с л	-4	9,265		26;	2,212					
		RV per	acre					ц	?	2,656		12(0,586	т 	E55,98	ო	£297	,969
		Dev pro	vlit					сл	73	1,928		85	2,812					
		Total co	sts					ц	3,8(51,443	- F	4,2{	55,324	Г				
		profit a	s % of	costs					19	%00.		20	.04%					
Programm	0	Year 1	ĉ	ĉ	5	Year 2	ĉ	ĉ	5	Year 3	ĉ	3	5	Year 4	ĉ	6	5	TOTALS
- Inite	Modiat harraina	ÿ	47	o v		ý (4 0 4		- V	ð s	4 0 4	3		à c				20 B
Units	Market nousing			2.4	4. U	9.0	0.4	4.0	4.0	0.4 0.	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.8
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship			0.5	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8 0.1 10	0.8	0.0	0.0 0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6 8.0 8.0
	Aff other TOTAL	0	0	3	0.0 5	5	0.0 5	0.0	0.0 5	0.0 5	0.0 5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 41.0
Units	Market housing			0	0	7	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	30
built'																		; ,
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			00	00	00	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	- 0	00	00	0 0	00	9 -
	Aff shared oship Aff other			00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	- 0
Units	Market housing				0	0	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	30
+30	Affordable soc rent				00	00	00	c	c	c	← c	c	ر - د	← c	00	00	00	97
	Aff shared oship Aff other				000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	0
Units	Market housing					0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	30
+4Q	Affordable soc rent					0	0	0	, , ,	÷ -	, ,	. .	, ,	. .		0	0	9
	Affordable sh osnip Aff shared oship						00		00		00	00	00	00	00	- 0	- 0	
	Aff other					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SITE 8A LAND COST & PHASING



			Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				
		rate	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	G3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Ş	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		00	00	00	0 0	00	00	326 28	543 46	543 46	543 46	543 46	543 46	543 46	543 46	00	0 0	4,123 350
	Affordable sh oship		00	00	00	00	00	00	⁴	2	5 r	ç ►	5 r	2- -	2	2-	00	00	23
	Aff shared oship Aff other		0 0	00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 0	۲ O	۰ م	۷ م	۲ 0	۰ م	۲ O	۰ م	00	00	0 20
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-12	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	0	0	-148
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	362	603	603	603	603	603	603	603	0	0	4,582
COSTS																			
Land	Land acquisition		-49																-49
	Stamp duty		0 1																0 '
	Furchase rees		.																- 5
Build costs	Market housing		0	0	0	0	169	281	281	281	281	281	281	281	0	0	0	0	2,137
	Affordable soc rent		0	0	0	0	34	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	0	0	0	0	427
	Affordable sh oship		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 .	~ 1	~ 1	~ 1	~ 1	~ 1			0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	53
	Aff shared oship		5 0	э с	0 0	5 0	4 C	~ 0	~ 0	~ 0	~ c	~ c	~ 0	~ 0	5 0	2 0	5 0	0 0	55 0
	Build contingency	5.0%	00	00	00	00	⊃ £	9 8	9 6	- œ	o 6	9 8	9 8	9 8	00	00	00	0 0	134
	Total																		2,804
Dev costs	Upfront Build solotod	5.8%	6	40	66	66	5	č	÷.	č	5	5	c	c	c	c	c	c	161
	Abnormals	3%	37	37	2	7	7	7	7	7	-	7	5	5	5	5	5	5	101
	Total	200	5	5															397
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	22	37	37	37	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0	280
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	9	9	4	ß	2	2	N	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
PG	Planning gain				9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	212
	Total																		79
Other	Planning	£515	- 2	7	7														21
	Survey Marketing	£500 FN	21		c	c	C	c	C	C	c	C	c	c	C	c	C	c	5, 0
	Total	2			5	>	>	>	>	>	>	>	þ	>	>	>	>	>	- 4
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	148
Total costs			61	91	71	77	277	439	451	459	459	459	425	425	20	20	0	0	3,731
Net profit/los	s from quarter		-61	-91	-71	-77	-277	-439	-89	144	144	144	178	178	583	583	0	0	851
Profit/loss bf f	rom last quarter		0	-62	-155	-230	-312	-600	-1,059	-1,169	-1,044	-916	-787	-620	-451	135	732	732	
Cumulative pr	ofit/loss		-61	-152	-226	-307	-589	-1,039	-1,148	-1,025	006-	-772	-609	-443	132	718	732	732	
Interest	Charged at Total	7.50%	7.50%	7.50% -3	7.50%	7.50% -6	7.50% -11	7.50% -19	7.50% -22	7.50% -19	7.50%	7.50% -14	7.50% -11	7.50% -8	7.50% 2	7.50% 13	0.00%	%00 ^{.0}	-120
Cumulative d	leveloper profit		-62	-155	-230	-312	-600	-1,059	-1,169	-1,044	-916	-787	-620	-451	135	732	732	732	731
carried forwa	ard to RV calc																		

SITE 8A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 9A: Pioneer Social Club



Input assumptions S	Scenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% soc	cial rented 20% in	termediate					
Month Tunneldo offo									
NOTIT LYRESIGE SITE VIADIILY	y study	Dwellings							
Site details				ave floor sp	ace	build	build	sales	
Site 9A Pioneer	Social Club	Dwellings		gross sn ft	net sri ft	cost	1 000	value ner sn ff	
Area ha 0.15		Market housing	.6 80.00%	728	675	90.00	90.00	165.00	
acres 0.37			1000 01		110	0.0%			
No dwgs 12 Density dw/ha 80.0		Attordable soc rent	.9 16.00%	128	6/9	0.0% 0.0%	90.00	/7.00	
		Aff intermediate rent 0).2 2.00%	728	675	90.00 200	90.06	92.00	
		Aff shared oship 0).2 2.00%	728	675	00.00	90.06	100.00	
		Aff other 0	%00.0	0	0	0.0% 90.00	90.06	0.00	
Continuency	£K	Total		8 736	8 100		£786 240	£1 103 616	
allowance 5.00%	39		×.00.001	0, 1 30	0,100		2100,240	21,133,010	
		Floorspace density	= 21,854 n	et sq ft per acr	Ð				
standard % build 10.00%	83								
		Otner costs Planning	515.0	£ per dwelli	bu				
nlite abnormale 1 0%	4 2	Survey	500	£ per dwelli	bu				
	2								
Total 12%		Marketing	0	£ per dwelli	bu				
Design fees on build costs 10.0%	83	Interest							
	c	% per annum	%nc./						
OII dev costs	0	Notes						Γ	
Planning gain £ per dwelling	25								

		Land																	
									Iterate	to ach	lieve 2	%0.0%	orofit			+001	C a c		
									Affo	rdable	Г	No at	ffordab	e e	offordat	ole	are No affo	ordable	
		Land pu RV per á	irchase acre	: price				<u>ਜ</u> ਜ	-10	7,032 <mark>8,769</mark>	-	4 4	6,475 1,428	7	£713,5	48	-£17	6,499	
		Dev prot	ĮĮ					с л	19	0,712		22	1,450						
		Total co profit as	sts s % of	costs				Ъ.	1,0()3,654 .00%	_	1,1	05,270						
Program	е	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	TOTALS	1
Units	Market housing			2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.6	
started	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship			0.5 0.1 0.1	0.5 0.1 0.1	0.5 0.1 0.1	0.5 0.1 0.1	0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 0.0	1.9 0.2 0.2	
	Aff other TOTAL	0	0	0.0 3	0.0 3	0.0 3	0.0 3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 12.0	
Units 'built'	Market housing			0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
+20	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other			0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	N O O O	
Units	Market housing				0	0	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
+30	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship				0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	000	
Units	Market housing				þ	0	00	0 0	9 64	9 64	90	00	0	00	00	0	0	10	
purchase +4Q	d Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other					0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	0000	

SITE 9A LAND COST & PHASING

	INCOME Aff Aff Aff Aff Aff Aff Aff			27	Q2	S		ż	4	Ş	Q4	3	+			.,	*		2 2
	Housing sales Ma Aff Aff Aff Aff Aff Aff Sa																		
	Aff Aff Aff Sa	rket housing ordable soc rent		00	0 0	00	00	00	00	267 23	267 23	267 23	267 23	0 0	0 0	00		00	00
	Afr Aff Sa	ordable sh oship		00	0 0	00	00	00	00	4 -	4 •	4 4	4 -	0 0	0 0	00		00	00
	Sa	snared osnip other		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	4 0	4 0	4 0	4 0	0 0	0 0	00		00	0 0
		les fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-10	-10	-10	-10	0	0	0		0	0 0
Cold income I 0 0 0 0 0 258 268 268 268 26 0 0 0 Land Samp outy Samp outy																			
CoSTS	Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	298	298	298	298	0	0	0		0	0 0
Induction interplatinterplatinterplation interplation interplation interplation inter	COSTS																		
	Land Lai	nd acquisition		-107															
	nd Du	amp auty rchase fees		ې د															
Build contained State from one of the section of the sectin of the section of the sectin of the section of the secti	To	tal		c	c	c	c	ľ		ļ	[c	c	c	¢	c		c	c c
	Build costs Má Aff.	irket housing		0 0	э с	0 0	0 0	15/ 31	157 31	15/ 31	15/ 31	0 0	э с	5 0	ə c	ə c		0 0	
Mit shared osing Build configeroy Total Mit shared osing Build configeroy 5.0% 0 0	Aff	ordable sh oship		00	00	00	00	24	24	24	24	00	00	00	00	00		00	00
	Aff	shared oship		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 (4 (4 (4 (0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0		0 0	0 0
Total by front Total by front 50% by front 10	An Bu	other ild contingency	5.0%	0 0	00	00	- - -	o 6	o 6	o 6	o 6	00	00	00	00	00		0 0	
Dev costs Upform 5.0% 10 0 <th0< td=""><td>To</td><td>tal</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>'</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th0<>	To	tal					'												
Hold related Abnormals 20, Total 8 8 0 </td <td>Dev costs Up</td> <td>front</td> <td>5.0%</td> <td>9 0</td> <td>010</td> <td>10</td> <td>9 9</td> <td>ç</td> <td>ç</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td> <td></td> <td>c</td> <td>c</td>	Dev costs Up	front	5.0%	9 0	010	1 0	9 9	ç	ç	c	c	c	c	c	c	c		c	c
Total Total <t< td=""><td></td><td>lia related</td><td>0.0.C</td><td>⊃ ∝</td><td>⊃ ∝</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>5</td><td>></td><td>5</td><td></td><td>5</td><td>5</td></t<>		lia related	0.0.C	⊃ ∝	⊃ ∝	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	5	5	>	5		5	5
Fees Fees on build costs 100% 0 0 21 21 21 21 0 <th< td=""><td>To</td><td>tal</td><td>0/4</td><td>b</td><td>)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	To	tal	0/4	b)														
FG Total Total 0	Fees Fe	es on build costs	10.0% 8.0%	0 -	0 -	0 0	0 0	21	- 21	21	2 ⁷	0 0	00	00	0 0	0 0	00		00
PG Planning gain Call Call <thcall< th=""> Call</thcall<>	To	tal	2			1	1			,	,	,	,	,	,	,	,		,
Other Earling Survey Marketing E515 E500 2 2 2 Survey Marketing $E500$ 6 0 0	PG P/s	anning gain tal				ø	9	Q	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0
Survey Marketing £500 F0 6 0	Other Pla	nning	£515	2	2	2													
Total costs Total costs 0	Su	Ney	£500 £0	9		c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	C		C
Sales fees b/forward from above 0	To	tal	2			b	>	b	b	>	>	b	>	>	>)	,		5
1 0181 COSIS	Sales fees b/f	orward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	0			0
	I OTAI COSTS			797	77	5	07	244	244	731	431	2	2	5	5	5		_	5
	Profit/loss bf from I	ast quarter		0	84	63	34	Ω	-244	-497	-443	-389	-102	191	191	191	-	91	91 191
Profit/loss bf from last quarter 0 84 63 34 5 -244 -497 -433 -389 -102 191 191 1	Cumulative profit/lo	SS		82	62	33	S	-239	-488	-435	-382	-100	187	191	191	191	-	91	91 191
Profit/loss bf from last quarter 0 84 63 34 5 -244 -497 -433 -389 -102 191 1	Interest Ch	arged at	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	7.50%	%00.0	0.00%	0.00%	Ö	%00	00% 0.00%
Profit/loss bf from last quarter 0 84 63 34 5 -244 -497 443 -389 -102 191 101 101 10	70	ta/		2			0	4	ဓု	φ	-1	Ģ	4	0	0	0		0	0
Profit/loss bf from last quarter 0 84 63 34 5 -244 -497 -433 -389 -102 191 101 187 191 101 101 101 1	Cumulative devel	oper profit		84	63	¥	S	-244	-497	-443	-389	-102	191	191	191	191	÷	2	91 191
Profit/loss bf from last quarter 0 84 63 34 5 -244 -497 -493 -389 -102 191																			

SITE 9A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

SITE 10A: The Old Dairy Wallsend



(number of a line in the initial stand)Initial stands(number of a line in the initial stand)(number of a line initial stands)(number of a line initial stands) <th>Input assumptions Sc</th> <th>cenario & option</th> <th>Affordable 20% = 80%</th> <th>social rented 2</th> <th>0% intermedia</th> <th>Ite</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Input assumptions Sc	cenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80%	social rented 2	0% intermedia	Ite				
New No <th>North Tyneside site viability</th> <th>r study</th> <th>Dwellings</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	North Tyneside site viability	r study	Dwellings							
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	•		,							
State Description State Description State Description State Stat	Site details				ave fl	oor space	build	build	sales	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} \mbox{control} & in the control in$	Site 10A The Old	d Dairy	Dwellings		gro	iss net	cost	INDEX =	value	
Models Total is not used Models is not used </th <th>Area ha 0.26</th> <th>]</th> <th>Market housing</th> <th>8.0 80.00</th> <th>75 75</th> <th>102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102</th> <th><u>ber sq n</u> 86.50</th> <th>86.50</th> <th><u>per sq π</u> 165.00</th> <th></th>	Area ha 0.26]	Market housing	8.0 80.00	75 75	102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102 102	<u>ber sq n</u> 86.50	86.50	<u>per sq π</u> 165.00	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	acres 0.64						0.0%		2	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	No dwgs		Affordable soc rent	1.6 16.00	3/	95 795	86.50	86.50	70.00	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Density dw/ha 38.5		Aff into modio to rout	00 c	<u>۲</u>	205	0.0%	00 00	BE 00	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			All Intermediate rent	<u>0.2</u> 2.0	« «	190	0°.00	00:00	00.60	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $			Aff shared oship	0.2 2.00	3 <u>7</u>	95 795	86.50	86.50	00.00	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} \mbox{Contingery} & Continger$			Aff other	0.0 0.0	%	0	0.0% 86.50	86.50	00.0	
allowance 5.00% 34 Horspace density 1.2.3.4 Horspace density Horspace density </td <th>Contingency</th> <th>£K</th> <td>Total</td> <td>10.0 1000</td> <td>0%/</td> <td>50 7 95</td> <td></td> <td>£687.675</td> <td>£1 166 265</td> <td></td>	Contingency	£K	Total	10.0 1000	0%/	50 7 95		£687.675	£1 166 265	
$ \begin{array}{cccc} \mbox{Powohment costs} & \mbox{Pandad } & \mbox{Pandad } & \mbox{Pandad } & \mbox{Pandad } & \mbox{Pandad } & \$	allowance 5.00%	34		0.01	×,1	20°		C10,1004	×1,100,500	
Development costs sandard % build 12.00% sandard % build 12.00% B7 Dere costs andard % build 12.00% Cher costs Faming an Faming 14% Dis abnomals Total 14% Dis abnomals abnomals 14% Dis abnomals 14% Di			Floorspace density	= 12,3	74 net sq ft p	er acre				
Periodication STACK Periodication standard & build 200% E E Per dwelling plus abnormals 14% 10 Survey 55.0 E Per dwelling plus abnormals 14% 10 Survey 50.0 E Per dwelling plus abnormals 14% 10 Marketing 50.0 E Per dwelling on build costs 10% 7 % Per dwelling 0 E Per dwelling on dev costs 8% 8 Moresta 76% 16% 16% 16% Planning gain 2.070 2.1 Nots 76% 16% 16% 16%										
Other costs Cuter costs Planing 5150 F er dweling Planing 13% 10 Survey 500 E per dweling Planing 13% 75 Markeing 0 E per dweling On dev costs 10% 75 % per dweling 1 Planning gain 2070 21 Markeing 1	Development costs standard % build 12.00%	87								
Planning blus abnomals 14% 10 51.0 1 per ovening Dital 13% 50 £ per ovening Total 13% 50 £ per ovening Narkeing 0 £ per ovening no build costs 10.0% 72 % per anum On dev costs 8% 8 7.50% Panning gain 2.07 21 % per anum			Other costs							
plus abnomals 14% 10 Survey 500 E per dwelling Total 13% 0 E per dwelling 0 E per dwelling Total 13% 72 Marketing 0 E per dwelling On dev costs 8% 8 Notes 7.50% F per dwelling 2.070 21 Notes			rianning	CLC	.0 the	awelling				
Total 13% Total 13% Design fees 0 Image: Constant state on build costs 10.0% 0 8% 8% 8 7.50% Planning gain 2.070 21 Notes	plus abnormals 1.4%	10	Survey	50(£ per	dwelling				
Total 13% Marketing D E per dwelling Design feas on build costs 13% 72 Marketing 0 E per dwelling On build costs 10.0% 72 Marketing 75 Marketing On dev costs 8% 8 Notes 7.50% Planting gain 2.070 21 Notes										
India 13% Design feat on build costs 72 Interest % per amum on dev costs 8% 8 on dev costs 8% 8 Planning gain £ per dwelling 2.070 21			Marketing	0	£ per	dwelling				
Design fees On build costs 10.0% on build costs 10.0% 72 on dev costs 8% 8 on dev costs 8% 8 Planning gain 2.070 21	1 otal 13%									
$ \begin{array}{c cccc} & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $	Design fees	40	Interest							
on dev costs 8% 8 Planning gain 2.070 21 £ per dwelling 2.070 21		4	% per annum	7.50	%					
Planning gain Notes £ per dwelling 2.070	on dev costs 8%	œ								
Planning gain 2.070 21 £ per dwelling 2.070 21			Notes							
	Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	21								

		Land																
									terate	to achie	eve 20	.0% pr	ofit					
			rchase	acion				<u>с</u> ,	Affor-	dable 610		No affc	rdable	Ч¥ Г	ordable	No	afforc	able
		RV per	acre					ય બ	-30,	523	_	95,8	369	မို	75,421	ч	:236,8	91
		Dev pro	Ę					ધ	186,	344		216,	948					
		Total co profit a :	sts s % of c	costs				ц Ц	980 19.(,671 0%		1,083 20.0	3,627 12%					
Programn	e	Year 1 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	TOTALS
Units	Market housing			0.8	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
started	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other			0.0 0.0	0.5 0.1 0.0	0.5 0.1 0.0	0.5 0.1 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.000	0.0.0.0	0.0000	0.0 0.0	0.0.0.0	0.0	0.000	0.0	0.000	1.6 0.2 0.0
	TOTAL	0	0	-	m	e	e	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10.0
Units 'huilt'	Market housing			0	0		2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
+20	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship			000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	0 0 0
Units	Aff other Market housing			0	00	00	0 +	0 0	0 2	0 2	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 8
complete +3Q	d Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship				000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000
Units	Aff other Market housing				0	00	00	0 +	0 0	5 0	0 0	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	0 8
purchase +4Q	d Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	00	00	00	0 0	0 5
	Aff shared oship Aff other					000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000

SITE 10A LAND COST & PHASING

			Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				
		rate	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	6	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	0 2	Q 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		00	0 0	00	00	00	00	105	315	315 27	315 27	00	00	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	1,049
	Affordable sh oship		00	00	00	00	00	00	ר מ-	4	4 4	4 4		00	00	00	00	00	8 4
	Aff shared oship		00	00	00	00	00	00	c	4 0	4 0	4 0	00	00	00	00	00	00	4 c
	Sales fees		00	00	00	0	00	00	⊳ 4	-11	-11	-11	00	0	00	0	0	0	- ³⁸
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	117	350	350	350	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,166
COSTS																			
Land	Land acquisition		-20																-20
	Stamp duty		0 1																0 1
	Furchase rees		.																- 5-
Build costs	Market housing		0	0	0	0	55	165	165	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	550
	Affordable soc rent		0	0	0	0	1	33	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
	Affordable sh oship		0	0	0	0	-	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
	Aff shared oship		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	~ (4 0	4 (4 (0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 0
	Att other Build contingency	5 0%	C	ə c			⊃ ო	⊃ €	o (⊃ €	C	C	- -			- -	5 0	- 	⊃ 7
	Total																		722
Dev costs	Upfront	6.0%	÷ 4	5 0	÷ 4	5 5	ç	ç	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	43
	Build related	0.0%	ס ע	ס ע	4	2	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	Þ	5	D	Ð	Ð	5	Ð	D	þ	5	4 5 0
	Total	0	2	2															6
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	7	22	22	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	-	.		7		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	∞ 5
DG	Planning dain				2	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	Total																		21
Other	Planning	£515	0	7	7														ιΩ I
	Survey Marketing	£00	۵		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 O
	Total																		9
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
I otal costs			4	19	07	32	100	559	242	250	11	11	-	-	-	0	0	-	947
Net profit/los	s from quarter		4	-19	-20	-32	-100	-259	-125	100	339	339	0	0	0	0	0	0	219
Profit/loss bf f	rom last quarter		0	4	-23	-44	-17-	-180	-447	-583	-491	-156	186	186	186	186	186	186	
Cumulative pri	ofit/loss		4-	-23	-43	-76	-177	-439	-572	-483	-153	183	186	186	186	186	186	186	
Interest	Charged at Total	7.50%	7.50% 0	7.50% 0	7.50% -1	7.50% -1	7.50% -3	7.50% -8	7.50% -11	7.50% -9	7.50% -3	7.50% 3	%00.0	0.00%	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	-33
				ç	3	ļ	100	ļ	C C L	201	017	100	100	101	100	100	100	100	100
cumulative d carried forwa	leveloper prorit rd to RV calc		4	-23	4	27	-180	-44/	-283	44	961-	186	186	186	186	180	186	180	186

SITE 10A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

٦

SITE 11A: Former Co op Store Brenkly Ave Shiremoor



Input assumptions s	cenario & option	Affordable 20% = 80% sc	ocial rented 20% inte	ermediate					
North Tyneside site viability	study	Dwellings							
Site details Site 11A The Fo	rmer Coop	Dwellings		ave floor space gross	net	build cost	build INDEX =	sales value	
Location Shiremoor Area ha 0.07		Market housing	6.4 80.00%	<mark>sq ft</mark> 788	sq ft k 670	er sq ft 99.00	1.000 99.00	<mark>per sq ft</mark> 160.00	
acres 0.17 No dwgs 8		Affordable soc rent	1.3 16.00%	788	670	0.0% 99.00	99.00	74.00	
Density dw/ha 114.3		Aff intermodiate rent	2000 C 0	79.0	670	0.0%	00 00	105.00	
		All Intermediate tent	0.7 2.00 2.0	00/	0/0	0.0%	00.88	00.601	
		Aff shared oship	0.2 2.00%	788	670	0.0%	00.66	114.00	
	Ċ	Aff other	0.0	0	0	<u>99.00</u>	00.66	0.00	
Contingency	A N	Total	8.0 100.00%	6,304 5	,360	H	£624,096	£773,019	
allowance 5.00%	Ω.	Floorspace density	= 30,988 ne	t sq ft per acre					
Development costs									
standard % build 9.00%	23	Other costs Planning	515 () 515 ()	f ner dwelling					
		D							
plus abnormals 0.0%	0	Survey	500	£ per dwelling					
Total 9%		Marketing	0	${\mathfrak E}$ per dwelling					
Design fees on build costs 10.0%	99	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
on dev costs 8%	Q	Notes						ſ	
Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	17								
]	

SITE 11A LAND COST & PHASING

	OME	using sales Market housing Affordable soc rent	Affordable sh oship	Aff shared oship	Aff other	Sales fees	tal income)STS	nd Land acquisition	Stamp duty Purchase fees	Total ild costs Market housing	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin	Aff shared oship	Aff other Build contingency	v costs Upfront	build related Abnormals	Total Fees on build costs	Fees on dev costs Total	Planning gain Total	er Planning	survey Marketing	es fees b/forward from above	ital costs	et profit/loss from quarter	ofit/loss bf from last quarter	mulative profit/loss	erest Charged at Total	
rate														5.0%	4.5%	4.5% 0%	10.0%	8.U%		£515	1003 £0						7.50%	
Year 1 Q1		00	00	0	0	0	•		-183	ာ ကု	0	00		00	~ 0	00	0	-			4	0	-175	175	0	175	7.50% 3	
Q2		00	00	0	0	0	0	•			0	00	000	00	2	00	0	-		~		0	6	ဇု	178	169	7.50% 3	
Q 3		00	00	0	0	0	0	,			0	00		00	~ 1	-	0	-	4	-	0	0	21	-21	172	151	7.50% 3	
Q4		00	00	0	0	0	0				0	0 0		00	2	-	0	-	9		0	0	26	-26	154	128	7.50% 2	
Year 2 Q1		00	00	0	0	0	0				125	25 3	000	⊃ ∞	:	-	16	-	9		0	0	198	-198	130	-68	7.50% -1	
Q2		00	00	0	0	0	0				187	37	ימי	0 (1	¢	5	25	Ð	0		0	0	270	-270	-69	-340	7.50% -6	
Q3		172 16	2 m	e	0	9-	193				187	37	വം	0 5	¢	5	25	5	0		0	9	277	-83	-346	-429	7.50% -8	
Q4		257 24	4	5	0	6-	290				0	00		00		5	0	þ	0		0	თ	6	281	-437	-157	7.50% -3	
Year 3 Q1		257 24	4	5	0	6-	290				0	00		00		5	0	Ð	0		0	თ	6	281	-159	121	7.50% 2	
Q2		00	00	0	0	0	0				0	00		00	•	5	0	Ð	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
ď3		00	00	0	0	0	0				0	00		00	¢	5	0	Þ	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
Q4		00	00	0	0	0	0				0	00		00	¢	5	0	Ð	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
Year 4 Q1		00	00	0	0	0	0				0	00		00		5	0	Ð	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
Q2		00	00	0	0	0	0	,			0	00	000	00	d	D	0	D	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
Q3		00	00	0	0	0	0	,			0	00		00	¢	5	0	D	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
Q4		00	00	0	0	0	0	,			0	00	000	00	¢	5	0	D	0		0	0	0	0	123	123	0.00% 0	
TOTAL		686 63	35	12	0	-25	773		-183	o ro	-188 499	4 1 0 0 0	1 C2 (34 O	655	R 0	00 90	ი 0 2	: 	4 4	401	55 8	646	127			ų	

SITE 11A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE

٦
SITE 12A: The Railwayman



~	Input assumptions Scen	ario & option	Affordable 20% = 80%	social rented 20% ii	ntermediate					
_	North Tyneside site viability st	ndy	Dwellings							
	Site details				ave floor sp	oace	build	build	sales	
	Location Percy Main				gross sg ft 747	sq ft	per sq ft	1.000	per sq ft	
	Area na <u>0.05</u> acres 0.12		Market nousing	3.2 80.00%	/4/	CCO	92.00 0.0%	92.00	00.061	
	No dwgs		Affordable soc rent	0.6 16.00%	747	635	92.00	92.00	77.00	
	Density dw/ha 80.0		Aff intermediate rent	0.1 2.00%	747	635	0.0% 92.00	92.00	104.00	
] [] [0.0%			
			Aff shared oship	0.1 2.00%	747	635	92.00 0.0%	92.00	0.00	
		ż	Aff other	0.0	0	0	92.00	92.00	0.00	
	Contingency	т.	Total	4.0 100.00%	2,988	2,540	Π	£274,896	£341,376	
	allowance 5.00%	4	Floorspace density	= 20,558 1	net sq ft per acr	þ				
	Development costs	1								
	standard % build 10.00%	29	Other costs							
			Planning	515.0	£ per dwelli	ing				
	plus abnormals 0.0%	0	Survey	500	£ per dwell	ing				
		,								
	Total 10%		Marketing	0	£ per dwell	ing				
	Design tees on build costs 10.0%	29	Interest % per annum	7.50%						
	on dev costs 8%	2								
			Notes							
	Planning gain £ per dwelling 2,070	ω								

FORDHAM RESEARCH GROUP LTD

		Land																
									terate	to achie	eve 20	.0% pr	ofit		-	1000 1000	,	
									Affor	dable		No affc	rdable	Aff	r ordable		e o afforc	lable
		Land pui	rchase	price				ъ	-85,	408		-66,	197					
		RV per a	Icre					ы	-691	,280		-535	,791	μ,	708,15	54 1-F	1,323	941
		Dev prof	Ë					ત્મ	54,	741		62,	524					
		Total co	sts					ц Ц	287	,235		311	456	-				
Programme		profit as	s % of (costs		Year 2			19.	Vear.3		20.1	%/(Year 4				
2		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	G3	Q4	Q1	Q2	0 3	Q4	Q1	Q2	G 3	Q4	TOTALS
Units started	Market housing			1.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oship			0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
~ ~	Aff shared oship Aff other			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.0
Units 'huilt'	Market housing			0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ę
+2Q	Affordable soc rent Affordable sh oshin			00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	← C
	Aff shared oship Aff other			000	000		000	000	000	000	000		000	000	000	000	000	000
Units	Market housing				0	0	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	ę
+3Q	Affordable soc rent				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	 (
	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship Aff other								000				000	000				
Units	Market housing				>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	n 1
purcnased +4Q	Affordable soc rent					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	~
*	Affordable sh oship Aff shared oship					00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
4	Aff other					0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0





		rate	Year 1 Q1	Q2	Q 3	Q4	Year 2 Q1	Q2	d 3	Q4	Year 3 Q1	Q2	d 3	Q4	Year 4 Q1	Q2	d 3	Q4	TOTALS
INCOME																			
Housing sales	Market housing		00	0 0	00	0 0	00	00	152 16	152 16	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	305
	Affordable sh oship		00	00	00	00	00	00	<u>ი</u> ლ	<u>ი</u> ე	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	ۍ <mark>د</mark>
	Aff shared oship		00	00	00	0 0	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 0	00
	Sales fees		0	0	0	0	0	0	-5	-2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-11
Total income			0	0	0	0	0	0	171	171	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	341
COSTS	_																		
Land	Land acquisition		-85																-85
	Stamp duty		0																0
	Purchase fees		Ņ																-2 88
Build costs	Market housing		0	0	0	0	110	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220
	Affordable soc rent		00	0 0	00	0 0	22	22	00	0 0	0 0	00	00	00	00	0 0	00	0 0	44 4
	Affordable sh oship		ə c				ი ი	ກຕ	> c		-						- -		n م
	Aff other		00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00			0 0	0 0
	Build contingency	5.0%	00	0 0	00	0 0	7	7	0 0	0	00	0 0	0 0	0 0	00	0	0	0	14
	Total																		289
Dev costs	Uptront Build related	5.0%	4 C	4 C	4 6	4 r	c	C	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	c	14
	Abnormals	%0°°	00	0 0	-	-	5	5	5	>	>	2	5	5	5	5	þ	>	<u>t</u> 0
	Total	2		,															29
Fees	Fees on build costs	10.0%	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
	Fees on dev costs	8.0%	0	0		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 5
PG	Planning dain				4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5 ∞
	Total															,		,	8
Other	Planning	£515		-	-														2
	Survey Marketing	£500	N		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N O
	Total																		4
Sales fees	b/forward from above		0	0	10	0 4	0	0	ц С	ц С	0	0	0	•	0	0	0	•	11
I OTAL COSTS			Ģ	n	2	<u>e</u>	RCL	RCL	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204
Net profit/los	s from quarter		81	Ŷ	-17	-16	-159	-159	165	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Profit/loss bf fr	om last quarter		0	83	80	64	50	-111	-275	-112	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	
Cumulative pro	ofit/loss		81	78	63	49	-109	-270	-110	54	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	
Interest	Charged at Total	7.50%	7.50% 2	7.50% 1	7.50% 1	7.50% 1	7.50% -2	7.50% -5	7.50% -2	7.50%	%00 ^{.0}	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00% 0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00 0	ņ
Cumulative de	eveloper profit		8	80	64	20	-111	-275	-112	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	54
carried torwa	rd to KV calc																		

SITE 12A CASH FLOW AFFORDABLE



Appendix 7 Site Location Plan



