

**MANSFIELD LOCAL PLAN –  
WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY APPRAISAL UPDATE**

---

**PREPARED ON BEHALF OF  
MANSFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**DECEMBER 2018**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2.0	WHOLE PLAN AND CIL VIABILITY ASSESSMENT JUNE 2018 .....	4
3.0	PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT .....	7
4.0	METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS .....	20
5.0	FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS .....	35
6.0	VIABILITY TESTING RESULTS .....	54
7.0	WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY AND DELIVERY .....	66

### Appendices

Appendix 1	Planning Application Analysis
Appendix 2	Land Transactions
Appendix 3	New Build Sales Data
Appendix 4	QS Construction Cost Assessment
Appendix 5	Allocations Assumptions and Results

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

- 1.1 Mansfield District Council ('the Council') is at an advanced stage of preparing a new Local Plan to cover the period 2013 to 2033. Submission of the plan for examination took place on 19 December 2018. In preparing the Local Plan the Council is required to ensure that the plan is deliverable and that the obligations and planning policy burdens do not threaten the viability of the developments identified in the plan.
- 1.2 As part of the evidence base supporting the new Local Plan, the Council has commissioned an infrastructure delivery plan, transport study and a whole plan viability study to assess the infrastructure requirements needed to support the level of growth within the district and the impact that this will have on the overall viability of the sites during the plan period.
- 1.3 The emerging Local Plan contains a number of planning policies that may impact on the viability of development. To inform the site allocations and overall Plan delivery, the Council needs to determine the impact of these plan policies on development viability. This will ensure that in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the sites and scale of development are not subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the plan's ability to be developed viably.
- 1.4 As part of the Local Plan evidence base the Council therefore commissioned a '*Whole Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment*' (the 'VA'). This VA was prepared by Nationwide CIL Service (NCS) in conjunction with Gleeds (Quantity Surveyors) and HEB (Chartered Surveyors) and is dated June 2018.
- 1.5 The NCS VA had regard to the Preferred Options Version of the Plan and the preparation of publication draft of the plan at that time. Since completion of the report the Council has finalised the Publication Draft of the Local Plan and consultation on this Publication Version of the Plan was undertaken over the period 20 September and 1 November 2018.
- 1.6 In the context of the Publication Draft of the Local Plan dated September 2018 and building on the work undertaken by NCS, we have been asked to prepare an update to the Local Plan Whole Plan Viability Assessment. This is to ensure that the Viability Assessment of the Local Plan reflects the most up to date versions of the policies and proposed allocation sites contained in the Publication Draft. In addition the update considers the impact of the policies on development both cumulatively but also on an individual basis to enable a greater degree of analysis of the impact of individual plan policies on viability.

- 1.7 The Local Plan is due to be submitted in December 2018 and is therefore within the transitional arrangement of the NPPF 2018 and will be examined against the NPPF 2012. In preparing this update to the original VA we have therefore had regard to the requirements of the NPPF 2012 and the supporting guidance contained in the appropriate version of the PPG.

### **Format of Report**

- 1.8 This update report is presented to provide a summary of the NCS VA, an overview of the Local Plan and its key policies, details of our methodology and assumptions in preparing this update, the results of our additional viability testing and conclusions regarding Plan viability and delivery.
- 1.9 For ease of reference the report is structured based on the following sections:

### **Section 2 – Whole Plan and CIL Viability Assessment June 2018**

- 1.10 Here we have provided a summary of the NCSVA including the general approach to the assessment and the conclusions relating to whole plan viability.

### **Section 3 – Planning Policy Context**

- 1.11 This section contains an overview of the Publication Draft of the Local Plan together with details of the proposed allocations and plan policies which impact on viability and delivery.

### **Section 4 – Methodology and Additional Viability Testing**

- 1.12 In this section we outline the methodology adopted by NCS in the preparation of the VA and any adjustments that we consider are required to this in the context of the Publication Version of the plan and additional property market evidence. We have also included details of the rationale for the development scenarios tested and the implications of the Local Plan development management policies.

### **Section 5 – Financial Appraisal Assumptions**

- 1.13 This section considers the financial appraisal assumptions that have been adopted in the NCS VA and any changes that are required in light of the Publication Draft of the Plan and any additional viability testing undertaken.

### **Section 6 – Results of Additional Viability Testing**

- 1.14 This section provides an overview of the results from the additional viability testing together with a commentary on the results, individual site viability and also the impact of the Local Plan policies on viability.

**Section 7 – Whole Plan Viability and Delivery**

- 1.15 In the context of the NCS VA and the further testing that we have undertaken, we provide our conclusions about the key policies that have implications for economic viability and comment on the viability and deliverability of Mansfield District’s emerging Local Plan.

## 2.0 WHOLE PLAN AND CIL VIABILITY ASSESSMENT JUNE 2018

---

- 2.1 The 'Whole Plan and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Assessment June 2018' (the 'VA') has been prepared by Nationwide CIL Service (NCS) in conjunction with Gleeds (Quantity Surveyors) and HEB (Chartered Surveyors) and is dated June 2018. Gleeds have provided the construction cost advice that has been utilised in the VA whilst HEB have provided evidence in relation to property and land values. In this section we have provided a brief overview of the study and its conclusions.
- 2.2 The purpose of the study is identified as being an assessment of the overall viability of the Mansfield District Local Plan and potential to introduce CIL charges by assessing the economic viability of development being promoted by the Plan. The NCS VA uses generic development typologies both residential and commercial to consider the cost and value impacts of the proposed plan policies and determine whether any additional viability margin exists to accommodate a Community Infrastructure Levy. The study also contains an assessment of the viability of two key strategic sites at Pleasley Hill and Jubilee Way which are key to the overall development strategy. A further site at Old Mill Lane was also tested however this site has not been allocated.
- 2.3 The Study has been prepared having regard to the 2012 NPPF and relevant guidance such Viability Testing Local Plans 2012 (Local Housing Delivery Group). In addition consideration has also been given to the March 2018 consultation drafts of the NPPF and PPG.
- 2.4 Viability is assessed by NCS using an industry standard Residual approach. This means that the Land Value, developers profit and development costs are deducted from the Development Value to determine the viability or otherwise of the development and any additional margin available for developer contributions. Provided the margin is positive (ie. Zero or above) then the development being assessed is deemed viable. In preparing the financial assessments NCS have used a bespoke model.
- 2.5 In relation to residential development the generic testing that has been undertaken is based on 5 different scenarios ranging in size from 10 to 350 units. The scenarios are tested in relation to greenfield and brownfield development sites and based on two different value zones. For commercial development 11 different development scenarios are tested including offices, industrial, retail and leisure.

2.6 The viability testing that has been undertaken is designed to assess the cumulative impact of the policies proposed by the plan to determine whether the overall development strategy is deliverable. In addition the model is used to identify the level of additional margin, beyond a reasonable return for the landowner and developer, which may be available for the introduction of CIL.

2.7 With reference to the study report the cumulative policies that are included in the testing are affordable housing requirements, National Space Standards, Accessibility Standards (based on M4 (2)), water conservation standards, BREAAAM and Sustainable Construction requirements including SuDS. The testing is also inclusive of a residual S106 contribution of £1,729 per dwelling.

2.8 The VA concludes that:

*"..... in general terms, housing development proposed in all locations in the Mansfield District Local Plan are broadly viable and, secondly, can accommodate significant CIL charges. The assessment of residential land and property values indicated that the Authority did possess significantly different residential sub-markets that warrant differential value assumptions being made in the Whole Plan Viability Assessment and, potentially, a differential rate approach to CIL based on two geographical zones."*

2.9 In terms of commercial development the VA concluded that:

*"...most forms of commercial and employment development are not viable based on the test assumptions, this does not mean that this type of development is not deliverable. For consistency a full developer's profit allowance was included in all the commercial appraisals. In reality many employment developments are undertaken direct by the operators. If the development profit allowance is removed from the calculations, then much employment development would be viable and deliverable. In addition, it is common practice in mixed use schemes for the viable residential element of a development to be used to cross subsidise the delivery of the commercial component of a scheme."*

2.10 The overall conclusion of the viability assessment was that:

*"...most of the development proposed by the Local Plan is viable and deliverable taking account of the cost impacts of the policies proposed by the plan and the requirements for viability assessment set out in the NPPF. It is further considered that significant additional margin exists, beyond a reasonable return to the landowner and developer to accommodate CIL charges."*

- 2.11 In relation to the strategic sites that were tested the study found that these were generally not viable however with a relaxation in affordable housing requirements and developers profit to 17-18% of GDV the sites at Pleasley Hill Farm and Jubilee Way would become viable. In relation to the site at Old Mill Lane the relatively high transport contributions meant that even with a relaxation in affordable housing requirements the developers profit would need to be reduced to 13% GDV for the development to become viable.
- 2.12 The study found that there were prospects for the introduction of CIL. Based on the results of the viability testing for residential development, the VA recommended the charges identified in table 2.1.

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Site Type</b>	<b>% Affordable Housing</b>	<b>CIL Rate (per sq.m)</b>
1	Greenfield	10%	£15
1	Brownfield	5%	£15
2	Greenfield	20%	£45
2	Brownfield	10%	£45
Strategic Sites	Greenfield	0-20% Affordable	£0

Table 2.1: Residential CIL Rates

- 2.13 In terms of commercial development the lack of viability as a result of the speculative form of development tested (ie. with a full developer's profit) meant that the VA recommended a zero charge for all non-residential uses except for retail. In relation to the latter a charge of £40 per sq.m was recommended for general retail (A1-A5) and £100 per sq.m for food supermarkets (A1).
- 2.14 The results from the NCS VA assisted in the formulation of a number of local plan policies for example affordable housing. Since the publication of the VA the Publication Version of the Plan has been finalised and this contains the proposed development management policies which will guide the form of development in the District over the plan period. In addition the Publication Version of the plan contains the proposed site allocations. In the next section we review the Publication Version of the Plan and provide details of the proposed allocations and also the plan policies which will have an impact on development viability and delivery.



## 3.0 PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

---

### **Background**

- 3.1 The Council has published the 'Publication' Draft Local Plan. The new Mansfield District Local Plan is a district wide development plan that will replace the existing Mansfield District Local Plan 1998.
- 3.2 This section identifies the key policies contained in the Publication Draft Version of the Local Plan (September 2018) that could potentially impact on development within the District. These impacts may be in terms of location, physical form or the level of planning contributions.

### **Mansfield District Local Plan 2013-2033 Publication Draft September 2018 ('the Local Plan')**

- 3.3 The new Local Plan sets out a vision for the District until 2033 and contains a spatial strategy which includes overall levels of growth and where development sites for new houses and employment will be located. It is a key tool for regenerating the urban areas in terms of shopping, leisure, housing and economic development and also improvements in physical and social infrastructure. Policies within the plan also deal with the natural and built environment, green infrastructure, climate change and sustainable development. Decisions on planning applications must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 3.4 We have provided a short summary of those policies most relevant to development viability in the paragraphs that follow.

### **Strategic Policies**

#### **Policy S1: The spatial strategy**

- 3.5 This policy states that the spatial strategy for Mansfield District to 2033 is to manage planned growth by directing development to appropriate locations, in accordance with a settlement hierarchy. In summary this hierarchy is:

**Mansfield urban area:** Most new housing, employment and district wide service development proposals will be concentrated within the Mansfield urban area (including Rainworth, Pleasley and Clipstone) on brownfield sites, other underutilised land and sustainable greenfield sites on the edge of the town. Development opportunities in the Mansfield urban area are focused, as far as possible, on locations which have good access to the MARR to improve connections with Greater Nottingham and the M1. Particular regeneration opportunities within and adjacent to Mansfield town centre will be priorities for delivery. Development at Rainworth should reflect the more rural character of the settlement and be more limited in scale;

**Market Warsop:** As the second largest settlement new development appropriate to its scale and regeneration needs will be directed to Market Warsop;

**Warsop Parish Villages:** Limited growth is directed to the settlements of Church Warsop, Meden Vale, Warsop Vale and Spion Kop to ensure the continued vitality of these rural communities whilst maintaining their distinctive character.

3.6 The spatial strategy also seeks to enable housing, commercial and retail development, during the period 2013 to 2033, including:

**Housing:** At least 6500 new homes between 2013 and 2033. This will be distributed as follows:

- i. Mansfield urban area - 90% or at least 5850 new homes; and
- ii. Warsop Parish - 10% or at least 650 new homes.

**Employment:** safeguard important existing employment areas, identify sites to meet future economic development needs for employment land for at least 41ha of employment land between 2013 to 2033.

**Retail:** Up to 17,240 sq.m of retail and leisure floorspace between 2017 and 2033 distributed as predominantly in Mansfield Town Centre (11,100 sq.m of comparison and 2,800 sq.m of food, drink and leisure floorspace) with the balance in the district centres of Mansfield Woodhouse and Market Warsop and the housing growth areas.

**Policy S3: Urban Regeneration and Policy S4: Delivering key regeneration sites**

3.7 Policy S3 states that development proposals which help reuse previously developed land within the Mansfield and Market Warsop urban areas will be supported. Whilst Policy S4 identifies a number of key regeneration sites summarised in table 3.1 within which Development proposals that would appropriately re-use these sites will be supported.

Site Ref	Location	Hectares
S4a	White Hart Street	3.5
S4b	Portland Gateway	28.9
S4c	Riverside	3.9

Table 3.1: Regeneration Sites

- 3.8 These sites are suitable for development for a range of uses including retail, residential, office and employment uses and have been vacant for several years due to a to lack of demand and financial viability. The sites are therefore not deemed deliverable at this time and hence they have not been allocated for development and do not contribute to meeting housing, retail, or employment needs up to 2033. The policy states that the Council will encourage and promote the regeneration of these sites.

### Housing Policies

#### Policy H1: Housing allocations

- 3.9 The sites contained in table 3.2 are allocated for housing development.

Ref	Address	No Dwellings
H1a	Clipstone Road East	511
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane	215
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	200
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	188
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive	178
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School	134
H1g	Abbott Road	102
H1h	Centenary Road	95
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	70
H1j	Cauldwell Road	42
H1k	Bellamy Road	40
H1l	High Oakham Farm (east)	40
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive	35
H1n	Sherwood Close	33
H1o	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	33
H1p	Hermitage Mill	32
H1q	South of Debdale Lane	32
H1r	Land off Holly Road	16
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane	14
H1t	Land off Ley Lane	14
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street	10
H1v	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	400
H1w	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop	36
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale	10
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2,480</b>

Table 3.2: Housing Allocations

3.10 Policy H1 sets out specific requirements for each site in relation to matters such as planning contributions. The explanation to the policy also notes that Policy P4 and Appendix 8 set out requirements for master plans for large development sites of 5 hectares and above or 150 dwellings.

3.11 Policy H1 identifies allocations with capacity for 2,480 dwellings whilst Policy H2 contains details of committed housing sites.

**Policy H3: Housing density and mix**

3.12 This policy states that development proposals of ten or more dwellings will be expected to:

- a) be built at a density that makes efficient use of the site with layouts that respect the character and appearance of the local area; and
- b) provide a range of dwelling sizes and types reflective of housing needs and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.

3.13 The explanation to the policy states that a density of between 30 and 35 dwellings per hectare is likely to prove acceptable in a large number of circumstances although lower or higher densities could be acceptable depending on site specific issues.

3.14 The explanation goes on to say that information on the need for different sizes and types of properties in Mansfield district is contained in both the SHMA and a specific study (Housing Needs of Particular Groups 2018). These set out requirements for the mix of properties over the plan. Table 3.3 contains a summary of the housing mix identified from these documents in the explanation to the policy.

Tenure	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
Market	5%	30%	45%	20%
Low Cost Home Ownership	15%	40%	40%	5%
Affordable Housing (rented)	40%	35%	20%	5%

Table 3.3: Housing Mix Summary

3.15 The policy explanation also goes on to say that the policy does not set specific requirements that must be met by an individual site but is intended to act as a guide. Account will also be taken of the character and scale of the site and the wider area. It will be easier for larger sites to deliver a mix while a town centre site is unlikely to deliver 4+bed properties. Development proposals will not be supported where the mix varies substantially from the mix identified above unless there are specific benefits associated with the mix of homes proposed.

**Policy H4: Affordable housing**

- 3.16 The policy sets out the minimum proportions of affordable housing required on market housing sites as follows:

*Within Zone 1*

- i. 10% on greenfield land; or
- ii. 5% on brownfield land.

*Within Zone 2*

- i. 20% on greenfield land; or
- ii. 10% on brownfield land.

- 3.17 These proportions will apply to sites of:

- a. more than 10 dwellings; or,
- b. with a combined gross floorspace of more than 1,000 square metres; or
- c. more than 0.5ha in site area.

- 3.18 The policy also states that the council will consider the type of property and tenure in relation to identified needs. It also makes provision for off-site commuted sums of an equivalent value in lieu of on-site provision where on-site provision is satisfactorily demonstrated not to be justified or where such off site contribution can be shown to contribute to the successful development of other affordable housing and or regeneration schemes within the district.

- 3.19 Proposals which do not meet the above policy requirements will only be acceptable where it is satisfactorily demonstrated that a different level or mix of affordable housing is required to make the development viable and the approach contributes towards creating mixed and balanced communities.

- 3.20 The Zones identified in the policy are based on those established having regard to respective property values in the VA. The explanation to the policy states that the Council will determine the mix of rented/intermediate affordable housing and the size and type of homes to be delivered having regard to up to date evidence of local housing need and discussions with registered affordable housing providers as appropriate.

**Policy H5: Custom and self-build homes**

- 3.21 This policy makes provision for at least 5 per cent of the dwelling plots to be provided as reasonably sized plots for self-build or custom build homes on development proposals of more than 100 homes. If these plots remain unsold after a period of 12 months then they may be used for general market housing.

### Employment Policies

#### Policy E2: Sites allocated as new employment areas

- 3.22 This policy allocates the sites contained in table 3.4 for employment development (Business Use Classes B1, B2 and B8).

Ref	Address	Hectares
E2a	Ratcher Hill Quarry Employment Area	5.37
E2b	Oakfield Lane, Market Worsop	2.2
E2c	Penniment Farm	9

Table 3.4: Employment Allocations

- 3.23 Policy E3 then deals with the retention of land for employment uses in the key and general employment areas listed in the policy. It also deals with the basis on which alternative uses (outside B1, B2 and B8) will be considered on these sites.

#### Strategic Urban Extensions

- 3.24 The local plan contains policies in relation to three Strategic Urban Extensions at Pleasley Hill Farm, Jubilee Way and Berry Hill. The latter is dealt with in policy SUE3 and it is already a committed site with planning consent and is now under construction. In relation to the remaining SUE's table 3.5 contains a brief summary of the uses identified in the respective policies.

Ref	Address	Use	Capacity
SUE1	Pleasley Hill Farm	Houses (inc retirement)	925
		Care Home	
		A1 retail	Up to 1,600 sq.m
		A3/A4	Up to 3,000 sq.m
		Hotel	
		Employment	1.7ha
SUE 2	Land Off Jubilee Way	PFS, nursery, gym	
		Houses	800
		Neighbourhood Parade	
		New Primary School	
		Employment	1.6ha

Table 3.5: Summary of Strategic Urban Extension Proposed Uses

- 3.25 The introduction to these SUEs states that the Land off Jubilee Way is located to east of the district and involves the development of the spoil tip of the former Crown Farm colliery and improvements to Mansfield Rugby Club and Sherwood Golf Club. Pleasely Hill Farm is located to the west of the district with access from the Mansfield Ashfield Regeneration Route (MARR). The site is located in a higher value landscape and the design and layout will be required to reflect this.
- 3.26 The plan states that these sites are not required to deliver the housing supply of 6,500 homes plus a buffer contained in the Local Plan. The viability of these sites was previously assessed by NCS in the VA and this is also reflected in the text to the policy which says that evidence suggests that they are not currently viable when taking account of the policy and infrastructure requirements required in order to deliver these two strategic sites. Given the benefits that both of the sites offer in the provision of employment land and meeting the council's aspirations of delivering long term sustainable growth by creating well designed neighbourhoods, these two strategic sites are allocated within the Local Plan. The council will continue to work with the site promoters and strategic partners including Homes England and the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership (D2N2 LEP) to deliver these sites with the supporting infrastructure and facilities that are required.

### **Development Management Policies**

- 3.27 We have summarised in the following paragraphs the key development management related policies relating to matters such as design, infrastructure and public open space which will have an impact on viability.

#### **Policy P1: Achieving high quality design**

- 3.28 This policy states that all new major development proposals (including new build, conversions and extensions) will be supported where they contribute positively to the creation of well-designed buildings and places. Requirements of the policy include responding positively to Mansfield's place making principles and Building for Life 12.

#### **Policy P3: Connected developments**

- 3.29 Policy P3 states that development will be supported provided it takes opportunities to encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport. The policy also deals with the provision of sufficient off-street car parking in accordance with Policy IN10 that complements the street scene and pedestrian environment whilst also being convenient and secure.

#### **Policy P4: Comprehensive development**

- 3.30 The policy contains a requirement for a masterplan to be submitted as part of any planning application on large sites (of five or more hectares or 150 dwellings).

**Policy P5: Climate change and new development**

- 3.31 This policy states that development proposals will be supported where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that they incorporate high standards of design and construction to reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change by incorporating the following measures, where practical and viable, having regard to the to the type, location and size of the proposal. Particular elements of the policy of relevance to viability include the provision of green infrastructure and landscaping, sustainable drainage and water management measures and appropriate flexibility to allow for future adaptation.

**Policy IN1: Infrastructure delivery**

- 3.32 The policy deals with the requirements for all development proposals to meet all reasonable costs associated with new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal. In addition and where appropriate, the development will contribute to the delivery of necessary related infrastructure to enable the cumulative infrastructure impacts of developments to be managed, including identified transport infrastructure requirements. The policy also includes provision for the future maintenance of facilities delivered as a result of the development and for clawback agreements on larger developments.
- 3.33 There is a test of viability contained in the policy which specifies that when determining the nature and scale of any planning obligations sought, account will be taken of any evidence of viability, specific site conditions, priorities in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and other material considerations.
- 3.34 The explanation to the policy states that it seeks to ensure that growth is supported by the necessary infrastructure, so that the provision of new homes and jobs does not put too much pressure on existing services and facilities.
- 3.35 In relation to CIL the explanation says that the council will continue to keep under consideration the need to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule having regard to local viability conditions and any future review of the system.

**Policy IN2: Green infrastructure**

- 3.36 This policy includes provision for on and off site contributions for new, and where appropriate enhancements to existing provision to be secured through developer contributions or conditions.



**Policy IN4: New community open space and outdoor sports provision**

3.37 The policy states that new residential development of 10 or more dwellings (net) will be required to contribute towards:

- a) the creation of new community open space (including play) and outdoor sports provision; and/or
- b) improving the quality of and/or accessibility to existing community open space, natural green space, play and outdoor sports provision.

3.38 In addition the policy states that new on-site provision and/or contributions towards enhancements to existing provision should be informed by the Council's community open space assessment and playing pitch assessment and strategy, including the Mansfield Green Space Standard and Sport England pitch standards. The requirements should also be proportionate to the size of the development and appropriate mechanisms should be put in place to deal with their future management, maintenance and sustained community use.

**Policy IN10: Car and cycle parking**

3.39 This policy makes provision for vehicle and cycle parking and in particular requires the inclusion of appropriate electric car charging provision to meet current and future demand.

**Policy IN11: Telecommunications and broadband**

3.40 The policy states that major development proposals will be supported where adequate broadband services are to be made available to all residents and / or users of the development. It also states that major development proposals should incorporate a bespoke duct network, designed and implemented in cooperation with a recognised network provider, and where viable, a fibre to the premises (FTTP) solution.

**Policy CC3: Sustainable drainage systems**

3.41 A requirement is contained in this policy that development proposals should, wherever possible, include measures to reduce and manage surface water through appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).

**Appendix 11 - The Mansfield green space standard**

3.42 Details of the amount of open space required within new residential development are contained in the Mansfield greenspace standard at Appendix 11 of the Local Plan. This states that where new open space provision is required a minimum amount of community open space to be provided on-site should be 10 percent (%) of the developable area of the proposed residential development.

3.43 In calculating the 10% provision the following are excluded and are in addition to the minimum 10% open space requirement:

- a) green space or landscaping (i.e. habitat buffer) required to mitigate impacts on protected species, priority habitats or designated sites;
- b) the physical area that a sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) takes up as required to mitigate impacts from flooding and meet drainage needs (e.g. infiltration basin or swale);
- c) landscaping required to buffer industrial or other areas to mitigate impacts from statutory nuisances and;
- d) landscaped or open grass verges along roads or cycle routes or other amenity areas required to meet road safety requirements, unless integrated as part of a wider multi-functional green corridor.

**Summary**

3.44 For ease of reference table 3.6 contains a summary of the key local plan policies that contain requirements that will have an impact on viability.

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration														
<b>Policy S2: The spatial strategy</b>	<p>Most new housing, employment and district wide service development proposals will be concentrated within the Mansfield urban area (including Rainworth, Pleasley and Clipstone) on brownfield sites, other underutilised land and sustainable greenfield sites on the edge of the town.</p> <p>Mansfield – 5,850 homes Warsop – 650 homes</p> <p>Employment 41 ha</p> <p>Retail and leisure 17,240 sq.m</p>	<p>Location and form of development</p> <p>Development on brownfield and greenfield sites on the edge of town</p> <p>New housing, employment, retail and leisure uses identified.</p>														
<b>Policy H1: Housing allocations</b>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>10 or less</td> <td>11-25</td> <td>26-49</td> <td>50-74</td> <td>75-99</td> <td>100-249</td> <td>250+</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>6</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table>	10 or less	11-25	26-49	50-74	75-99	100-249	250+	2	3	9	1	1	6	2	Size and location of typologies for testing
10 or less	11-25	26-49	50-74	75-99	100-249	250+										
2	3	9	1	1	6	2										
<b>Policy P1: Achieving high quality design</b>	The council will expect all new developments to achieve a good standard of design as a minimum, based on the Mansfield Place Making Principles and the Building for Life 12 design assessment tool.	Design – Mansfield Place Making Principles Building for Life 12														
<b>Policy P4: Comprehensive development</b>	On large sites (of five or more hectares or 150 dwellings) a masterplan for the whole site will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application.	Masterplans														

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration
<p><b>Policy P3: Connected developments</b></p> <p><b>Policy IN10: Car and cycle parking</b></p>	<p>Requirements for sufficient off-street car parking in accordance with Policy IN10</p> <p>Parking and cycle provision design so that</p> <p>a. meets the minimum standards and design requirements set out in further guidance to be set out by the council;</p> <p>b. includes appropriate electric car charging provision to meet current and future demand.</p>	<p>Parking Standards</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging points</p>
<p><b>Policy P5: Climate change and new development</b></p>	<p>Development proposals will be supported where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that it incorporates high standards of design and construction to reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change by incorporating the following measures, where practical and viable, having regard to the to the type, location and size of the proposal.</p> <p>The list of requirements includes amongst others.</p> <p>SuDS and water management measures Flexibility for future adaptation.</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage</p> <p>Water management measures</p> <p>Nationally described space standards</p>
<p><b>Policy CC3: Sustainable drainage systems</b></p>	<p>All development proposals should, wherever possible, include measures to reduce and manage surface water through appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage</p>
<p><b>Policy H3: Housing density and mix</b></p>	<p>10 or more dwellings expected to provide a range of dwelling sizes and types reflective of housing needs and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Information on the need for different sizes and types of properties in Mansfield district is contained in both the SHMA and a specific study (Housing Needs of Particular Groups). These set out requirements for the mix of properties over the plan period.</p> <p>This policy does not set specific requirements that must be met by an individual site but is intended to act as a guide. Development proposals will not be supported where the mix varies substantially from the mix identified above unless there are specific benefits associated with the mix of homes proposed.</p>	<p>Mix of market and affordable houses for testing</p>
<p><b>Policy H3: Housing density and mix</b></p>	<p>Density between 30 and 35 dwellings per hectare is likely to prove acceptable in a large number of circumstances although lower or higher densities could be acceptable depending on site specific issues.</p>	<p>Density for testing</p>

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration
<b>Policy H4: Affordable housing</b>	<p>Housing developments more than 10 new dwellings (0.5 hectares or 1,000 sq.m). Minimum requirements</p> <p><i>Zone 1</i> 10% on greenfield land; or 5% on brownfield land.</p> <p><i>Zone 2</i> 20% on greenfield land; or 10% on brownfield land.</p> <p>The council will determine the mix of rented/intermediate affordable housing and the size and type of homes to be delivered having regard to up to date evidence of local housing need and discussions with registered affordable housing providers as appropriate.</p>	Amount, type and mix of affordable housing for testing
<b>Policy IN1: Infrastructure delivery</b>	<p>All development proposals will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. meet all reasonable costs associated with new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal;</li> <li>b. where appropriate, contribute to the delivery of necessary, related infrastructure to enable the cumulative infrastructure impacts of developments to be managed, including identified transport infrastructure requirements;</li> <li>c. provide for the future maintenance of facilities delivered as a result of the development; and</li> <li>d. where appropriate and necessary, enter into clawback agreements.</li> </ul>	Developer Contributions
<b>Policy IN11: Telecommunications and broadband</b>	<p>Major development proposals should incorporate a bespoke duct network, designed and implemented in cooperation with a recognised network provider, and where viable, a fibre to the premises (FTTP) solution.</p>	Broadband provision and ducting

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration
<p><b>Policy IN2: Green infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>Policy IN4: New community open space and outdoor sports provision</b></p> <p><b>Appendix 11 - The Mansfield green space standard</b></p>	<p>On and off site contributions for new, and where appropriate enhancements to existing, provision will be secured through developer contributions or conditions.</p> <p>New residential development of 10 or more dwellings (net) will be required to contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the creation of new community open space (including play) and outdoor sports provision; and/or</li> <li>b. improving the quality of and/or accessibility to existing community open space, natural green space, play and outdoor sports provision.</li> </ul> <p>New on-site provision and/or contributions towards enhancements to existing provision should be informed by the Council's community open space assessment and playing pitch assessment and strategy, including the Mansfield Green Space Standard and Sport England pitch standards.</p> <p>Where new open space provision is required a minimum amount of community open space to be provided on-site should be 10 percent (%) of the developable area of the proposed residential development.</p>	<p>Open Space Provision</p>

Table 3.6: Summary of Local Plan Policies and Viability Implications

## 4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

---

### **Economic Viability Framework**

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (the NPPF) introduces a focus on viability in considering appropriate Development Plan Policies. In particular Paragraph 173 states that:

*'Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.'*

- 4.2 In addition to the above, the NPPF (paragraph 174) states that:

*'Local Planning Authorities should set out their Policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing. They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards. In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence.'*

- 4.3 The Local Housing Delivery Group has published advice for planning practitioners titled 'Viability Testing Local Plans'. This guidance recommends that (page 10):-

*'The approach to assessing plan viability should recognise that it can only provide high level assurance that the policies within the plan are set in a way that is compatible with the likely economic viability. It cannot guarantee that every development in the plan period will be viable, only that the plan policies will be viable for the sufficient number of sites upon which the plan relies in order to fulfil its objectively assessed needs.'*

### 4.4 The guidance states that:

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

### 4.5 In addition the advice set out within the NPPF (paragraph 175) states that *'where practical, CIL charges should be worked up and tested alongside the Local Plan.'*

### 4.6 The document 'Viability Testing Local Plans' suggests that viability testing of Local Plans does not require a detailed viability appraisal of every site anticipated to come forward over the plan period. As a consequence of the potentially widely different economic profiles of sites within the local area, it suggests:

*"A more proportionate and practical approach in which local authorities create and test a range of appropriate site typologies reflecting the mix of sites upon which the plan relies."*

### 4.7 The Planning Advisory Service in the note 'Successful Plan Making – Advice for Practitioners' suggests that:

*"Under the NPPF, authorities need to test the whole plan and all its policies together to show its impact on viability; however, separate viability testing of strategic sites is also recommended if they are key to the delivery of the plan."*

### 4.8 The Harman Guidance suggests that:

*"Planning Authorities may build up data based on the assessment of a number of specific local sites included within the land supply, or they may create a number of hypothetical sites, typologies or reasonable assumptions about the likely flow of development sites."*

*'What is important is that partners have confidence that the profile of sites included within an assessment is a good match with likely future supply over the plan period, and avoid making assumptions that could be contested.'*

*'The appraisal should be able to provide a profile of viability across a geographical range and/or range of different types of site.'*

*"Once this profile is established, it may also help to include some tests of case study sites, based on more detailed examples of actual sites likely to come forward for development if this information is available."*

**Methodology**

- 4.9 The NCS VA uses generic development typologies to consider the cumulative cost and value impacts of the proposed local plan policies and determine viability and in addition whether any margin exists to accommodate a Community Infrastructure Levy. The study also contains an assessment of the viability of the SUEs at Pleasley Hill and Jubilee Way together with a further site at Old Mill Lane.
- 4.10 Economic viability is assessed in the VA using an industry standard Residual Model approach. The model subtracts the Land Value and the Fixed Development Costs from the Development Value to determine the viability or otherwise of the development and any additional margin available for developer contributions. The model factors in a reasonable return for the landowner, a reasonable profit return to the developer and the assessed cost impacts of proposed planning policies to determine if there is a positive or negative residual output. Provided the margin is positive (ie Zero or above) then the development being assessed is deemed to be viable.
- 4.11 In preparing this update to the VA we have also adopted the residual approach however in undertaking the individual viability assessments we have considered the impact of the plan policies both singularly and cumulatively and presented the results accordingly. This is to enable the Council to understand which policies have the greatest impact on viability and where viability may be an issue inform consideration of a policy hierarchy. Table 4.1 provides a simple diagram illustrating this residual approach.

<b><i>Gross Development Value (value of the completed development scheme)</i></b>
<i>Less</i>
<i>Cost of Development (inclusive of build costs, fees, finance, land cost)</i>
<i>Less</i>
<i>Other Costs (inclusive of planning obligations)</i>
<i>Less</i>
<i>Developers Target Profit</i>
<i>= Development Surplus or "Headroom"</i>

Table 4.1: Residual Appraisal Approach



- 4.12 The residual sum that is left represents the development surplus or “headroom”. Consideration of this then allows an informed decision to be made about the viability of the development in general, and in particular, the ability to fund Local Plan policies involving additional costs for development such as developer contributions policies.
- 4.13 The NCS VA uses a bespoke excel model to assess viability. In preparing this update we have used Argus Developer which is a leading industry cash flow model.

**Sites and Typologies for Testing**

**Residential Sites**

- 4.14 The generic testing undertaken by NCS in the VA is based on a series of development typologies to reflect the type of development likely to emerge over the plan period. For residential development, five scenarios were considered and the density at which the schemes were tested was based on the assumptions below:

- Apartment 100 units per Ha
- 2 Bed House 40 units per Ha
- 3 Bed House 35 units per Ha
- 4 Bed House 25 units per Ha
- 5 Bed House 20 units per Ha

- 4.15 Based on these assumptions as to density we have calculated the overall density at which each scheme was tested and have provided details of this together with the respective generic schemes in table 4.2.

Ref	No Units	House Type	Density
Small Scale Urban Infill	10	2 beds	40
Small Scale Urban Edge	10	2 and 3 beds	37
Medium Scale Urban Mixed Residential	100	2, 3 and 4 beds	36
Medium Scale Urban Mixed Residential	100	2, 3, 4 and 5 beds	32
Large Scale Urban Extension	350	2, 3, 4 and 5 beds	29

Table 4.2: Summary of VA Generic Typologies Tested

- 4.16 Table 3.2 contains details of the proposed allocations in the District. These show that it is likely that future residential development in Mansfield will take place on both greenfield and also on some previously developed sites. The estimated housing yields from the allocations range in size from 10 units to 524 dwellings.

4.17 In preparing this update assessment we have prepared a financial appraisal for each of the proposed allocations save for H1p Hermitage Mill. This site is subject to a planning application including the conversion of the mill building to a care home and the balance of the site is to be for 32 assisted living units. Table 4.3 contains details of the respective allocations, capacities and gross and net site areas assumed. With reference to both the NCS VA and also Policy H4 we have also included details of the ward and value zone within which the allocation is situated. We have assumed that in each case onsite open space will be provided except for those sites highlighted in green where we have assumed a contribution to offsite provision.

4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

Ref	Address	Ward	Zone	Site Type	Capacity	Gross Site Area (ha)	Net Site Area (ha)	Density
H1a	Clipstone Road East	Newlands	1	GF	511	17.09	14.60	35
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane	Grange Farm	2	GF	194	8.32	6.40	30
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	Brick Kiln	1	GF	200	7.59	5.71	35
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	Ransoom Wood	1	GF	188	7.14	5.37	35
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive	Woodlands	1	GF	178	4.98	4.24	42
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School	Penniment	1	GF	134	5.1	3.83	35
H1g	Abbott Road	Penniment	1	GF	102	5.54	3.40	30
H1h	Centenary Road	Broomhill	1	BF	95	2.42	2.42	39
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	Portland	1	BF	75	1.63	1.25	60
H1j	Cauldwell Road	Oakham	2	GF	42	1.3	1.11	38
H1k	Bellamy Road	Ransom Wood	1	GF	40	2.14	1.33	30
H1l	High Oakham Farm (east)	Oakham	2	GF	40	1.57	1.33	30
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive	Sherwood	1	GF	35	0.85	0.85	41
H1n	Sherwood Close	Carr Bank	1	GF	33	0.6	0.6	55
H1o	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	Broomhill	1	GF	33	1.11	0.94	35
H1q	South of Debdale Lane	Sherwood	1	GF	32	1.08	0.91	35
H1r	Land off Holly Road	Holly	1	GF	16	0.46	0.46	35
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane	Holly	1	GF	14	0.46	0.46	30
H1t	Land off Ley Lane	Manor	1	GF	14	0.47	0.47	30
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street	Broomhill	1	GF	10	0.29	0.29	34
H1v	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	Market Warsop	1	GF	400	16.28	10.53	38
H1w	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop	Market Warsop	1	GF	36	1.21	1.03	35
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale	Warsop Carrs	1	BF	10	0.32	0.32	31

Table 4.3: Proposed Allocations for Testing

- 4.18 In preparing the evidence base for this update report we have considered available information in relation to full or reserved matters planning applications for residential developments of 10 dwellings or more since 2015. Details of this analysis is contained in **Appendix 1**. The information relates to 12 applications and a total of 979 dwellings.
- 4.19 The applications analysis shows that of the 12 schemes analysed 25% were developments of bungalows, either larger 3 and 4 bed properties or in one case a scheme for over 50s consisting of 2 bed dwellings. In the context of this evidence it is likely that housing schemes comprising bungalows will continue to come forward in the District over the plan period. This typology does not appear to have been included in the NCA VA and for completeness we have therefore tested two generic bungalow developments of 10 and 20 units.
- 4.20 The planning application analysis shows a range of densities for bungalow developments which is driven by the size of the units being developed and ranges from 12 up to 39 dwellings per hectare. For the purpose of our testing we have assumed development based on 25 dwellings per hectare.

**Mix and Dwelling Size**

- 4.21 Having established the size and capacity for each site we have then adopted a typical housing mix and house size reflecting the development density. In order to inform this we have considered the housing mix policy contained in the Local Plan and also the analysis of recent planning applications contained at **Appendix 1**. Table 4.4 provides a summary of the average housing mix and dwelling size, taken from this analysis. NIA indicates that no information is available in the application documents about the size of the particular dwelling.

	<b>1 bed</b>	<b>2 bed</b>	<b>3 bed</b>	<b>4 bed</b>	<b>5 bed</b>	<b>1 bed apt</b>	<b>2 bed apt</b>
% of mix	-	11%	32%	50%	4%	1%	2%
Size (sq.m)	-	65	90	135	196	NIA	NIA
Size (sq.ft)	-	695	966	1,458	2,107	NIA	NIA

Table 4.4: Mix and Average Dwelling Size from Planning Application Analysis

- 4.22 For completeness table 4.5 contains the mix and average dwelling size information with the bungalows and apartments excluded.

#### 4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed
% of mix	-	9%	34%	54%	4%
Size (sq.m)	-	61	83	132	196
Size (sq.ft)	-	655	894	1,419	2,107

Table 4.5: Mix and Average Dwelling Size from Planning Application Analysis houses only

4.23 With the bungalows and apartments excluded from the analysis the number of 2 bed dwellings reduces slightly and the percentage of 3 and 4 bed dwellings increases. In terms of the dwelling size this reduces for the 2, 3 and 4 bed units once the bungalows are removed from the analysis.

4.24 **Policy H3 Housing Density and Mix** sets out requirements for the provision of a range of housing types and sizes on sites of 10 dwellings or more. The policy sets out a mix taken from the SHMA 2015 and the Housing Needs of Particular Groups 2018. This is intended to act as a guide rather than a specific requirement for each site however development proposals will not be supported where the mix varies substantially from the mix identified in the policy. Details of the housing mix are contained in table 3.3.

4.25 With reference to the requirements contained in policy H3 we have therefore adopted the overall housing mix contained at table 4.6. Reflecting the fact that a number of 5 bed dwellings are being delivered we have included a very small allowance for 5 bed houses. The housing mix that has been adopted broadly reflects that used in the NCS VA save for the fact that we have included a number of 1 bed dwellings (to accord with the housing mix policy) and reduced slightly the number of 4 bed dwellings.

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed
% of mix	7%	30%	45%	15%	3%

Table 4.6: Overall Dwelling Mix Adopted for Viability Testing

4.26 Our testing in relation to bungalow developments assumes that the dwellings will comprise 40% 2 bed and 60% 3 bed dwellings.

4.27 The NCS VA assumed the dwelling sizes contained in table 4.7.

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed
sq.m	-	75	90	120	150
sq.ft		807	969	1,292	1,615

Table 4.7: Dwelling Sizes from NCS VA

4.28 The dwelling sizes are within the requirements of the National Space Standards. In terms of the planning application analysis that we have undertaken the 2 bed unit size in the analysis is smaller than that assumed by NCS and is also beneath the Space Standard requirements. The overall size of the 3 bed unit from the analysis is 90 sq.m so this accords to the NCS assumption. The 4 and 5 bed units are 135 sq.m and 196 sq.m so are slightly larger than the assumptions made by NCS. For the purpose of the testing the allocations in this update report we have retained the dwelling sizes used by NCS as they are considered to be reasonable. We have included the 1 bed dwelling at 58 sq.m (624 sq.ft) to accord with the National Space Standards.

4.29 The planning application analysis that we undertook resulted in an average dwelling size for 2 bed bungalows of 68 sq.m (735 sq.ft). This is within the range identified for single storey dwellings in the space standards and hence we have adopted this for the purpose of our testing. The average size for the 3 bed bungalows was 99 sq.m (1,061 sq.ft) with the Space Standards range being 74 to 95 sq.m. To a degree the analysis of the sizes of 3 bed bungalows was skewed by an executive scheme of dwellings that is unlikely to be typical of the majority of new development of bungalows. If this is excluded the average size is 83 sq.m (893 sq.ft). This is considered to be more typical of the average size of 3 bed bungalow and is within the range contained in the Space Standards. In testing the viability of schemes of bungalows we have therefore adopted the size for the 3 bed bungalow at 83 sq.m (893 sq.ft).

4.30 In modelling the impact of affordable housing provision our viability testing has regard to the requirements of **H4 Affordable Housing** which requires that for proposals for more than 10 dwellings (0.5 hectares) or more the on-site target will be as follows:

- Zone 1 – 10% on greenfield and 5% on brownfield;
- Zone 2 – 20% on greenfield and 10% on brownfield.

4.31 The explanation to the policy states that the Council will have regard to evidence of local housing need and discussions with registered providers in determining the mix of rented/intermediate dwellings. In preparing the VA, NCS in discussions with the Council adopted the affordable housing mix contained in table 4.8. For the purpose of our updated testing we have retained this mix and have then applied it to the house types broadly in accordance with the requirements of Policy H3 and as outlined at table 3.3. This mix is referred to as affordable housing option 1.

	Starter	Intermediate	Social Rent	Affordable Rent
sq.m	15%	15%	20%	50%

Table 4.8: Affordable Mix from NCS VA (affordable housing option 1)

4.32 In addition we have modelled viability based on a second option taking into account the requirements in the new NPPF that where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership. This means that in those areas where the affordable threshold is 10% or less all of the affordable provision is assumed to be affordable home ownership. For those areas where the affordable housing requirement is 20% we have assumed that 50% of this provision will be for affordable homeownership. In all cases we have assumed an equal split between intermediate and starter homes. This is referred to as affordable housing option 2.

4.33 **Policies P1 and P5** make provision for a number of requirements in relation to new housing development including Building for Life 12, flexibility for future adaptation and sustainable drainage and water measures. In meeting these requirements the testing undertaken in the VA includes the costs associated with matters such as water measures. In preparing our base construction cost assessments we have assumed that dwellings will meet the requirements of Building for Life 12 and in addition the form of development that we have assumed includes any additional costs associated with the provision of SuDS and the minimum standards for water efficiency as defined by building regulations.

4.34 **Policy H1: Housing Allocations** contains specific requirements in relation to each of the sites tested for example highways requirements and we have had regard to these site specific requirements (taken from the IDP) and associated costs in preparing our assessments.

**Commercial Sites**

4.35 NCS in the VA have undertaken viability assessments in relation to a wide of commercial development typologies as detailed in table 4.9. The range of uses tested is wide and having regard to the Publication Version of the Local Plan is considered sufficiently robust to demonstrate viability in the District. We have not therefore undertaken testing of any further typologies save in the context of our evidence base to verify the assumptions that have been made by NCS in their testing.

Commercial Development Sample Typology					
Unit Size & Land Plot Ratio					
		Plot Ratio		Gross:Net	Sample
		Unit Size Sqm	%		
Industrial	B1b B1c B2 B8	1000	200%	1.0	Factory Unit
Office	B1a	1000	200%	1.2	Office Building
Food Retail	A1	3000	300%	1.0	Supermarket
General Retail	A 1 – A5	300	150%	1.0	Roadside Type Shop Unit
Residential Inst	C2	4000	150%	1.2	Care Facility
Hotels	C3	3000	200%	1.2	Mid Range Hotel
Community	D1	200	150%	1.0	Community Centre
Leisure	D2	2500	300%	1.0	Bowling Alley
Agricultural		500	200%	1.0	Farm Store
Sui Generis	Car Sales	1000	200%	1.0	Car Showroom
Sui Generis	VehicleRepairs	300	200%	1.0	Repair Garage

Table 4.9: Commercial Development Typologies (NCS VA)

**Local Plan Development Management Policies**

4.36 For the allocated sites that we have tested and also the generic schemes of bungalows, table 4.10 contains a summary of the key local polices that impact on viability and how these have been dealt with in our testing.

**Summary**

4.37 Having established the sites, typologies and local plan policies for testing, Section 5 then considers the assumptions that we have made in our financial appraisals.



4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration	Approach to Testing
<p><b>Policy P1: Achieving high quality design</b></p> <p><b>Policy P4: Comprehensive development</b></p>	<p>The council will expect all new developments to achieve a good standard of design as a minimum, based on the Mansfield Place Making Principles and the Building for Life 12 design assessment tool.</p> <p>On large sites (of five or more hectares or 150 dwellings) a masterplan for the whole site will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application.</p>	<p>Design – Mansfield Place Making Principles</p> <p>Building for Life 12</p> <p>Masterplans</p>	<p>The dwelling construction costs include any additional costs associated with the requirements for Building for Life 12.</p> <p>The testing undertaken for the allocations in excess of 5 hectares or 150 dwellings include any costs associated with the preparing of masterplans.</p>
<p><b>Policy P3: Connected developments</b></p> <p><b>Policy IN10: Car and cycle parking</b></p>	<p>Requirements for sufficient off-street car parking in accordance with Policy IN10</p> <p>Parking and cycle provision design so that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>meets the minimum standards and design requirements set out in further guidance to be set out by the council;</li> <li>includes appropriate electric car charging provision to meet current and future demand</li> </ol>	<p>Parking Standards</p> <p>Electric vehicle charging points</p>	<p>The development typologies tested and hence the construction cost assessments are in accordance with the parking requirements contained in the Local Plan.</p> <p>We have separately considered the costs associated with electric vehicle charging points.</p>
<p><b>Policy P5: Climate change and new development</b></p>	<p>Development proposals will be supported where it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that it incorporates high standards of design and construction to reduce, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change by incorporating the following measures, where practical and viable, having regard to the type, location and size of the proposal.</p> <p>The list of requirements includes amongst others SuDS and water management measures</p> <p>Flexibility for future adaptation</p>	<p>Sustainable drainage</p> <p>Water management measures</p> <p>Nationally described space standards</p>	<p>The construction costs include the costs to achieve the minimum standards for water efficiency, as defined by Building Regulations and include a cost for surface water attenuation.</p> <p>The form of development tested and in particular the inclusion of open spaces addresses the requirement for SuDS, and the costs assessed make provision for all associated SuDS costs.</p> <p>The dwellings used in our testing accord to the National Described Space Standards.</p>

4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration	Approach to Testing
<b>Policy CC3: Sustainable drainage systems</b>	All development proposals should, wherever possible, include measures to reduce and manage surface water through appropriate sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)	Sustainable drainage	The form of development tested and in particular the inclusion of open spaces addresses the requirement for SuDS, and the costs assessed make provision for all associated SuDS costs.
<b>Policy H3: Housing density and mix</b>	<p>10 or more dwellings expected to provide a range of dwelling sizes and types reflective of housing needs and the achievement of mixed and balanced communities.</p> <p>Information on the need for different sizes and types of properties in Mansfield district is contained in both the SHMA 2015 and a specific study (Housing Needs of Particular Groups 2018). These set out requirements for the mix of properties over the plan period.</p> <p>This policy does not set specific requirements that must be met by an individual site but is intended to act as a guide. Development proposals will not be supported where the mix varies substantially from the mix identified above unless there are specific benefits associated with the mix of homes proposed</p>	Mix of market and affordable houses for testing	In preparing our viability assessments for the allocations we have adopted a dwelling mix that broadly accords to that identified within Policy H3.
<b>Policy H3: Housing density and mix</b>	Density between 30 and 35 dwellings per hectare is likely to prove acceptable in a large number of circumstances although lower or higher densities could be acceptable depending on site specific issues.	Density for testing	The allocations testing that has been undertaken is in accordance with the capacities contained within the Local Plan. These capacities have been assessed by the Council as densities generally of between 30 and 35 per hectare.

4.0 METHODOLOGY AND ADDITIONAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENTS

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration	Approach to Testing
<p><b>Policy H4: Affordable housing</b></p>	<p>Housing developments more than 10 new dwellings (0.5 hectares or 1,000 sq.m). Minimum requirements</p> <p><i>Zone 1</i> 10% on greenfield land; or 5% on brownfield land.</p> <p><i>Zone 2</i> 20% on greenfield land; or 10% on brownfield land.</p> <p>The council will determine the mix of rented/intermediate affordable housing and the size and type of homes to be delivered having regard to up to date evidence of local housing need and discussions with registered affordable housing providers as appropriate.</p>	<p>Amount, type and mix of affordable housing for testing</p>	<p>Testing has been undertaken based on the varying targets of 5%, 10% and 20% affordable housing provision for developments of more than 10 dwellings</p> <p>We have assumed a mix of 50% affordable rent, 20% social rent, 15% intermediate and 15% starter homes. This accords to the mix previously tested by NCS.</p> <p>We have assumed a mix of affordable housing based on the requirements of Policy H3. (Affordable Housing Option 1).</p> <p>In addition Affordable Housing Option 2 considers viability having regard to the requirements for Affordable Home Ownership contained in the NPPF 2018.</p>
<p><b>Policy IN1: Infrastructure delivery</b></p>	<p>All development proposals will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. meet all reasonable costs associated with new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal;</li> <li>b. where appropriate, contribute to the delivery of necessary related infrastructure to enable the cumulative infrastructure impacts of developments to be managed, including identified transport infrastructure requirements;</li> <li>c. provide for the future maintenance of facilities delivered as a result of the development; and</li> <li>d. where appropriate and necessary, enter into clawback agreements.</li> </ul>	<p>Developer Contributions</p>	<p>For the allocations tested we have had regard to the requirements for the respective sites as noted in Policy H1 and have included contributions towards highways, education and other requirements based on the contributions advised by the Council and as detailed later in this report.</p>
<p><b>Policy IN11: Telecommunications and broadband</b></p>	<p>Major development proposals should incorporate a bespoke duct network, designed and implemented in cooperation with a recognised network provider, and where viable, a fibre to the premises (FTTP) solution</p>	<p>Broadband provision and ducting</p>	<p>The construction cost assessments are inclusive of the costs associated with the provision of sufficient and suitable ducting to facilitate ease of high speed broadband installation at a future date.</p>

Policy	Requirements	Viability Consideration	
<p><b>Policy IN2: Green infrastructure</b></p> <p><b>Policy IN4: New community open space and outdoor sports provision</b></p> <p><b>Appendix 11 - The Mansfield green space standard</b></p>	<p>On and off site contributions for new, and where appropriate enhancements to existing, provision will be secured through developer contributions or conditions.</p> <p>New residential development of 10 or more dwellings (net) will be required to contribute towards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the creation of new community open space (including play) and outdoor sports provision; and/or</li> <li>b. improving the quality of and/or accessibility to existing community open space, natural green space, play and outdoor sports provision.</li> </ul> <p>New on-site provision and/or contributions towards enhancements to existing provision should be informed by the Council's community open space assessment and playing pitch assessment and strategy, including the Mansfield Green Space Standard and Sport England pitch standards.</p> <p>Where new open space provision is required a minimum amount of community open space to be provided on-site should be 10 percent (%) of the developable area of the proposed residential development.</p>	<p>Open Space Provision</p>	<p>The development typologies for each site reflect any relevant requirements for public open space (either on or off site), and therefore the assessments are reflective of this together with the costs of future maintenance of the open space.</p> <p>Table 4.3 identifies those sites where a contribution towards offsite provision has been assumed based on £1,100 per dwelling.</p>

Table 4.10: Implications of Development Management Policies

## 5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

---

5.1 In this section, we have outlined the assumptions that have been adopted in our financial appraisals in relation to our site allocations testing and also the generic typologies tested for bungalow developments. The assumptions contained within the NCS VA are based on research undertaken by HEB Chartered Surveyors in relation to land and property values and Gleeds Quantity Surveyors in relation to the construction costs. This information has helped to inform the appraisal assumptions that we have adopted.

### **Base Input Land Cost**

#### **NCS Approach**

- 5.2 Within the VA, NCS noted that *"there is no single method of establishing threshold land values for the purpose of viability assessment in planning but the NPPF and emerging best practice guidance does provide a clear steer on the appropriate approach"*.
- 5.3 Their approach to land value in preparing the VA was to firstly to consider the existing use value (EUV) based on its market value. They did this with reference to comparable evidence of the type of land being assessed using agricultural values for greenfield sites and industrial values for brownfield sites.
- 5.4 They then went on to consider the Gross Residual Value of the land for an alternative use (eg. residential use) noting that this represents the difference between development value and development cost after a reasonable allowance for development profit, assuming planning permission has been granted. The gross residual value does not make allowance for the impact of development plan policies on development cost and therefore represents the maximum potential value of land that landowners may aspire to.
- 5.5 In the VA they concluded that the appropriate benchmark value will therefore lie somewhere between existing use value and gross residual value based on alternative planning permission.
- 5.6 In determining the appropriate premium to the landowner above existing use value in the 'Existing Use Value Plus' approach, NCS suggested that adopting a fixed percentage over existing value was inappropriate because the premium is tied solely to existing value – which will often be very low. Their approach instead was to share the uplift in value resulting from planning permission between the landowner (as a reasonable return to incentivise the release of land) and the Local Authority (as a margin to enable infrastructure and affordable housing contributions) based on a 50:50 split. This was an approach adopted by the Inspector based on the available evidence before him in a case known as Shinfield.

- 5.7 The greenfield existing use values adopted by NCS were based on agricultural land values at £20,000 per hectare (£8,100 per acre). For brownfield sites an existing use value based on general commercial development was used at £425,000 per hectare (£172,000 per acre). NCS then used their financial appraisals to generate a gross residual value (the maximum potential value of land based on total development value less development cost with no allowance for affordable housing, sec 106 contributions or planning policy cost impacts).
- 5.8 Based on the share of uplift from existing use value table 5.1 contains details of the ranges of benchmark land values adopted in the NCS viability assessments. These benchmark land values are taken from the land costs contained in the various financial appraisals prepared by NCS that inform the VA report.

	Zone 1		Zone 2	
	Min (per net acre)	Max (per net acre)	Min (per net acre)	Max (per net acre)
Greenfield	£105,290	£127,520	£226,809	£302,589
Brownfield	£189,024	£208,853	£328,946	£384,573

Table 5.1: Threshold Land Values Adopted in NCS Assessment

**Guidance**

- 5.9 Land value is difficult to assess for a number of reasons. Firstly, development land value is an utterly derived value, with land being bought as a factor of production in the course of development. The price is generally determined by the development potential of the site. Secondly, the comparison of land value in terms of prices paid for sites is extremely difficult because of the large number of site specific variables that will impact upon the price paid. For example, the amount of remediation or other abnormal costs are likely to differ from site to site. Hence, any evidence of land transactions needs to be treated with a degree of subjectivity as adjustments may be necessary for factors such as abnormal site conditions, contamination and development density.
- 5.10 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) states that viability should consider *"competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."*

5.11 Paragraph: 015 of the Planning Practice Guidance notes that:

*"A competitive return for the land owner is the price at which a reasonable land owner would be willing to sell their land for the development. The price will need to provide an incentive for the land owner to sell in comparison with the other options available. Those options may include the current use value of the land or its value for a realistic alternative use that complies with planning policy."*

5.12 Building on this approach, the document 'Viability Testing in Local Plans' advocates the use of 'threshold land value'. This should represent the value at which a typical willing landowner is likely to release land for development, before the payment of taxes. The guidance suggests that threshold land value needs to take account of the fact that future plan Policy requirements will have an impact on land values and landowner expectations, and therefore using a market value approach as a starting point carries the risk of building in assumptions of current Policy costs rather than helping to inform the potential for future Policy. As a result it suggests that market values can be a useful 'sense check' and suggests that the threshold land value is based on a premium over current use values and credible alternative use values. The latter would be most appropriate where there is competition for land among a range of alternative uses such as in town centres.

5.13 The updated PPG to accompany the 2018 version of the NPPF reinforces the position that the starting point for establishing the benchmark land value is existing use. It states that:

*"To define land value for any viability assessment, a benchmark land value should be established on the basis of the existing use value (EUV) of the land, plus a premium for the landowner. The premium for the landowner should reflect the minimum return at which it is considered a reasonable landowner would be willing to sell their land. The premium should provide a reasonable incentive, in comparison with other options available, for the landowner to sell land for development while allowing a sufficient contribution to comply with policy requirements. This approach is often called 'existing use value plus' (EUV+)."*

5.14 It goes on to say that in establishing the benchmark land value the guidance identifies what factors to take into account, namely benchmark land value should:

- be based upon existing use value;
- allow for a premium to landowners;
- reflect the implications of abnormal costs; site-specific infrastructure costs; and professional site fees and

- Be informed by market evidence including current uses, costs and values wherever possible. Where recent market evidence is used to inform assessment of benchmark land value this evidence should be based on developments which are compliant with policies, including for affordable housing.

5.15 The PPG provides further clarification regarding the assessment of existing use value. It says that

*"EUV is the value of the land in its existing use together with the right to implement any development for which there are policy compliant extant planning consents, including realistic deemed consents, but without regard to alternative uses. Existing use value is not the price paid and should disregard hope value."*

5.16 The premium (or the 'plus' in EUV+) is the second component of benchmark land value. This is the amount above existing use value (EUV) that goes to the landowner. According to the PPG the premium should provide a reasonable incentive for a land owner to bring forward land for development while allowing a sufficient contribution to comply with policy requirements.

5.17 The RICS Guidance Note 'Financial Viability in Planning' explains that for a development to be financially viable, any uplift from the current use value of land that arises when planning permission is granted should be able to meet the cost of planning obligations, whilst at the same time, ensuring an appropriate site value for the land owner and a risk adjusted return to the developer for delivering the project. The return to the land owner will be in the form of a land value increase in excess of current use value. The land value will be based on market value which will be risk adjusted, so it will normally be less than current market prices for development land on which planning permission has been secured and planning obligation requirements are known.

### **Threshold Land Value Assumptions**

5.18 In arriving at our assessments of land values in Mansfield, we have had regard to available transactional evidence in the District to inform the existing use value and also have had regard to residential land sales as a sense check in terms of the threshold land value figure adopted. We have undertaken research using Land Registry data and other databases such as EGi and CoStar. We have provided at **Appendix 2** details of land transactions that we have considered.



- 5.19 The future residential development sites within the District are likely to be either previously developed sites, or more likely Greenfield sites located immediately adjacent or close to the existing Mansfield urban areas. This is reflected within the proposed allocations, which include some Brownfield sites although the majority comprise Greenfield sites that are located on the edge of the Mansfield urban area.
- 5.20 In arriving at a market value for previously developed, brownfield land, both the land owner and the developer would have regard to a site's current use value, albeit a landowner would be seeking an uplift in value above this level. Conversely, a developer would be reluctant to pay a full residential value for the site, having regard to the risk and cost involved in obtaining planning consent and the likely policy contributions being sought by the Council. In arriving at an assessment of market value for these purposes it is therefore necessary to have regard to both evidence of current use values as well as evidence from sites with residential planning permissions and then make reasonable adjustments to reflect factors such as the land owner's aspirations, the developer's concerns, risks inherent in the development process, and potential planning obligations.
- 5.21 Within Mansfield we would expect current values for previously developed land in the settlement areas with extant planning consents for commercial development to be in the range of £247,000 per hectare (£100,000 per acre) to £494,000 per hectare (£200,000 per acre). This is consistent with the NCS assumption at £425,000 per hectare (£172,000 per acre). The definition of viability in the context of planning recognises the issue of a landowner receiving an appropriate site value, which whilst being less than full residential value is likely to be higher than current use value. Having regard to this we have considered the level of site value at which a landowner is likely to release a site for development in the Mansfield urban area and Parish of Warsop. This will also be influenced by the supply of competing residential development sites available in the area. A large number of sites will have a limiting effect on value, and conversely a more limited number of sites is likely to increase the landowners' expectations of a value uplift.
- 5.22 The landowner in making a decision regarding site value will also have regard to the likely house prices in the area and inevitably those in higher value areas will be seeking a greater uplift to existing use value than those in lower house price areas.

## 5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

- 5.23 In order to deliver the growth proposed in the Local Plan there are a number of greenfield allocations in the Publication Draft of the Local Plan. At the present time, these sites will normally be used for agricultural and grazing purposes or informal open space with site values on this basis typically in the region of £12,500 - £50,000 per hectare (£5,000 - £20,000 per acre) or less. Again this is consistent with the assumptions made by NCS with existing use values for greenfield sites at £20,000 per hectare (£8,100 per acre). It is probable that a number of such sites have had development expectations, since they are at the edge of or within the settlement area and in some cases may already be subject to option agreements. Naturally, any land owner is unlikely to sell such sites for that level of value and clearly a land owner will be seeking an uplift in value if they are to consider releasing the site for development.
- 5.24 The NPPF requires local authorities to provide a buffer of 5% or 20% in relation to their supply of sites to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. This is intended to ensure that the landowner will have to compete in the market to sell their site so will have to competitively price the site to sell, albeit they will still want a return in excess of its current or alternative use value. If a landowner has unrealistic expectations of value, then the theory is that developers will just acquire a more competitively priced site elsewhere and the overpriced site will remain undeveloped.
- 5.25 The approach used by NCS is reasonable in the context of preparing a Local Plan Viability Assessment. The range of land values generated result in a reasonable uplift from the existing use values and particularly in Zone 1 the range of threshold land values is fairly narrow. In preparing our Viability Assessments we have utilised the threshold land values that have been adopted by NCS to establish a single tone of land value. For legibility we have used an approach which adopts a single threshold land value for each value zone and land type. This is based on the midpoint of the range of values assessed by NCS in table 5.1 and then rounded to the nearest whole number to reach reasonable high level assessment of threshold land value. We have provided in table 5.2 details of the threshold land values that we have adopted for the purpose of our viability assessments.

	<b>Zone 1 (per net ha)</b>	<b>Zone 1 (per net acre)</b>	<b>Zone 2 (per net ha)</b>	<b>Zone 2 (per net acre)</b>
Greenfield	£284,000	£115,000	£654,500	£265,000
Brownfield	£494,000	£200,000	£877,000	£355,000

Table 5.2: Threshold Land Values Adopted for Viability Testing

5.26 As a sense check we have also considered residential land sales based on the available evidence. From the sales listed at **Appendix 2** it is clear that there is a range of prices that have been paid for land with residential planning permission reflecting the differing characteristics of the development sites, the landowner’s expectations and the existing planning policy requirements. The sales data shows prices paid at around £258,500 per net hectare (£105,000 per net acre) up to £1,460,000 per net hectare (£591,000 per net acre) for a brownfield site in Berry Hill. From the available evidence land prices are highest in Berry Hill which is a Zone 2 location. As previously noted these values can only provide guidance in relation to the subject viability testing as these sales will include the pre-existing policy requirements and as a consequence are not directly comparable for this exercise. The prices paid will also reflect the unique characteristics ie. level of abnormal development costs for the specific site.

**Land Acquisition Costs**

5.27 In addition to the threshold land values detailed above, we have also assumed land acquisition costs based on a total of 1.8% of the purchase price for agent’s fees and legal fees. This is in line with normal market practice and rates. We have also assumed payment of stamp duty in accordance with HMRC thresholds and rates which are summarised in table 5.3.

Property or lease premium or transfer value	SDLT rate
Up to £150,000	Zero
The next £100,000 (the portion from £150,001 to £250,000)	2%
The remaining amount (the portion above £250,000)	5%

Table 5.3: HMRC Stamp Duty Rates

**Timing of Land Acquisition**

5.28 Our viability appraisals assume that the land is acquired on day 1 of the development programme and hence the purchase carries finance costs from the outset. For most of the small allocations considered this would be usual practice. However, it should be noted that for the larger residential developments typically above 200 units it would be unusual for a developer to acquire the entirety of such a large site from day 1. A large development site would normally be the subject of a phased acquisition programme, with the land only being drawn down by the developer as required. As a result, land acquisition costs are more likely to be phased over the development period and so the cost of finance would be reduced with a corresponding increase in viability and the amount of development surplus. Whilst each development will depend on its own circumstances inevitably a landowner would expect and accept a phased draw down of land from a developer. Hence in our assessments the landowner is benefitting from the entire land receipt at the outset.

**Other Residential Appraisal Assumptions****Development Programme**

- 5.29 In our experience a developer would seek to construct and sell around 25-35 dwellings per annum and potentially more on certain sites. For the purpose of the assessments we have assumed an average sales rate for each site of around 3 per month, depending on the size of the development, with the first sales typically taking place at between 7 months and 10 months after the start on site again dependent on the size of the development.
- 5.30 Sales rates tend to increase in respect of larger sites as developers seek to 'double up' and develop out a site in tandem. This may take the form of affiliated developers (such as Barratt and David Wilson Homes) or separate house builders. We have factored this into the sales rates assumed within the testing parameters for the larger developments and have adopted a rate of 4 to 5 per month.

**Sales Values***Market Housing*

- 5.31 The sales values that have been adopted by NCS in the VA have been informed by valuations undertaken by HEB Chartered Surveyors based on available evidence of sales and asking prices for new build and modern homes. We have provided at tables 5.4 and 5.5 summaries of the sales prices that have been assumed for the purpose of the testing in the VA in Zones 1 and 2 respectively.

Type	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Price (per sq.m)	Price (per sq.ft)	Unit Price
2 bed	75	807	1,900	£177	£142,500
3 bed	90	969	1,850	£172	£166,500
4 bed	120	1,292	1,850	£172	£222,000
5 bed	150	1,615	1,800	£167	£270,000
		<b>Ave</b>	<b>£1,850</b>	<b>£172</b>	

Table 5.4: Zone 1 Summary of Sales Prices adopted in VA

Type	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Price (per sq.m)	Price (per sq.ft)	Unit Price
2 bed	75	807	2,250	£209	£168,750
3 bed	90	969	2,200	£204	£198,000
4 bed	120	1,292	2,200	£204	£264,000
5 bed	150	1,615	2,150	£200	£322,500
		<b>Ave</b>	<b>£2,200</b>	<b>£204</b>	

Table 5.5: Zone 2 Summary of Sales Prices adopted in VA

## 5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

- 5.32 The valuations prepared for the VA were undertaken in April 2018 based on available evidence at that time. The Land Registry House Price Index shows that prices have increased in Mansfield during 2018. In December 2017 the average house price was £128,668 whilst in April 2018 at the time of the VA is was £127,153. In August 2018 the date of the last complete data set the average house price in the District was £135,844. This is an increase of 6.4% since the date of the HEB valuations.
- 5.33 The data for new build sales shows that in December 2017 the average price for a new build house was £161,385, this rose to £164,634 in April 2018 and was £168,738 in June 2018 which is the date of the most recent complete data set. The price increase from April to June was 2.5%.
- 5.34 We have also undertaken research in to new build sales and asking prices. Provided at **Appendix 3** is data relating to new build sales that have taken place in the District over the period since January 2017 together with current asking prices on new developments. We have provided a summary of this information in tables 5.6 and 5.7 with the data presented with reference to Zones 1 and 2 identified in the HEB report.

## 5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

Scheme	Location	Ward	Developer	Ave Sale Price (per sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per sq.ft)	Comments
UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	WOODLANDS		£122		Small development terraced houses
SKERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	CARR BANK		£134		
ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	WOODLANDS		£145		Small development terraced houses
BISHOPS MEADOW	CHURCH WARSOP	WARSOP CARRS		£147	£157	
HERITAGE PARK	MANSFIELD	NEW GATE	CAIRNS HERITAGE HOMES	£167		Last 3 sales in 2017
WEAVERS VIEW	PLEASLEY	WOODHOUSE	PERSIMMON	£172	£178	
MAPLE GARDENS	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	PARK HALL	BARRATT	£194	£209	£199 per sq.ft ex 2.5 storey houses
GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	WOODHOUSE		£194		Over 50s 2 bed bungalows
LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£220		Over 55s 2 bed bungalows
SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£241		2 and 3 bed bungalows
BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£275		Small detached bungalows
AVALON	MANSFIELD	PENNIMENT	PERSIMMON		£188	

Table 5.6: Zone 1 New Build Sales Prices

5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

Scheme	Location	Ward	Developer	Ave Sale Price (per sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per sq.ft)	Comments
OAKHAM GARDENS	MANSFIELD	OAKHAM	RIPON HOMES	£186		
MULBERRY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	£191		Development of 18 large detached houses
BERRY HILL HALL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL		£203		Apartments in a conversion
ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	£220	£228	Development of large detached houses
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	DAVID WILSON HOMES		£220	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	BARRATT		£180	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	BELLWAY		£228	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	AVANT HOMES		£236	

Table 5.7: Zone 2 New Build Sales Prices

- 5.35 Within Zone 1 the schemes analysed included small development of terraced houses close to the town centre, together with large scale developments undertaken by national housebuilders such as Barratt and Persimmon. The analysis also includes details of four developments of bungalows. The nature of the allocations is such that they are generally greenfield and of a size which means that they are likely to be developed by larger national and regional housebuilders. In this context the developments by Persimmon (Weavers View and Avalon) and Barratt Homes at Maple Gardens are considered relevant. The selling prices on these developments range from an average of £1,852 per sq.m (£172 per sq.ft) to £2,088 per sq.m (£194 per sq.ft). Current asking prices are from £1,916 per sq.m to £2,250 per sq.m (£178 per sq.ft to £209 per sq.ft). By comparison the sales prices adopted by NCS for Zone 1 are £1,850 per sq.m (£172 per sq.ft). This suggests that given the location and characteristics of the allocations, the increase in selling prices since April 2018 and also the available evidence, the prices that have been adopted by NCS may be slightly conservative. For the purpose of this update we have therefore adopted an average net selling price of **£1,884 per sq.m (£175 per sq.ft)** for the allocations that have been tested in Zone 1.
- 5.36 The evidence in table 5.6 shows that a premium is typically paid for new build bungalows in comparison with houses. For the purpose of our testing we have therefore applied a premium uplift of 15% to the selling prices of the bungalows and have adopted an average net selling price of **£2,167 per sq.m (£201 per sq.ft)**.
- 5.37 In Zone 2 the range of average sales prices varies from £2,002 to £2,368 per sq.m (£186 to £220 per sq.ft) however currently released asking prices particularly for the developments at Berry Hill show an increase above these levels. With the exception of the asking prices for the Barratt Scheme at £1,938 per sq.m (£180 per sq.ft) average asking prices are generally in the range of £2,368 to £2,540 per sq.m (£220 to £236 per sq.ft). This increase in asking prices may be a result of the increase in selling prices generally although at this stage selling prices at these levels may not ultimately be achieved. NCS have adopted a net selling price in Zone 2 at an average of **£2,200 per sq.m (£204 per sq.ft)**. This is potentially towards the lower end of the range of average net sales prices that might be achieved for the allocations contained in Zone 2 however as the recently released asking prices at Berry Hill are as yet unproven we have adopted a cautious approach and retained the NCS overall average sales price for the purpose of our testing.

*Affordable Housing*

- 5.38 The values that have been assumed by NCS for the affordable homes are based on the likely bid by a Registered Provider. We have provided details in table 5.8 of the bid prices as a percentage of open market value that have been assumed by NCS in the VA. The average bid prices that have adopted are in line with our expectations and have been utilised for the purpose of this update report.



Tenure	Percentage of Market Value
Starter Homes	80%
Intermediate	65%
Affordable Rent	50%
Social Rent	40%

Table 5.8: Affordable Housing Bid Prices

5.39 Our testing assumes a zero grant position.

### Construction Costs

- 5.40 Within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, NCS have used a construction cost rate of £1,040 per sq.m for all residential developments of 2 – 5 bed houses. This is stated as a median and as such our QS consider that it is reasonable, for the purpose of high level generic testing. If more detailed considerations such as development size, capacity and density are taken into account then it may be appropriate to make suitable adjustments. The construction costs that have been adopted for the purpose of testing the allocations have been prepared by our Quantity Surveyor having regard to the known requirements and characteristics of those sites. A report containing their methodology and cost assessments is contained at **Appendix 4**. In addition the individual construction cost assessments for the site specific viability appraisals are contained as Appendix A to their report.
- 5.41 These costs are based on current building regulation requirements and reflect the car parking standards contained in the Local Plan. They are inclusive of substructures, super structures, all external works, incoming services and drainage, preliminaries, fees and a contingency and also the provision of suitable ducting to facilitate ease of high speed broadband installation. The construction costs include the costs to achieve the minimum standards for water efficiency, as defined by Building Regulations and include a cost for surface water attenuation. The costs assessed make provision for all associated SuDS costs.
- 5.42 The construction costs include the cost of provision of on-site public open space, play areas (as appropriate) and the cost of future maintenance in accordance with Local Plan requirements.
- 5.43 In accordance with the requirements of Policy IN10 our QS has also separately assessed the costs of providing electric vehicle charging points at £250 per dwelling.

**Section 106/Section 278 and Emerging Planning Policy Requirements**

- 5.44 **Policy H4 – Affordable Housing.** The viability testing that we have undertaken assumes the provision of affordable housing based on either 5, 10 or 20% dependent on site type and location. We have assumed a tenure mix of 50% affordable rent, 20% social rent, 15% intermediate and 15% starter homes. This accords to the mix previously tested by NCS. In addition we have assumed a mix of affordable housing based on the requirements of **Policy H3** at table 5.4.
- 5.45 **Policy IN1: Infrastructure delivery.** This policy makes provision for new development to meet all reasonable costs associated with new infrastructure required as a consequence of the proposal. In addition policy H1 contains specific requirements in relation to the allocations themselves. In preparing our testing of the allocations we have therefore undertaken testing to model the impact on viability of the developer contributions contained in table 5.9.
- 5.46 In relation to the developments of bungalows we have assumed a S106 contribution of £1,100 per dwelling for the provision of offsite public open space.

## 5.0 FINANCIAL APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS

Ref	Address	No Dwellings	Education (£/dwelling)	Open Space (£/dwelling)	Highways (£/dwelling)	Other (£/dwelling)
H1a	Clipstone Road East	511	6,873			1,057
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane	215	5,665		245	1,057
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	200	6,058		245	1,057
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	188	5,664		122	1,057
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive	178	5,630		141	1,057
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School	134	5,635		940	1,057
H1g	Abbott Road	102	5,595		240	1,057
H1h	Centenary Road	95	5,677	1,100		1,057
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	70	5,715			1,057
H1j	Cauldwell Road	42	5,884			1,057
H1k	Bellamy Road	40	5,393		435	1,057
H1l	High Oakham Farm (east)	40	6,471			1,057
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive	35	5,774	1,100		1,057
H1n	Sherwood Close	33	5,585	1,100		1,057
H1o	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	33	5,585			1,057
H1p	Hermitage Mill	32	5,760			1,057
H1q	South of Debdale Lane	32	5,974			1,057
H1r	Land off Holly Road	16	6,899	1,100		1,057
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane	14	5,462	1,100		1,057
H1t	Land off Ley Lane	14	5,462	1,100		1,057
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street	10	6,281	1,100		1,057
H1v	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	400	5,707		4,489	1,057
H1w	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop	36	5,992			1,057
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale	10	6,281	1,100		1,057

Table 5.9: S106 Contributions modelled in Viability Assessments

### **Sales and Marketing Costs**

- 5.47 NCS in the VA have assumed disposal costs, including sales and marketing expenses, at a rate of 2.5% of the Gross Development Value of the market housing. This is within a range of typical development industry rates for housing development and is considered reasonable for the purpose of this assessment. In addition to the above we have also included an allowance of £500 per unit for the costs associated with the transfer of the affordable homes to a registered provider.

### **Finance**

- 5.48 NCS in their viability assessments have included finance based on an interest rate of 5% together with arrangement fees of 1%. Again this is within a typical range and hence for the purpose of this update we have assumed a finance rate of 6% inclusive of arrangement and monitoring fees. This reflects the cost of finance currently available in the development market for residential developments of the type contained in our viability assessments.

### **Developer's Profit and Overhead**

- 5.49 In assessing the appropriate level of developer's profit, we have had regard to both the size and form of the proposed development and the likely risk associated with the development as a result. The level of profit requirement will principally reflect the risk of constructing a particular development site and as a result a developer will typically require different levels of profit as reward for risk across different sites.
- 5.50 Many factors will govern risk in relation to a development site; these include location, the local property market, the size and scale of the development, potential contamination and other abnormal costs and the type of accommodation being provided. Other considerations affecting risk could include the planning status of the site, and specifically whether a planning consent is in place for the proposed scheme.
- 5.51 In terms of residential development, a smaller residential development would be considered less risky than a large scale strategic residential development site. On a larger site it may take many years for the developer to build out and complete the sale of all of the houses. There could be significant changes (for better or worse) in the property market during the lifetime of the development. Therefore, the risk associated with having capital tied up in the development is carried for many years. As a result, a developer would require a higher profit return than on the smaller development site.

- 5.52 The industry standard measure of profit return is typically based on a percentage of either Gross Development Value (GDV) or cost. In certain instances developers may use an internal rate of return as an additional check measure. In our experience profit based on GDV is more commonly used for residential developments although not exclusively, whilst a return based on cost is more typical for commercial development.
- 5.53 From our development market experience, residential developments would tend to command a profit return of 15-20% GDV, inclusive of a developer's overhead.
- 5.54 The HCA Guidance Note '*Investment and Planning Obligations: Responding to the Downturn*'<sup>1</sup> suggests that a figure of 16% of values rather than cost may be targeted for private residential sales. The HCA's User Manual <sup>2</sup> accompanying their Development Appraisal Tool suggests a typical figure at that time (July 2009) of 17.5-20% GDV, but this is given as a guide only as the manual suggests that profit will depend on the state of the market and the size and complexity of the scheme. It is notable that the manual, to accompany the newer versions of the HCA Development Appraisal Tool, refrain from giving any form of guidance on the measure of any appraisal variables.
- 5.55 Looking at planning decisions, Planning Inspectors in certain instances have made reference in decisions to the level of profit adopted and what is typical, including the following examples:-

Flambard Way, Godalming<sup>3</sup> (a mixed development of 225 flats and commercial accommodation): the inspector refers to an industry norm of 15-20% profit and although not explicitly stated this seems to be based on cost;

Flemingate, Beverly<sup>4</sup> (a mixed use development): Here the Inspector accepted 15% of cost;

---

<sup>1</sup> HCA Guidance Note '*Investment and Planning Obligations: Responding to the Downturn*' (HCA, 2009)

<sup>2</sup> HCA Economic Appraisal Tool User Manual (HCA, 2009)

<sup>3</sup> Planning Inspectorate Decision in relation to 'Waverley Borough Council appeal by Flambard Development Limited' APP/R3650/A/08/2063055 (Planning Inspectorate 2008)

<sup>4</sup> Planning Inspectorate Decision in relation to Application by CP Group, Wykeland Group and Quintain Estates & Development PLC, LPA: East Riding of Yorkshire' APP/E2001/V/08/1203215 (Planning Inspectorate 2008)

Clay Farm<sup>5</sup> (2,300 dwellings and retail, health centre, education): Here the Local Planning Authority suggested a profit return based on 20% of cost or 16% of GDV. 16% GDV was considered by the Council to be consistent with the profit based on GDV in the HCA document detailed above. The Inspector appears to accept the LPA's approach albeit the key point at issue related to whether the scheme should be assessed on a residual land value basis, or based on the actual historic purchase price.

Former Royal Hotel, Newbury<sup>6</sup> (35 sheltered apartments): The Inspector here decided that the profit range of 17.5%-20% of GDV detailed in the HCA EAT user manual was the correct level of profit for this development.

Shinfield, Reading<sup>7</sup> (residential development comprising 126 dwellings and a sports pavilion): The inspector determined that a figure of 20% profit on GDV was appropriate for this development.

- 5.56 As the above demonstrates, the profit return requirement is not at a fixed level and will vary from site to site, depending upon the risk profile which is driven by many factors.
- 5.57 Within the VA, NCS have used a 20% return on GDV in the residential viability appraisals to reflect speculative risk on the market housing units. In line with the draft guidance on viability in the March 2018 PPG they have adopted a profit allowance on the affordable housing element at 6%. The PPG that was introduced in July to accompany the new NPPF suggests that for the purpose of plan making an assumption of 15-20% of GDV may be considered a suitable return to developers in order to establish the viability of plan policies. The guidance goes on to say that a lower profit figure may be more appropriate in consideration of the delivery of affordable housing in circumstances where this guarantees an end sale at a known value and reduces risk.
- 5.58 The approach taken by NCS is consistent with both the consultation draft PPG and the final document that was adopted. It also reflects our experience in the market with a lower profit return being adopted for the affordable units typically at around 6% of GDV.

---

<sup>5</sup> Planning Inspectorate Decision in relation to 'Applications by Countryside Properties PLC & Countryside Properties (UK) Ltd to Cambridge City Council' APP/Q0505/A/09/2103599 and APP/ Q0505/A/09/2103592 (Planning Inspectorate, 2009)

<sup>6</sup> Planning Inspectorate Decision in relation to 'Former Royal Hotel, Newbury, Gillingham, Dorset SP8 4QJ' APP/N1215/A/09/2117195

<sup>7</sup> Planning Inspectorate Decision in relation to 'Land at the Manor, Shinfield, Reading RG2 9BX and bordered by Brookers Hill to the North, Hollow Lane to the East and Church Lane to the West' APP/X0360/A/12/2179141 (Planning Inspectorate 2013)

5.59 On the basis of the above and having regard to the nature of the allocated sites, a profit level based on 20% of GDV (inclusive of overheads) on the market housing has been adopted for sites of 20 dwellings and above. For the smaller allocations less than 20 dwellings we have adopted a profit return for the market housing of 17.5% of GDV. In relation to the affordable dwellings we have adopted a profit based on 6% of GDV. This accords to the approach taken by NCS in the preparation of the VA.

## 6.0 VIABILITY TESTING RESULTS

---

6.1 This section sets out the results and findings from the viability assessments undertaken for the proposed allocation sites tested together with the generic bungalow typologies.

### **Residential Results – Allocations**

6.2 In each case the results tables are presented by Affordable Housing/Value Zone. The Zone 1 results are contained in table 6.1 and those for Zone 2 in table 6.2. The respective tables show the Local Plan reference, address and site type. We have then included information about the number of dwellings tested, the density and then the average dwelling size for the scheme. Having regard to the characteristics of H1i and H1n an adjusted housing mix has been tested based on the current planning application whilst in relation to H1l we have adopted a housing mix that includes a greater number of 4 and 5 bed dwellings. Further details of the mix assumed in each case is contained within the individual site construction cost summaries at **Appendix 4**.

6.3 The 'Surplus' is the residual sum that is left once the gross costs (inclusive of developer's profit and threshold land cost) are deducted from gross revenues. The development surplus is presented on the basis of an amount per sq.m of built floor space.

6.4 The first column under the overall heading of surplus shows the base surplus. This is the viability of development having regard to the base construction cost position which reflects current building regulation requirements including water efficiency measures and provision for broadband ducting. In addition these appraisals make provision for the costs associated with the Local Plan policy requirements relating to the following:

- Provision of onsite open space (or a contribution in lieu) and;
- Sustainable Drainage Systems.

6.5 The base position assumes a development of entirely market housing.

6.6 The viability of the allocation is then tested with the inclusion of other Local Plan policies which have an impact on viability.



- 6.7 Policy H4 makes provision for differing levels of affordable housing (5% - 20%) for developments of more than 10 dwellings. We have therefore undertaken viability testing assuming on onsite affordable housing provision based on the policy requirement for each allocation. In doing so we have considered two different options, the first, option 1 is based on the tenure split contained in the VA and as outlined at table 4.8. The second assumes a tenure mix in accordance with the 2018 NPPF with a greater number of starter homes and intermediate dwellings. The columns titled AH Option 1 and AH Option 2 show the respective development surplus per sq.m at the policy compliant level of provision for the allocation. A minus figure shows that the development makes a loss and hence is not viable at that particular level of provision.
- 6.8 In relation to those results where the development is not viable the cells have also been shaded red. A number of the allocations are below the size threshold for affordable housing and hence affordable housing provision has not been tested. These cells are highlighted grey.
- 6.9 Obviously viability and hence the level of planning obligations that can be supported varies across the District. To allow consideration of the impact of other plan policies in combination with affordable housing we have included the columns in the right hand section of the tables. Based on the results of our testing, these columns show the impact on viability of Policy IN1 in terms of its requirements relating to developer contributions. The columns titled Education, Highways and Other S106 show the reduction in surplus resulting from these contributions. This is based on the rates per dwelling identified in table 5.9.
- 6.10 The results in the right hand side of the tables show the impact or reduction in viability due to the respective policy in the form of the per sq.m reduction to the 'Surplus'. This allows the viability impact to be considered in relation to these requirements both singularly and cumulatively and in combination with differing tenures of affordable housing provision.
- 6.11 Taking the result for H1a Clipstone East in table 6.1 as an example, with 10% affordable housing provision based on option 1, the development has a surplus of £170 per sq.m and hence is viable. If the requirement for an education contribution is added this would reduce the surplus by £58 to £112 per sq.m. With an 'other S106' contribution this reduces the surplus by a further £9 per sq.m and hence the surplus would reduce to £103 per sq.m. Based on these cumulative policy requirements the development is viable and there would still be a surplus of £103 per sq.m.
- 6.12 The development surplus and the policy impact per sq.m have in all cases been rounded to the nearest £ per sq.m

6.13 Full details of the testing assumptions and results for the allocations are contained at **Appendix 5**, whilst the construction cost assessments for each allocation are contained in the QS report at **Appendix 4**.

### Housing Allocations Zone 1

Ref	Address	Site Type	Capacity	Density	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)			Impact on Surplus (per sq.m)		
						Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2	Education	Highways	Other S106
H1a	Clipstone Road East	GF	511	35	90	£201	£170	£188	£58		£9
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	GF	200	35	90	£159	£125	£146	£56	£2	£10
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	GF	188	35	90	£142	£109	£128	£53	£1	£10
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive	GF	178	42	90	£202	£167	£187	£52	£1	£10
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School	GF	134	35	90	£150	£107	£137	£54	£9	£10
H1g	Abbott Road	GF	102	30	89	£75	£42	£57	£54	£3	£10
H1h	Centenary Road	BF	95	39	89	£74	£59	£68	£54		£10
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	BF	75	60	58	-£92	-£112	-£100	£90		£16
H1k	Bellamy Road	GF	40	30	89	£47	£16	£32	£54	£4	£11
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive	GF	35	41	89	£122	£86	£106	£58		£11
H1n	Sherwood Close	GF	33	55	85	£128	£92	£117	£59		£11
H1o	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	GF	33	35	90	£81	£54	£70	£55		£10
H1q	South of Debdale Lane	GF	32	35	90	£52	£24	£41	£59		£10
H1r	Land off Holly Road	GF	16	35	87	£29	-£1	£5	£75		£12
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane	GF	14	30	88	£18	-£10	£12	£59		£11
H1t	Land off Ley Lane	BF	14	30	88	-£99	-£127	-£105	£59		£11
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street	GF	10	34	88	£12			£68		£11
H1v	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane	GF	400	38	90	£203	£171	£189	£50	£39	£9
H1w	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane	GF	36	35	89	£106	£71	£89	£60		£11
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School	GF	10	31	88	-£91			£69		£11

Table 6.1: Results – Housing Allocations Zone 1

### Housing Allocations Zone 2

Ref	Address	Site Type	Capacity	Density	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)		
						Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2
<b>H1b</b>	Land off Skegby Lane	GF	194	30	90	£174	£90	£109
<b>H1j</b>	Caldwell Road	GF	42	38	89	£155	£74	£91
<b>H1i</b>	High Oakham Farm (east)	GF	40	30	119	£259	£197	£211

Table 6.2: Results – Housing Allocations Zone 2

Impact on Surplus (per sq.m)		
Education	Highways	Other S106
£52	£2	£10
£59		£11
£48		£8

### **Zone 1 Summary**

- 6.14 The results of the testing in relation to Zone 1 show that at the base position ie. with no affordable housing the majority of the allocations tested are viable. The three unviable results relate to two brownfield sites (H1i and H1t) and one greenfield site (H1x). The lack of viability in relation to H1i is a result of the abnormal development costs associated with this site. For H1t and H1x the allocations are 14 and 10 dwellings respectively and smaller sites such as these are relatively more expensive to development particularly when combined with some demolition and site clearance costs as is the case here.
- 6.15 We have considered in more detail the viability position in relation to the various policy requirements in Zone 1.

#### *Affordable Housing*

- 6.16 The allocations in Zone 1 are subject to an affordable housing requirement of 10% for greenfield sites and 5% for brownfield sites. For sites of 10 dwellings or less there is no affordable requirement.
- 6.17 The results of our viability assessments show that based on the option 1 tenure assumptions the majority of greenfield allocations in Zone 1 are viable. The testing shows that 14 of the 16 greenfield allocations tested are viable and able to support a 10% affordable housing requirement. The surpluses range from £16 to £171 per sq.m with the larger sites generally being more viable than the smaller allocations.
- 6.18 The two unviable results relate to H1r and H1s which are small sites of 16 and 14 dwellings respectively. The deficits in these cases are limited at only -£1 and -£10 per sq.m respectively which indicates that the sites are very close to being viable on this basis. It would take only a very small adjustment to the level of developers profit or land price or both for these developments to become viable. Indeed these developments are only marginally unviable and in reality are still likely to come forward on this basis.
- 6.19 The testing undertaken based on affordable option 2 assumes that the affordable provision at 10% will be affordable home ownership. This leads to an improvement in viability and all of the greenfield allocations tested on this basis are viable. The level of surplus ranges from £5 to £189 per sq.m. Again the larger allocations are generally more than the smaller sites.

- 6.20 There are 3 brownfield allocations located in Zone 1. The policy requirement here is for 5% affordable housing provision. Based on option 1 the largest allocation H1h is viable with a surplus of £59 per sq.m. The other two allocations H1i and H1t are unviable with losses of £92 and £99 per sq.m respectively. In relation to H1i the deficit arises mainly as a result of the abnormal development costs that have been assessed in relation to the site at over £400,000. For H1t the loss occurs due to the relatively high cost pro-rata of developing smaller sites combined with the cost of site clearance and minor demolitions.
- 6.21 Based on option 2 the viability improves slightly for these two allocations with a small reduction in the level of loss.
- 6.22 It should be noted however that even at the base position ie with no affordable housing these two allocations are unviable, therefore it is not the requirement for affordable housing that creates a lack of viability in these cases.

### *Planning Contributions*

- 6.23 The amount of education contribution per dwelling varies between the allocations. The impact on viability of the inclusion of education contributions leads to a reduction in the level of surplus ranging from £90 per sq.m for H1i to £50 per sq.m for H1v. In the majority of cases the reduction in surplus is around £50 to £60 per sq.m.
- 6.24 Of the 20 allocations tested in Zone 1, 10 could support a policy compliant level of affordable housing (based on option 1) and an education contribution at the level required. In relation to option 2 then 12 of the allocations tested could support a policy compliant level of affordable housing and an education contribution.
- 6.25 The extent of highways contributions required are more limited with only 7 allocations identified as requiring a highways contribution. The impact on the level of surplus is also limited as aside from H1v the reduction in surplus is less than £10 per sq.m. In all cases the level of surplus based on either affordable option 1 or 2 means that the 7 allocations could support the required highways contribution and a policy compliant level of affordable housing.
- 6.26 We have also modelled the impact of a S106 contribution of £1,057 per dwelling for other matters. The testing shows that this leads to a reduction in the level of surplus of between £9 and £16 per sq.m. In all cases where allocations are viable based on a policy compliant level of affordable housing they are also able to support a S106 contribution of £1,057 per dwelling and remain viable.

## 6.0 RESULTS OF ADDITIONAL VIABILITY TESTING

6.27 For completeness table 6.3 contains details of the surplus/deficit per sq.m for each allocation based on the policy compliant level of affordable housing provision (option 1 or option 2) combined with the package of other planning contributions required for each site for example highways and education.

Ref	Address	Option 1 Cumulative surplus/deficit	Option 2 Cumulative surplus/deficit
<b>H1a</b>	Clipstone Road East	£103	£121
<b>H1c</b>	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	£57	£77
<b>H1d</b>	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	£45	£65
<b>H1e</b>	Land at Redruth Drive	£103	£124
<b>H1f</b>	Former Rosebrook Primary School	£34	£64
<b>H1g</b>	Abbott Road	-£25	-£10
<b>H1h</b>	Centenary Road	-£5	£3
<b>H1i</b>	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	-£219	-£207
<b>H1k</b>	Bellamy Road	-£53	-£37
<b>H1m</b>	Land off Balmoral Drive	£18	£38
<b>H1n</b>	Sherwood Close	£23	£47
<b>H1o</b>	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	-£12	£4
<b>H1q</b>	South of Debdale Lane	-£46	-£29
<b>H1r</b>	Land off Holly Road	-£88	-£81
<b>H1s</b>	Land at Cox's Lane	-£81	-£58
<b>H1t</b>	Land off Ley Lane	-£198	-£175
<b>H1v</b>	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane	£73	£91
<b>H1w</b>	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane	£0	£18

Table 6.3: Cumulative Testing Results Zone 1

6.28 The results show that based on option 1 nine of the sites tested are viable based on the cumulative package of affordable housing and other policy requirements in relation to education etc. In relation to the remaining nine unviable allocations the results suggest that there may need to be some relaxation in requirements to achieve viable development on these sites, albeit two of the sites tested are unviable even in the absence of policy requirements.

6.29 Based on the option 2 the viability position improves and 11 of the allocations tested are viable based on the full planning contribution requirements. Putting to one side the results for H1t and H1i, then the other results have more limited deficits and would generally be able to support some planning contributions together with affordable housing at the policy compliant level.

### **Zone 2 Summary**

6.30 In Zone 2 three greenfield allocations have been tested. In each case these developments are viable at the base position with surpluses ranging from £155 to £259 per sq.m. We have considered in more detail the viability position in relation to the various policy requirements in Zone 2.

#### *Affordable Housing*

6.31 The allocations in Zone 2 are subject to an affordable housing requirement of 20% for greenfield sites and 10% for brownfield sites. For sites of 10 dwellings or less there is no affordable requirement.

6.32 The results of our viability assessments show that based on the option 1 the greenfield allocations in Zone 2 are viable. The testing shows that each of the three allocations tested is viable and is able to support a 20% affordable housing requirement. The surpluses range from £74 to £197 per sq.m. The testing based on affordable option 2 demonstrates an improvement in viability with the surpluses ranging from £91 to £211 per sq.m.

#### *Planning Contributions*

6.33 The amount of education contribution per dwelling varies between the allocations. The impact on viability of the inclusion of education contributions leads to a reduction in the level of surplus ranging from £59 per sq.m for H1j to £48 per sq.m for H1l.

6.34 Only allocation H1b is required to make a highways contribution and this is fairly limited with a reduction in the level of surplus equivalent to only £2 per sq.m.

6.35 The testing based on a S106 contribution to other matters shows a reduction in surplus of between £8 and £11 per sq.m however this is not significant in the context of the levels of surplus for these sites.

6.36 For completeness table 6.4 contains details of the surplus/deficit per sq.m for each allocation based on the policy compliant level of affordable housing provision (option 1 or option 2) combined with the package of other planning contributions required for each site.



Ref	Address	Option 1 Cumulative surplus/deficit	Option 2 Cumulative surplus/deficit
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane	£26	£45
H1j	Cauldwell Road	£5	£22
H1i	High Oakham Farm (east)	£141	£155

Table 6.4: Cumulative Testing Results Zone 2

6.37 The results show that each of the three allocations is sufficiently financially viable to support the combined package of affordable housing at the policy compliant level together with other planning contributions.

### Bungalows – Generic Testing

6.38 We have also prepared generic viability assessments in relation to standalone schemes of bungalows based on capacities of 10 and 20 dwellings. The testing has been undertaken at a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. The results of our testing are contained in tables 6.5-6.8, as follows:

Table 6.5 - Zone 1 brownfield

Table 6.6 – Zone 1 greenfield

Table 6.7 – Zone 2 brownfield

Table 6.8 – Zone 2 greenfield

6.39 As with the results for the allocations, the tables show the scheme reference, number of dwellings and average dwelling size. We have then included the development surplus per sq.m at the base position with no affordable housing. Where the results are viable at the base position then for the larger scheme of 20 bungalows we have modelled the impact of affordable housing provision based on options 1 and 2. The results that are unviable have been highlighted in red.

### Zone 1

Ref	No Dwellings	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)		
			Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2
1	10	78	-£141		
2	20	78	-£156		

Table 6.5: Zone 1 - Brownfield Testing

## 6.0 RESULTS OF ADDITIONAL VIABILITY TESTING

Ref	No Dwellings	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)		
			Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2
1	10	78	£45		
2	20	78	£28	-£2	£8

Table 6.6: Zone 1 - Greenfield Testing

### Zone 2

Ref	No Dwellings	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)		
			Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2
1	10	78	-£68		
2	20	78	-£97		

Table 6.7: Zone 2 - Brownfield Testing

Ref	No Dwellings	Ave Size (sq.m)	Surplus (per sq.m)		
			Base	AH Option 1	AH Option 2
1	10	78	£7		
2	20	78	-£23		

Table 6.8: Zone 2 - Greenfield Testing

- 6.40 The viability testing of bungalows shows that based on the generic typologies assumed the development of brownfield sites for bungalows in both zones 1 and 2 is not viable at the base position. This is largely a result of the combination of the larger site required pro-rata for bungalows in comparison with more traditional housing and the higher benchmark land values assumed for brownfield sites.
- 6.41 Viability in relation to greenfield sites improves with both the bungalow schemes tested in Zone 1 viable at the base position. The results for Zone 1 also suggest that it would be possible to achieve a policy compliant level of affordable housing at 10% on greenfield sites in Zone 1, albeit for option 1 the result is marginal with a very small deficit equivalent to only £2 per sq.m.
- 6.42 In Zone 2 the selling prices assumed are higher than in Zone 1 however the benchmark land value is also higher and this tends to offset the increased selling prices with the result that surpluses are more limited. The smaller scheme of 10 dwellings is viable on greenfield sites in Zone 2 however the larger 20 unit scheme becomes unviable with a loss of £23 per sq.m. This level of loss suggested the development is more marginal however a relatively small reduction in the level of developers profit or land value would result in a viable development.

**Electric Vehicle Charging Points**

- 6.43 Policy IN10 requires the provision of charging points to meet current and future demand. Our QS has estimated the cost of electrical vehicle charging points to be in the region of £250 per dwelling in addition to the base construction costs. Adding these costs into the viability assessments would mean that based on the average dwelling sizes this would lead to a reduction in the level of surplus in the range of £4.31 to £2.10 per sq.m. The cost of electric vehicle charging points is minimal and makes no significant difference to the base construction costs and will have a very limited impact on overall viability

## 7.0 WHOLE PLAN VIABILITY AND DELIVERY

---

### **Conclusions**

- 7.1 As outlined in Section 4, the NPPF requires that the Local Plan should be deliverable and the sites and scale of development identified in the Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and Policy burdens that their ability to be viably developed is threatened.
- 7.2 In preparing this update Viability Assessment we have considered the spatial and strategic policies of the Local Plan, the proposed housing allocations on which new development will be delivered, the development management policies that will guide the form, design, quality of development and the associated planning obligations.
- 7.3 The VA prepared by NCS considered viability in the context of a number of generic development typologies both commercial and residential. Since the VA was prepared the proposed allocations and plan policies have been finalised and we have therefore prepared this update assessment based on the policy position contained in the Publication Draft of the Local Plan.
- 7.4 Building on the work undertaken by NCS we have been able to prepare a site specific viability appraisal for the majority of the proposed allocations on which the plan relies based on the information that is available at the present time. In preparing these appraisals we have been able to model the impact of plan polices both singularly and cumulatively to understand the relative impact on viability of these policies.
- 7.5 In addition we have also identified a significant number of developments of bungalows that have taken place across the District recently. For completeness we have prepared testing in relation to two bungalow typologies to consider the impact that plan polices have on this form of development.
- 7.6 The Development Management Policies contained within the Local Plan vary in terms of their impact on development. Not all will have direct implications for development viability. A summary of the key policies and their effect on development is contained at Section 3 of this report.
- 7.7 Of the policies assessed a number will impact on the form and design of development such as those which require provision for SuDS or for open space. Others such as Affordable Housing will place an obligation on the developer which will have a cost implication. Requirements for local infrastructure provision may require a monetary payment either through a S.106/S278 contribution or possibly CIL at a future point in time.

- 7.8 In preparing our viability assessments we have firstly considered those policies which guide the form and design of development. The construction cost assessments have been prepared to meet current building regulation requirements and are reflective of Policy requirements in relation to design standards, and on-site open space provision and drainage/water management. In addition we have also considered the requirements for infrastructure provision on the respective sites, and any site specific S106/S278 contributions/works required in relation to the allocations.
- 7.9 Full details of our assumptions in relation policy requirements are contained at table 4.10 whilst our QS report on the Build Cost assumptions is included at **Appendix 4**. Tables 6.1-6.2 contain the results of our viability testing of the Local Plan policies in relation to the proposed residential allocations. The tables show the results of our testing firstly based on a development of entirely market housing adopting a construction cost position which reflects current building regulations requirements, and the policies relating to the provision of onsite open space (or an offsite contribution in lieu) and Sustainable Drainage Systems. Our testing reflects the requirements of **Policy H3** in relation to the housing mix tested.
- 7.10 The results of our testing of the allocations shows that in Zones 1 and 2 the development of market housing is generally viable except in relation to two brownfield sites (H1i and H1t) and one small greenfield site (H1x). The lack of viability in relation to these sites generally arises due to either higher abnormal development costs or the relative expense of developing smaller sites with clearance costs. In these cases for development to come forward either the land owner or developer or both will need to accept a reduction in the level of return that they may be seeking.
- 7.11 **Policy H4: Affordable Housing** of the Local Plan deals with the requirements for the provision of affordable housing in the District. We have considered the impact on development of affordable housing and in particular the differing affordable housing thresholds identified in Policy H4. The relevant threshold has been applied to each allocation dependent on whether it is greenfield or brownfield and located in Zone 1 or 2. We have also considered two options in terms of the tenure of affordable provision.
- 7.12 The testing of allocations in the Zone 1 area show that for those 16 sites that are viable at the base position then they are generally able to support affordable housing at the policy compliant level. There are only 2 unviable results and in each case the level of deficit is small which suggests that the requirement for affordable housing in these cases is unlikely to prevent development being delivered on these sites.
- 7.13 In the Zone 2 areas the three allocations tested can support the policy compliant level of affordable housing at 20%.

- 7.14 A greater degree of information is also available about the level of other planning contributions that may be required in relation to the allocations. Based on information provided by the Council taken from the up to date IDP we have modelled the impact of developer contributions in relation to education and highways (where required). We have also considered viability in the context of a S106 contribution to other matters in the amount of £1,057 per dwelling.
- 7.15 Table 6.3 contains the results of our testing for Zone 1 assuming the cumulative policy position. Based on the cumulative package of planning contributions and affordable housing, this shows that based on affordable housing option 1, half of the allocations are viable and able to support the full package of planning contributions. Based on option 2 a further two sites, a total of 11 allocations are sufficiently viable to support the policy compliant package of planning obligations.
- 7.16 Table 6.4 shows that the allocations situated in Zone 2 are sufficiently viable to support 20% affordable housing and the cumulative plan policy requirements.
- 7.17 We have also undertaken some generic testing of bungalows based on schemes of 10 and 20 dwellings. The results of this illustrate that due to the higher land costs, the development of bungalows is generally not viable even based on 100% market housing schemes. On greenfield sites bungalow development is viable particularly in Zone 1 where land costs are lower. Based on the results however it is unlikely that standalone schemes of bungalows would be able to support substantive affordable housing provision.
- 7.18 The results of our testing in relation to affordable housing are in line with the requirements and the affordable housing zones contained within the Local Plan Policy H4. In those limited instances for brownfield sites or smaller developments where viability may be more marginal then the policy has flexibility in the form of a test of viability to address this issue and allow a different level or mix of affordable housing to make the development viable.
- 7.19 The results of our testing of the allocations indicates that the thresholds contained in Policy H4 are generally reasonable and with the inclusion of a test of viability it is unlikely to prejudice the delivery of new housing development in the District.
- 7.20 Similarly the Policy IN1 Developer Contributions has an impact on viability and it may not be possible to achieve all of the contributions required from a number of the allocation sites. In this context like H4 the policy contains flexibility with a test of viability. The policy states that when determining the nature and scale of any planning contributions sought account will be taken of a number of matters including any evidence of viability and priorities in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. This will assist to ensure that in those cases were a balance needs to be achieved in relation to planning obligations delivery of development is not prejudiced.

**OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

7.21 The VA that was prepared by NCS noted that *"in general terms housing development proposed in all locations in the Mansfield District Local Plan are broadly viable"*. In addition the study concluded

*"...most of the development proposed by the Local Plan is viable and deliverable taking account of the cost impacts of the policies proposed by the plan and the requirements for viability assessment set out in the NPPF. It is further considered that significant additional margin exists, beyond a reasonable return to the landowner and developer to accommodate CIL charges."*

7.22 This update assessment, based on the proposed allocations and policies contained in the Publication Draft of the Local Plan, largely accords to the views of NCS relating to the viability of development across the District. In preparing the allocations viability assessments we have however been able to model the impact of developer contributions (in relation to education, highways and other matters) based on the most up to date information provided by the Council taken from the IDP. This suggests that many of the proposed allocations are able to support the full package of developer contributions and affordable housing still deliver a surplus. In some cases however the allocations are not able to support the policy level of affordable housing and the full package of S106 contributions. For these sites the Council will need to achieve a balance between affordable housing and S106 contributions.

7.23 In delivering development on these sites the Council may need to consider the best approach to developer contributions be that through S106 or CIL. Dependent on the approach taken to delivery it may be that for those locations where viability is at issue S106 may offer a greater degree of flexibility to ensure that future delivery is not put at risk. Contributions through a S106 Agreement may allow more targeted provision, suitable to larger development schemes.

7.24 Given the specific circumstances of the Council and development in the District you will need to make a decision about which approach is likely to be most effective in the District. The viability assessment shows that funds are available to support infrastructure provision and consideration will need to be given as to how to best secure this money and within what delivery timetable.

7.25 Subject to the comments made above, the overall scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens contained in the Local Plan are not of such a scale that cumulatively they threaten the ability of the sites and scale of development identified in the Plan to be developed viably. In certain circumstances there may need to be a balance achieved between any requirements for affordable housing and S106 contributions/CIL (if introduced), however there is sufficient flexibility in the Plan policies as currently drafted to allow a relaxation of policy requirements if appropriate.



## **APPENDIX 1**

### **PLANNING APPLICATION ANALYSIS**

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **LAND TRANSACTIONS**

**APPENDIX 3**

**NEW BUILD SALES DATA**

**APPENDIX 4**

**QS CONSTRUCTION COST ASSESSMENT**

## **APPENDIX 5**

### **ALLOCATIONS ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **PLANNING APPLICATION ANALYSIS**

APPENDIX 1

Planning Application Analysis Since 2015

Ref	Planning Application Number	Address	Ward	Site Area (Hectares) Gross		Houses						Apartments			Total	Site area gross (acres)	Site area net (hectares)	Site area net (acres)	Gross to net ratio	Dwellings Per net ha	Floorspace (sq.ft) per net acre	Developer	Comments
						1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed									
1	2017/0738/FUL	Nursery Site, The Park, Mansfield (BF)	Carr Bank	1.25	Mix			5	18						23	3.09	1.25	3.09	100%	18	17,227	Mansfield Homes Ltd	No on site Affordable Provision Still in Council ownership
					%			22%	78%				100%										
					Size (sq.ft)			2,004	2,400				53,211										
2	2017/0618/RES	Parcel 2 - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	4.50	Mix			50	96					146	11.12	4.50	11.12	100%	32	14,084	Bellway		
					%			34%	66%				100%										
					Size (sq.ft)			833	1,197				156,611										
3	2017/0605/FUL	Land off Portland Street, Mansfield Woodhouse (GF)	Manor	0.84	Mix		3	11						14	2.07	0.84	2.07	100%	17	6,686	Old Anvil Developments	Scheme of Bungalows	
					%		21%	79%				100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		836	1,033				13,872											
4	2017/0572/RES	Land at Penniment Farm, Abbott Road, Mansfield (GF)	Penniment	8.10	Mix		9	96	97					202	20.02	5.19	12.81	64%	39	15,526	Persimmon Homes		
					%		4%	48%	48%			100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		638	836	1,164			198,918											
5	2017/0047/FUL	Land off Ley Lane, Mansfield Woodhouse (GF)	Manor	0.43	Mix		9	5						14	1.06	0.43	1.06	100%	33	9,025	Not Known	Scheme of Bungalows, awaiting decision	
					%		64%	36%				100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		645	753				9,570											
6	2017/0014/RES	Parcels 3A and 3B - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	9.00	Mix		39	78	154	6				277	22.24	8.05	19.89	89%	34	15,306	Barratt/DWH		
					%		14%	28%	56%	2%		100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		615	913	1,282	1,983		304,435											
7	2016/0599/ST	Parcel 1 - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	3.81	Mix		10	34	45	6				95	9.41	3.48	8.60	91%	27	13,593	Avant Homes		
					%		11%	36%	47%	6%		100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		711	993	1,440	1,872		116,889											
8	2016/0440/ST	Former Evans Halshaw, Nottingham Road, Mansfield (BF)	Berry Hill	1.89	Mix			27	7			11	21	66	4.67	1.89	4.67	100%	35	-	Dukeries Properties Ltd		
					%			41%	11%		17%	32%	100%										
					Size (sq.ft)			1,703	2,174														
9	2016/0400/ST	Yasmee, 164 Skegby Lane, Mansfield (BF)	Grange Farm	0.87	Mix			4	6					10	2.15	0.87	2.15	100%	12	7,444	Dukeries Properties Ltd	Scheme of 3 and 4 bed bungalows	
					%			40%	60%			100%											
					Size (sq.ft)			1,398	1,731			15,978											
10	2016/0262/ST	Land Adj to Sandy Lane Surgery, Sandy Lane, Mansfield (GF)	Newgate	1.45	Mix		19	40	4					63	3.58	1.45	3.58	100%	43		Chevin Homes Ltd		
					%		30%	63%	6%			100%											
					Size (sq.ft)																		
11	2018/0568/RES	Land at Pump Hollow Road Allotments, Forest Town, Mansfield (GF)	Kingsway	1.88	Mix			52						52	4.65	1.71	4.22	91%	30		Harron Homes	Pending Decision	
					%			100%				100%											
					Size (sq.ft)			1,140				59,297											
12	2015/0334/NT	Land at 7 Oxclose Lane, Mansfield (BF)	Woodhouse	0.44	Mix		17							17	1.09	0.44	1.09	100%	39	11,277	Dukeries Properties Ltd	Scheme of 2 bed bungalows for over 50s	
					%		100%					100%											
					Size (sq.ft)		723					12,289											

Overall Mix

Housing Mix	Houses						Apartments			Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	
No Dwellings		106	318	486	37	0	11	21	0	979
Percentage		11%	32%	50%	4%		1%	2%		100%

Exc Bungalows

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed	Total
No Dwellings		77	298	475	37		887
Percentage		9%	34%	54%	4%		100%

Dwelling Size

Dwelling Size	Houses						Apartments		
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed
Ave Size (sq.ft)		695	966	1458	2107				
Ave Size (sq.m)		65	90	135	196				

Dwelling Size ex bungalows

Dwelling Size	Houses						Apartments		
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	5 bed	6 bed	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed
Ave Size (sq.ft)		655	894	1419	2107				
Ave Size (sq.m)		61	83	132	196				

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **LAND TRANSACTIONS**



**APPENDIX 2**

**Residential Land Sales (source Land Registry)**

Ref	Planning Application Number	Address	Ward	Site Area (Hectares) Gross	Developer	Comments	Price Paid	Price (per gross acre)	Price (per net acre)	Date of Acquisition
2	2017/0618/RES	Parcel 2 - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	4.50	<b>Bellway</b>		£3,815,000	£343,091	£343,091	12 June 2018
6	2017/0014/RES	Parcels 3A and 3B - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	9.00	<b>Barratt/DWH</b>		£8,910,000	£400,648	£447,964	19 January 2018
7	2016/0599/ST	Parcel 1 - Lindhurst Development, Land off A617 (MarrRoute), Between Nottingham Rd and Southwell Rd west, Mansfield (GF)	Berry Hill	3.81	<b>Avant Homes</b>		£3,224,296	£342,482	£374,958	08 February 2018
8	2016/0440/ST	Former Evans Halshaw, Nottingham Road, Mansfield (BF)	Berry Hill	1.89	<b>Dukeries Properties Ltd</b>		£2,760,000	£590,982	£590,982	24 January 2017
9	2016/0400/ST	Yasmee, 164 Skegby Lane, Mansfield (BF)	Grange Farm	0.87	<b>Dukeries Properties Ltd</b>	<b>Scheme of 3 and 4 bed bungalows</b>	£225,000	£104,819	£104,819	2 transactions June and December 2016
10	2016/0262/ST	Land Adj to Sandy Lane Surgery, Sandy Lane, Mansfield (GF)	Newgate	1.45	<b>Chevin Homes Ltd</b>		£375,000	£104,662	£104,662	21 June 2018
12	2015/0334/NT	Land at 7 Oxclose Lane, Mansfield (BF)	Woodhouse	0.44	<b>Dukeries Properties Ltd</b>	<b>Scheme of 2 bed bungalows for over 50s</b>	£275,000	£252,360	£252,360	02 April 2015

<b>Appendix 2 - Land Sales (source Costar)</b>									
<b>Property Address</b>	<b>Property City</b>	<b>PropertyType</b>	<b>Sale Date</b>	<b>Sale Price</b>	<b>Sale Status</b>	<b>Land Area (acres)</b>	<b>Sale Price per acre</b>	<b>Asking Price</b>	<b>Asking price per acre</b>
Hamilton Way	Mansfield	Land	18/10/2018	£1,355,000	Sold	5.00	£271,000	£1,500,000	£300,000
Great Central St	Mansfield	Land	05/06/2018	£1,000,000	Sold	4.00	£250,000		
Hermitage Ln	Mansfield	Land	21/03/2016	£900,000	Sold	2.00	£450,000	£500,000	£250,000
Rock Vly	Mansfield	Land	01/02/2016	£840,000	Sold	6.87	£122,271		
Station Rd	Mansfield	Land	18/08/2017	£175,000	Sold				
Hallam Way	Mansfield	Land	10/06/2016	£115,000	Sold	0.18	£638,873		

**APPENDIX 3**

**NEW BUILD SALES DATA**

**APPENDIX 3 - SUMMARY NEW BUILD SALES AND ASKING PRICES**

Scheme	Location	Ward	Developer	Ave Sale Price (per sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per sq.ft)	Comments
UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	WOODLANDS		£122		Small development terraced houses
SKERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	CARR BANK		£134		
ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	WOODLANDS		£145		Small development terraced houses
BISHOPS MEADOW	CHURCH WARSOP	WARSOP CARRS		£147	£157	
HERITAGE PARK	MANSFIELD	NEW GATE	CAIRNS HERITAGE HOMES	£167		Last 3 sales
WEAVERS VIEW	PLEASLEY	WOODHOUSE	PERSIMMON	£172	£178	
OAKHAM GARDENS	MANSFIELD	OAKHAM	RIPON HOMES	£186		
MULBERRY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	£191		Development of 18 large detached houses
MAPLE GARDENS	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	PARK HALL	BARRATT	£194	£209	£199 per sq.ft ex 2.5 storey houses
GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	WOODHOUSE		£194		Over 50s 2 bed bungalows
BERRY HILL HALL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL		£203		Apartments in a conversion
ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	£220	£228	Development of large detached houses
LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£220		Over 55s 2 bed bungalows
SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£241		2 and 3 bed bungalows
BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	HOLLY		£275		Small detached bungalows
AVALON	MANSFIELD	PENNIMENT	PERSIMMON		£188	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	DAVID WILSON HOMES		£220	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	BARRATT		£180	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	BELLWAY		£228	
BERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	BERRY HILL	AVANT HOMES		£236	

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	19	OYSTER WAY	WARSOP	NG20 0FG	£120,000	10/03/2017		70	753	£1,714	£159	T	
	1	BISHOPS MEADOW	CHURCH WARSOP	NG20 0SQ	£265,000	06/06/2018		167	1798	£1,587	£147	T	4

**Bishops Meadow Availability**

**AVAILABILITY AT 5 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
18	4	Portland	£399,995	241	2,597	£154	£1,658	D	Sold stc
19	4	Portland	£399,995	241	2,597	£154	£1,658	D	Sold stc
20	4	Clumber	£305,000	176	1,890	£161	£1,737	D	
21	4	Clumber	£305,000	176	1,890	£161	£1,737	D	Sold stc
2	5	Wheat	£280,000	176	1,899	£147	£1,587	T	
3	4	Barley	£265,000	148	1,593	£166	£1,791	T	Sold stc
						<b>£157</b>	<b>£1,695</b>		

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

Apartment No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
7	GREENFIELD CLOSE	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0DX	£299,995	22/03/2018		106	1141	£2,830	£263	D Bungalow	4
2	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£156,000	31/08/2017		52	560	£3,000	£279	D Bungalow	
4	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£165,000	24/01/2017			0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	D Bungalow	
8	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£140,000	25/08/2017		52	560	£2,692	£250	D Bungalow	
10	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£159,500	23/01/2018		52	560	£3,067	£285	D Bungalow	
12	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£155,500	28/03/2018		52	560	£2,990	£278	D Bungalow	
14	BIRCHLANDS	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0ER	£159,500	22/11/2017		52	560	£3,067	£285	D Bungalow	
1	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	09/04/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
2	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	04/05/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
3	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	14/02/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
4	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	05/03/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
5	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	07/02/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
6	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	27/10/2017		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
7	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	27/04/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
9	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	28/06/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
11	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	23/03/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
14	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	01/06/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
15	LITTLE HAVEN	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0FA	£139,950	08/06/2018		59	635	£2,372	£220	SD Bungalow over 55s	2
11	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£155,000	28/04/2017	Monsal	58	624	£2,672	£248	SD Bungalow	2
15	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£147,000	17/11/2017	Monsal	58	624	£2,534	£235	SD Bungalow	2
16	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£189,950	06/03/2018	Longstone	77	829	£2,467	£229	D Bungalow	3
17	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£185,000	16/02/2018	Longstone	77	829	£2,403	£223	D Bungalow	3
18	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£152,500	15/12/2017	Monsal	58	624	£2,629	£244	D Bungalow	2
19	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£182,000	19/12/2017	Longstone	77	829	£2,364	£220	D Bungalow	3
21	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£189,950	04/05/2018	Longstone	77	829	£2,467	£229	D Bungalow	3
22	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£170,000	17/05/2017	Sheldon	60	646	£2,833	£263	D Bungalow	2
25	SARTFIELD ROAD	FOREST TOWN	NG19 0LX	£174,000	11/05/2018	Ashford	58	624	£3,000	£279	D Bungalow	2
5A	OXCLOSE LANE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8DF	£144,995	16/08/2017	A	67	721	£2,164	£201	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
2	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£145,000	20/04/2017	A	67	721	£2,164	£201	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
3	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£142,995	10/04/2017	B	70	753	£2,043	£190	T Bungalow over 50s	2
4	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£139,950	18/08/2017	A	67	721	£2,089	£194	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
5	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£137,000	09/01/2017	A	67	721	£2,045	£190	T Bungalow over 50s	2
6	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£144,995	19/05/2017	A	67	721	£2,164	£201	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
10	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£144,995	11/07/2017	A	67	721	£2,164	£201	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
12	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£139,995	16/06/2017	A	67	721	£2,089	£194	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
14	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£130,000	31/05/2017	A	67	721	£1,940	£180	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
16	GROSVENOR CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8FA	£135,000	26/05/2017	A	67	721	£2,015	£187	SD Bungalow over 50s	2
81	DEBDALE WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 7NR	£139,995	26/01/2017		70	753	£2,000	£186	S	

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

**Weavers View - Persimmon Homes**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	2	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£58,496	25/05/2017		58	624	£1,009	£94	F	
	4	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£58,496	26/05/2017		58	624	£1,009	£94	F	
	6	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£59,796	31/05/2017		58	624	£1,031	£96	F	
	8	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£59,796	26/05/2017		58	624	£1,031	£96	F	
	10	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£61,096	26/05/2017		58	624	£1,053	£98	F	
	12	WYNDHAM WAY	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TF	£61,096	26/05/2017		58	624	£1,053	£98	F	
	67	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£60,300	21/12/2017		58	624	£1,040	£97	F	
	71	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£61,600	21/12/2017		58	624	£1,062	£99	F	
	73	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£61,600	20/12/2017		58	624	£1,062	£99	F	
	63	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£59,000	21/12/2017		58	624	£1,017	£95	F	
	65	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£59,000	21/12/2017		58	624	£1,017	£95	F	
	69	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£60,300	21/12/2017		58	624	£1,040	£97	F	
	49	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£119,995	30/06/2017	Cooper	60	646	£2,000	£186	D	2
	51	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£114,995	24/04/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,917	£178	S	2
	53	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£111,000	31/03/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,850	£172	S	2
	56	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£114,995	29/06/2018	Cooper	60	646	£1,917	£178	T	2
	60	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£114,995	31/07/2018	Cooper	60	646	£1,917	£178	T	2
	76	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£114,995	31/10/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,917	£178	S	2
	78	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£114,500	29/09/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,908	£177	S	2
	86	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£120,500	15/12/2017	Cooper	60	646	£2,008	£187	D	2
	92	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£116,995	29/09/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,950	£181	S	2
	94	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£114,995	28/07/2017	Cooper	60	646	£1,917	£178	S	2
	54A	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£117,995	29/06/2018	Hurst	64	689	£1,844	£171	S	2
	57	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£134,995	28/04/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,849	£172	S	3
	41	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£133,995	30/06/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,836	£171	S	3
	43	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£134,995	30/06/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,849	£172	S	3
	54	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£137,995	29/06/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,890	£176	S	3
	55	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£131,995	13/10/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,808	£168	S	3
	59	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£136,995	17/11/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,877	£174	S	3
	61	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£136,995	30/11/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,877	£174	S	3
	62	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£134,995	27/07/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,849	£172	S	3
	64	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£137,995	13/07/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,890	£176	S	3
	66	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£139,995	13/07/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,918	£178	S	3
	70	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£136,995	31/08/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,877	£174	S	3
	72	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£138,495	29/06/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,897	£176	S	3
	74	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£137,995	29/06/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,890	£176	S	3
	74A	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£136,495	29/06/2018	Paddington	73	786	£1,870	£174	S	3
	84	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£139,995	30/10/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,918	£178	D	3
	96	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£129,135	27/01/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,769	£164	S	3
	98	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£127,000	29/09/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,740	£162	S	3
	116	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£124,995	09/03/2017	Paddington	73	786	£1,712	£159	S	3
	31	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£169,995	29/06/2018	Ripon	90	969	£1,889	£175	D	3
	33	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£170,995	29/06/2018	Ripon	90	969	£1,900	£177	D	3
	37	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£168,995	29/06/2018	Ripon	90	969	£1,878	£174	D	3
	39	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£169,995	25/06/2018	Ripon	90	969	£1,889	£175	D	3
	45	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£150,000	31/03/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,667	£155	S	3
	47	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£154,995	27/03/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,722	£160	S	3
	80	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£154,495	11/12/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,717	£159	S	3
	82	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£145,995	27/10/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,622	£151	S	3
	88	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£156,995	31/10/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,744	£162	S	3
	90	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£156,995	31/08/2017	Ripon	90	969	£1,744	£162	S	3
	35	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TJ	£179,995	28/06/2018	Salisbury	98	1058	£1,837	£170	D	4
	29	MANDALAY ROAD	PLEASLEY	NG19 7TH	£180,995	29/06/2018	Salisbury	98	1058	£1,841	£171	D	4
										<b>£1,851</b>	<b>£172</b>		

Ave excluding apartments

**AVAILABILITY AT 5 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
119	2	Cooper	£118,995	60	646	£184	£1,983	SD	
120	2	Cooper	£118,995	60	646	£184	£1,983	SD	
121	3	Hatfield	£169,995	90	969	£175	£1,888	D	
110	3	Iris	£164,995	-	-	-	-	D	
111	3	Iris	£164,995	-	-	-	-	D	
115	3	Iris	£164,995	-	-	-	-	D	
116	3	Iris	£164,995	-	-	-	-	D	
117	3	Paddington	£137,995	73	786	£176	£1,890	SD	
108	3	Paddington	£139,995	73	786	£178	£1,918	SD	
118	3	Paddington	£139,995	73	786	£178	£1,918	SD	
109	3	Paddington	£141,995	73	786	£181	£1,945	SD	
138	3	Redcar	£164,995	-	969	£170	£1,833	SD	
139	3	Redcar	£169,995	-	969	£175	£1,888	D	
113	3	Ripon	£172,995	90	969	£179	£1,922	D	
112	4	Salisbury	£184,995	98	1,055	£175	£1,888	D	
						<b>£178</b>	<b>£1,914</b>		

**Penniment Farm - Avalon**

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
160	4	Chedworth	£229,995	60	1,222	£188	£2,026	D	
152	3	Hatfield	£194,995	90	969	£201	£2,166	D	
156	3	Rufford	£172,995	81	870	£199	£2,140	D	
155	3	Rufford	£173,995	81	870	£200	£2,153	D	
158	3	Souter (2.5s)	£156,995	87	932	£168	£1,813	Mid T	
157	3	Souter (2.5s)	£159,995	87	932	£172	£1,848	End T	
						<b>£188</b>	<b>£2,024</b>		

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

**Maple Gardens - Barratt**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds	
	22	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£87,051	22/06/2017		20	70	753	£1,244	£116	T	2
	24	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£86,787	22/06/2017		20	70	753	£1,240	£115	T	2
	30	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£86,812	22/06/2017		20	70	753	£1,240	£115	T	2
	32	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£86,802	22/06/2017		20	70	753	£1,240	£115	T	2
	34	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£86,875	22/06/2017		20	70	753	£1,241	£115	T	2
	26	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£76,156	22/06/2017			59	635	£1,291	£120	F	
	28	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£76,156	22/06/2017			46	495	£1,656	£154	F	
	36	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£107,875	29/06/2017		22	86	926	£1,254	£116	S	3
	38	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£107,919	29/06/2017		22	86	926	£1,254	£117	S	3
	40	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£71,420	29/06/2017		22	86	926	£830	£77	T	3
	1	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£269,995	22/09/2017	Alnwick	139	1491	£1,949	£181	D	4	
	2	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£254,995	23/06/2017	Cambridge	132	1424	£1,927	£179	D	4	
	10	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£267,995	22/02/2018	Cambridge	132	1424	£2,026	£188	D	4	
	5	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£262,995	28/09/2017	Cambridge	132	1424	£1,988	£185	D	4	
	19	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£266,995	30/11/2017	Cambridge	132	1424	£2,018	£187	D	4	
	4	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£219,995	31/03/2017	Chesham	107	1155	£2,050	£190	D	4	
	2	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£232,995	23/03/2018	Chesham	107	1155	£2,171	£202	D	4	
	1	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£209,995	28/06/2018	Colchester	91	984	£2,297	£213	D	3	
	3	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£209,995	26/07/2018	Colchester	91	984	£2,297	£213	D	3	
	6	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£159,995	31/03/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,072	£193	S	2	
	8	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£155,995	31/03/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,021	£188	S	2	
	48	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£163,995	14/09/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,124	£197	S	2	
	50	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£158,995	27/07/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,059	£191	S	2	
	52	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£161,995	27/07/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,098	£195	S	2	
	54	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£159,995	27/07/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,072	£193	S	2	
	72	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£163,995	30/11/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,124	£197	S	2	
	74	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£163,995	14/12/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,124	£197	S	2	
	80	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£166,995	14/12/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,163	£201	S	2	
	82	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£167,995	21/12/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,176	£202	S	2	
	5	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£170,995	29/03/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,215	£206	S	2	
	9	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£169,995	06/07/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,202	£205	S	2	
	11	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£169,995	26/04/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,202	£205	S	2	
	15	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£169,995	26/07/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,202	£205	S	2	
	17	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£167,995	28/06/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,176	£202	S	2	
	36	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£169,995	15/06/2018	Finchley	77	831	£2,202	£205	S	2	
	195	PARK HALL ROAD	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8QX	£174,995	27/01/2017	Finchley	77	831	£2,267	£211	D	2	
	6	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£254,995	25/01/2018	Halstead	125	1348	£2,036	£189	D	4	
	8	TRAFALGAR WAY	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RJ	£255,995	22/02/2018	Halstead	125	1348	£2,044	£190	D	4	
	7	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£252,995	26/10/2017	Halstead	125	1348	£2,020	£188	D	4	
	17	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£250,995	30/11/2017	Halstead	125	1348	£2,004	£186	D	4	
	3	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£239,995	31/08/2017	Hexham	122	1314	£1,966	£183	D - 2.5s	4	
	21	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£254,995	22/02/2018	Lincoln	115	1243	£2,208	£205	D	4	
	84	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£259,995	14/12/2017	Lincoln	115	1243	£2,251	£209	D	4	
	1	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£258,995	29/03/2018	Lincoln	115	1243	£2,243	£208	D	4	
	3	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£257,995	29/03/2018	Lincoln	115	1243	£2,234	£208	D	4	
	1	EUSTON WALK	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SH	£261,995	26/07/2018	Lincoln	115	1243	£2,269	£211	D	4	
	2	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£189,995	31/03/2017	Morpeth	89	956	£2,139	£199	D	3	
	4	BOND CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SA	£209,995	28/06/2018	Morpeth	89	956	£2,364	£220	D	3	
	1	VINE WALK	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8UA	£207,995	22/02/2018	Morpeth	89	956	£2,342	£218	D	3	
	10	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£186,995	28/04/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,823	£169	S	3	
	12	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£184,995	26/05/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,804	£168	S - 2.5s	3	
	14	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£184,995	26/05/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,804	£168	S - 2.5s	3	
	16	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£194,995	24/08/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,901	£177	S - 2.5s	3	
	18	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£186,995	26/05/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,823	£169	S - 2.5s	3	
	20	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£187,995	26/05/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,833	£170	S - 2.5s	3	
	56	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£188,995	28/09/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,843	£171	S - 2.5s	3	
	58	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£194,995	17/11/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,901	£177	S - 2.5s	3	
	60	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£197,995	14/12/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,930	£179	S - 2.5s	3	
	62	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£194,995	27/10/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,901	£177	S - 2.5s	3	
	64	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£194,995	28/09/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,901	£177	S - 2.5s	3	
	66	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£196,495	28/09/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,916	£178	S - 2.5s	3	
	76	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£196,995	14/12/2017	Rochester	103	1104	£1,921	£178	S - 2.5s	3	
	78	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£197,995	22/02/2018	Rochester	103	1104	£1,930	£179	S - 2.5s	3	
	9	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£236,500	26/10/2017	Somerton	109	1170	£2,176	£202	D	4	
	11	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£239,995	26/10/2017	Somerton	109	1170	£2,208	£205	D	4	
	15	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£237,995	26/10/2017	Somerton	109	1170	£2,190	£203	D	4	
	5	EUSTON WALK	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8SH	£209,995	30/08/2018	Somerton	109	1170	£1,932	£179	D	4	
	68	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£139,995	30/11/2017	Kendal	60	645	£2,336	£217	S	2	
	70	PICCADILLY CLOSE	MANSFIELD WOODHOUSE	NG19 8RX	£139,995	30/11/2017	Kendal	60	645	£2,336	£217	S	2	
										Ave excluding apartments/affordable	<b>£2,083</b>	<b>£194</b>		
										Ave excluding apartments/affordable and 2.5 s	<b>£2,147</b>	<b>£199</b>		

**AVAILABILITY AT 5 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
95	4	Chesham	£239,995	107	1,155	£208	£2,237	D	
92	4	Chesham	£241,995	107	1,155	£210	£2,255	D	
202	4	Chesham	£239,995	107	1,155	£208	£2,237	D	
203	4	Chesham	£239,995	107	1,155	£208	£2,237	D	
65	3	Cheadle	£213,995	88	946	£226	£2,435	D	
207	3	Morpeth	£215,995	89	956	£226	£2,432	D	
68	4	Lincoln	£254,995	115	1,243	£205	£2,208	D	
88	4	Cambridge	£284,995	132	1,424	£200	£2,154	D	
77	4	Cambridge	£285,995	132	1,424	£201	£2,162	D	
79	4	Alnwick	£291,995	139	1,491	£196	£2,108	D	
						<b>Asking Price Ave</b>	<b>£209</b>	<b>£2,246</b>	



**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwellin g Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	20A	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£137,500	16/02/2017		85	915	£1,618	£150	T	
	21	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£129,000	17/03/2017		85	915	£1,518	£141	T	
	21A	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£130,000	21/04/2017		85	915	£1,529	£142	T	
	22	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£129,000	17/03/2017		85	915	£1,518	£141	T	
	22A	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£137,500	10/03/2017		85	915	£1,618	£150	T	
	23	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£135,000	26/05/2017		85	915	£1,588	£148	T	
	24	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£129,000	17/03/2017		85	915	£1,518	£141	T	
	25	ST JOHN STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1QJ	£137,500	09/06/2017		85	915	£1,618	£150	T	
	58	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£135,000	30/06/2017		102	1098	£1,324	£123	T	
	60	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£132,000	30/06/2017		102	1098	£1,294	£120	T	
	62	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£129,000	20/10/2017		102	1098	£1,265	£117	T	
	64	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£134,950	06/10/2017		102	1098	£1,323	£123	T	
	66	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£129,000	27/11/2017		102	1098	£1,265	£117	T	
	68	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£131,000	14/07/2017		102	1098	£1,284	£119	T	
	70	UNION STREET	MANSFIELD	NG18 1RP	£144,950	21/07/2017		102	1098	£1,421	£132	T	
	32E	SKERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	NG18 2PR	£125,000	11/01/2017		90	969	£1,389	£129	S	
	32G	SKERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	NG18 2PR	£126,300	05/06/2017		90	969	£1,403	£130	T	
	32H	SKERRY HILL	MANSFIELD	NG18 2PR	£132,000	15/02/2018		86	926	£1,535	£143	D	
APARTMENT 12	RY HILL H	BERRY HILL LANE	MANSFIELD	NG18 4FH	£225,000	01/03/2017		98	1055	£2,296	£213	F	
APARTMENT 21A	RY HILL H	BERRY HILL LANE	MANSFIELD	NG18 4FH	£132,000	14/03/2017		61	657	£2,164	£201	F	
APARTMENT 4A	RY HILL H	BERRY HILL LANE	MANSFIELD	NG18 4FH	£175,000	01/06/2018		83	893	£2,108	£196	F	
	280	BERRY HILL LANE	MANSFIELD	NG18 4JD	£325,000	28/07/2017		116	1249	£2,802	£260	D Bungalow	
	4	WOODLAND PARK VIEW	MANSFIELD	NG18 5FD	£199,950	10/02/2017		115	1238	£1,739	£162	S	
	8	WOODLAND PARK VIEW	MANSFIELD	NG18 5FD	£195,000	30/06/2017		108	1163	£1,806	£168	S	
	9	WOODLAND PARK VIEW	MANSFIELD	NG18 5FD	£220,000	27/10/2017		118	1270	£1,864	£173	T	

**APPENDIX3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

**Mullberry Gardens - Dukeries Homes**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	5	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£385,000	02/02/2017		175	1884	£2,200	£204	D	
	7	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£535,000	13/04/2018		270	2906	£1,981	£184	D	
	9	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£505,000	02/02/2017		244	2626	£2,070	£192	D	
	11	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£518,000	10/03/2017		244	2626	£2,123	£197	D	
	14	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£525,000	05/07/2017		270	2906	£1,944	£181	D	
	17	BLOOMSBURY GARDENS	MANSFIELD	NG18 4XY	£499,995	24/02/2017		244	2626	£2,049	£190	D	
										<b>£2,061</b>	<b>£191</b>		

**Rockcliffe Grange - Dukeries Homes**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	8	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£465,000	01/06/2018	Mayfair	203	2185	£2,291	£213	D	5
	12	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£345,000	09/02/2018	Windsor	141	1518	£2,447	£227	D	4
	14	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£347,000	28/03/2018	Windsor	141	1518	£2,461	£229	D	4
	16	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£420,000	29/03/2018	Park Lane	184	1981	£2,283	£212	D	4
	18	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£350,000	23/04/2018	Burlington	144	1550	£2,431	£226	D	4
	20	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£360,000	09/03/2018	Westminster	153	1647	£2,353	£219	D	4
	22	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£460,000	08/03/2018	Mayfair	203	2185	£2,266	£211	D	5
	24	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£360,000	27/04/2018	Burlington	144	1550	£2,500	£232	D	4
	28	ROCKCLIFFE GRANGE		NG18 4YW	£458,000	29/06/2018	Mayfair	203	2185	£2,256	£210	D	5
										<b>£2,365</b>	<b>£220</b>		

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
41	5	Mayfair	£475,000	203	2185	£217	£2,340	D	
45	4	Park Lane	£455,000	184	1981	£230	£2,473	D	
46	4	Park Lane	£439,000	184	1981	£222	£2,386	D	
47	4	Burlington	£365,000	144	1550	£235	£2,535	D	
55	4	Westminster	£385,000	153	1647	£234	£2,516	D	
						<b>£228</b>	<b>£2,450</b>		

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

**Oakham Gardens - Ripon Homes**

Apartment	No	Street	Town	Postcode	Price Paid	Date	Dwelling Name	Sq.m	Sq.ft	Price (Per Sq.m)	Price (Per Sq.ft)	Type	No Beds
	20	HERMITAGE LANE	Mansfield	NG18 5HA	£275,000	25/05/2018		135	1453	£2,037	£189	D	
	4	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£209,950	29/03/2018		102	1098	£2,058	£191	D	
	5	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£240,000	03/04/2018		117	1259	£2,051	£191	D	
	6	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£231,500	30/08/2017		120	1292	£1,929	£179	D	
	7	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£202,500	25/08/2017		102	1098	£1,985	£184	D	
	8	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£219,950	06/10/2017		107	1152	£2,056	£191	D	
	9	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£187,500	29/09/2017		116	1249	£1,616	£150	D	
	10	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£225,000	29/09/2017		92	990	£2,446	£227	D	
	11	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£241,500	09/02/2018		125	1345	£1,932	£179	D	
	12	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£173,500	06/02/2018		87	936	£1,994	£185	D	
	15	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£235,000	14/03/2018		120	1292	£1,958	£182	D	
	16	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£220,000	31/05/2018		107	1152	£2,056	£191	D	
	17	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£172,500	21/12/2017		87	936	£1,983	£184	D	
	18	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£142,500	08/12/2017		66	710	£2,159	£201	S	
	19	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£142,500	08/12/2017		66	710	£2,159	£201	S	
	20	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£232,500	30/11/2017		120	1292	£1,938	£180	D	
	21	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£239,950	27/10/2017		125	1345	£1,920	£178	D	
	22	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£220,500	30/10/2017		107	1152	£2,061	£191	D	
	23	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£183,500	22/09/2017		92	990	£1,995	£185	D	
	24	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£220,000	04/08/2017		116	1249	£1,897	£176	D	
	25	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£235,500	13/10/2017		125	1345	£1,884	£175	D	
	26	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£183,500	08/09/2017		92	990	£1,995	£185	D	
	27	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£218,000	15/09/2017		107	1152	£2,037	£189	D	
	28	MILL COURT	Mansfield	NG18 5GN	£220,000	22/09/2017		116	1249	£1,897	£176	D	
										<b>£2,002</b>	<b>£186</b>		

**APPENDIX 3 - NEW BUILD SALES SINCE JAN 2017**

**Berry Hill - David Wilson Homes**

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
28	3	Kennett	£224,995	101	1089	£207	£2,224	SD	
9	4	Ingleby	£249,995	100	1081	£231	£2,489	D	
4	4	Ashtree	£309,995	129	1391	£223	£2,399	D	
26	4	Ashtree	£309,995	129	1391	£223	£2,399	D	
41	4	Bradgate	£329,995	134	1439	£229	£2,468	D	
8	4	Holden	£349,995	143	1536	£228	£2,453	D	
42	4	Layton	£358,995	149	1605	£224	£2,408	D	
38	4	Layton	£359,995	149	1605	£224	£2,414	D	
6	4	Winstone	£389,995	164	1765	£221	£2,378	D	
40	5	Henley	£405,995	184	1983	£205	£2,204	D	
32	5	Henley	£406,995	184	1983	£205	£2,209	D	
<b>Asking Price Ave</b>						<b>£220</b>	<b>£2,368</b>		

**Berry Hill - Barratt**

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
269	3	Moresby	£209,995	101	1089	£193	£2,076	D	
266	3	Moresby	£209,995	100	1081	£194	£2,091	D	
270	4	Kingsville	£219,995	129	1391	£158	£1,702	2.5s SD	
271	4	Kingsville	£219,995	129	1391	£158	£1,702	2.5s SD	
272	4	Alderney	£283,995	134	1439	£197	£2,124	D	
<b>Asking Price Ave</b>						<b>£180</b>	<b>£1,939</b>		

**Berry Hill - Bellway**

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
	3	Somerby	£185,000	71	767	£241	£2,596	SD	
	3	Somerby	£185,000	71	767	£241	£2,596	SD	
	4	Worcester	£225,000	104	1122	£201	£2,159	SD	
	4	Willesley	£280,000	113	1212	£231	£2,487	D	
<b>Asking Price Ave</b>						<b>£228</b>	<b>£2,459</b>		

**Berry Hill - Avant Homes**

**AVAILABILITY AT 6 NOVEMBER 2018**

Plot	No Beds	Type	Asking Price	Size (sq.m)	Size (sq.ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq ft)	Asking Price (Per Sq m)	Description	Status
62	3	Newton	£244,995	96	1037	£236	£2,544	D	
65	3	Newton	£249,995	96	1037	£241	£2,596	D	
28	4	Danbury	£284,995	114	1228	£232	£2,498	D	
26	4	Danbury	£289,995	114	1228	£236	£2,542	D	
7	4	Rosebury	£329,995	134	1442	£229	£2,463	D	
63	4	Tetbury	£359,995	141	1518	£237	£2,553	D	
68	4	Tetbury	£359,995	141	1518	£237	£2,553	D	
<b>Asking Price Ave</b>						<b>£236</b>	<b>£2,536</b>		

**APPENDIX 4**

**QS CONSTRUCTION COST ASSESSMENT**

**REPORT OF ESTIMATED COSTS OF CONSTRUCTION**

**MANSFIELD LOCAL PLAN**

**Prepared on Behalf of Mansfield District Council  
DECEMBER | 2018**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0	RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS .....	1
3.0	NOTES REGARDING COSTS USED BY NCS FOR GENERIC SITES .....	6

### Appendices

Appendix 1 – Individual Site Cost Sheets

Appendix 2 – Bungalow Generic Costs

## **LOCAL PLAN – MANSFIELD DISTRICT COUNCIL**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 Keppie Massie have undertaken work to estimate the costs of construction for various development typologies in order to help inform the testing of viability for the Local Plan that Mansfield Council wish to adopt.
- 1.2 The work has been in respect of the construction costs of a number of developments anticipated and tested and this report details the methodology adopted and gives summaries of the construction cost data prepared.
- 1.3 We have also considered two generic developments of bungalows, one of 10 and one of 20 units. These have been assumed to be at a density of 25 dwellings per hectare. The floor areas assumed are 68m<sup>2</sup> – 2B semi-detached and 83m<sup>2</sup> - 3B semi-detached and detached.
- 1.4 Tables indicating the costs assessed, based on the information available to us, are given within the overall report.

### **2.0 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS**

#### **Costing Methodology – Houses**

- 2.1 Costs for the buildings:
- 2.2 The dwellings themselves are costed based on their floor area. All dwellings are assumed to have two floors of the same area. The substructure costs that have been adopted are based on a rate per m<sup>2</sup> that has been applied to the footprint area and are for normal substructures comprising simple strip footings founded at a nominal depth of 1m. Rates per m<sup>2</sup> are derived from data held by Keppie Massie based on a large range of housing projects carried out in recent years.
- 2.3 Superstructure costs have been calculated on a rate per m<sup>2</sup> basis and applied to the gross internal floor area for each dwelling. These too are derived from data held by Keppie Massie. Each different floor area has a specific rate/m<sup>2</sup> to reflect the differing costs per m<sup>2</sup> as the dwelling size varies.



- 2.4 Costs for the external works etc:
- 2.5 These are density based following an assessment of plot size from the density derived from the numbers of dwellings for each of the specified sites; the densities are shown on the cost tables.
- 2.6 Estate roads and footpaths; area and costs assessed from plot size; including kerbs, street lighting and road drainage. Rates and prices are from our cost data and published data.
- 2.7 Work within curtilage is assessed based on areas derived from the plot size and include boundaries, parking area, paving, grassed and planting areas. Rates and prices are from our cost data and published data.
- 2.8 Drainage and incoming service supplies costs are assessed on a cost/dwelling basis and include plot drainage and an allowance for mains drainage, using typical costs. Allowance has been made for the costs of surface water attenuation/SUDS.
- 2.9 Public Open space: costs are generally based on areas defined by Mansfield Council HELAA and Local Plan Policy requirements. Works include allowances for grass, trees with an allowance for simple future maintenance. POS has been excluded from some sites as agreed with Mansfield Council.
- 2.10 Garages have been included on the following basis:
- 3 bedroom detached houses – single integral garage
  - 4 bedroom detached houses – single detached garage
  - 5 bedroomed detached house – double detached garage
- 2.11 Costs for other matters:
- 2.12 Preliminaries are costed on cost per unit time for a construction period based on the sales rate; larger developments have lower cost per dwelling than smaller developments.
- 2.13 Fees for design, planning etc are based on a % of the construction costs.
- 2.14 Adjustment for costs to reflect the size of the development; large developments are more economic than small ones and costs have been adjusted in accordance with BCIS scale data.

- 2.15 Costs for abnormal works are based on the information made available to us by the Council.
- 2.16 Contingencies are included at 5%.
- 2.17 As profit will be included elsewhere within the viability appraisal, construction profit is not included within construction costs.
- 2.18 Electric vehicle charging points: The cost of providing a 32 amp radial spur with isolator has been assessed as £250 per dwelling.

### Outline Specification assumed

- 2.19 Keppie Massie have assumed the following outline specification for the purposes of assessing the construction costs of the dwellings based on a standard specification.

<b>Generally</b>	
National Housing Standards	The dwellings are sized to comply with the National Housing Standards. Note: site H1i and H1n uses data from the planning applications for these sites.
Building Regulations	All works will comply with the current Building Regulations in force.
NHBC	All works will comply with the current NHBC requirements (or similar) in force.
<b>Substructures</b>	
Foundations (Normal)	Standard strip footings at nominally 1m deep have been assumed to the external walls and party walls.
Ground Floors	In situ concrete with insulation and screed over.
<b>Superstructures</b>	
Staircases	Standard timber stairs with timber balustrades. Concrete stairs to flats with timber or simple metal balustrades.
Upper Floors	Chipboard floor boarding on timber joists. Concrete floors to flats complying with acoustic and fire requirements of the Building Regulations.
External Walls	Facing brick, with some detailing, externally; cavity fully filled with insulation, and insulating blockwork inner skin.

<b>Superstructures</b>	
Roof	Pitched roof with concrete tiles and trussed timber structure.
Roof Insulation	400mm fibreglass quilt at ceiling level.
Rainwater Installation	uPVC gutters and downpipes.
Windows	uPVC framed windows with double glazing.
External Doors	uPVC or similar front and rear doors.
Internal Walls and Partitions	Generally of studwork within dwellings, with insulation and plasterboard. Party walls in concrete blockwork to meet the acoustic and fire requirements of the Building Regulations.
Internal Doors	Hollow core doors with timber veneer appearance and ironmongery, frames in softwood, gloss painted. Doors to and within flats will be fire rated in accordance with the Building Regulations.
Floor Finishes	No applied floor finishes; painted softwood skirtings. Plain contract carpet finish to common areas of flats.
Wall Finishes	Plasterboard dry lining with skim and emulsion paint finishes. Ceramic tiling included as splashbacks in bathrooms and in shower areas to 1.8m high.
Ceiling Finishes	Plasterboard with skim and emulsion paint finish.
Fittings	Kitchen fittings of medium to basic quality; no white goods or appliances.
Sanitary Fittings	Bath in white acrylic, WCs and wash basins in white ceramic with taps, wastes etc.
Plumbing Installation	Soil and waste pipework in uPVC generally boxed in. Hot and cold water pipework in plastic pipework with insulation.
Heating Installation	Gas fired high efficiency combination condensing boiler with radiators, controls etc.
Electrical Installation	Wiring for power and lighting. Switches and socket outlets in white plastic. All fittings with Low energy lamps. No decorative fittings included. Smoke detectors included.
TV Aerial Installation	Cable points in Living Room and Main bedroom; containment to roof space or aerial point. No aerial included.

<b>Superstructures</b>	
Telephone Installation	Conduit installation to points in Living Room and Main Bedroom to all units.
Lift Installation	Not included except within the larger flat developments in which a single lift is assumed.
<b>Externally</b>	
Site Clearance	Simple removal nominal thickness of material, assumed inert.
House Drives	Black tarmacadam on suitable base and sub-base.
Paving	Pre-cast concrete flags on compacted granular fill generally.
Grassed Areas	Topsoil with grass seed generally (turf to front gardens). Topsoil thickness 150mm.
Fencing – Rear	In treated softwood and as indicated on the drawings/site plan.
Fencing – Front	None; open plan assumed except where railings are indicated on the site plan.
Roads and Footpaths	Adopted roads to adoption standards in black tarmacadam with street lighting, concrete kerbs and road drainage. Footpaths in precast concrete flags to adoptable standards.  Roads to courts and parking areas and access to flats assumed to be non-adopted but to similar specification to adopted roads.
Drainage	Drainage in UPVC pipework with inspection chambers and manholes. Collector drains and drains beyond curtilage are to be adopted. Allowance for surface water attenuation has been made. General further SUDS requirements will be met using the Public Open Space.
Public Open Space	Based on areas assessed in accordance with Mansfield Council requirements. It is assumed that these are generally grassed areas with some tree/shrub planting and paths. Allowance for simple maintenance (grass cutting) included, capitalised over 15 years.

Table 2.2: Outline Specification

### **3.0 NOTES REGARDING COSTS USED BY NCS FOR GENERIC SITES**

- 3.1 Within the Whole Plan Viability Assessment, NCS have used a construction cost rate of £1,040 per m<sup>2</sup> for all residential developments of 2 – 5 bed houses. This is stated as a median and as such we can consider that it is reasonable, for the purpose of high level generic testing. If more detailed considerations such as development size, capacity and density are taken into account then it may be appropriate to make suitable adjustments.

**APPENDIX 1**

**INDIVIDUAL SITE COST SHEETS**



**H1b Land off Skegby Lane**

Site area	<b>8.32 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>30.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>64000 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>19200 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 2714 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	11824 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>194 Nr (30.3dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>	<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00% 14 Nr	58 m2	812 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%	0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%	75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00% 58 Nr	75 m2	4350 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%	90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00% 45 Nr	90 m2	4050 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00% 42 Nr	90 m2	3780 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00% 29 Nr	120 m2	3480 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00% 6 Nr	150 m2	900 m2
	<b>194 Nr</b>		<b>17372 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£11,823,258	£60,945
External Works within curtilage costs	£1,010,561	£5,209
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£1,149,227	£5,924
Garages	£453,232	£2,336
Drainage costs	£915,690	£4,720
Inc Services costs	£728,390	£3,755
Public Open Space	£312,038	£1,608
Costs of play facilities	£197,021	£1,016
Preliminaries for 57 months	£1,463,216	£7,542
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£18,052,635</b>	<b>£93,055</b>
Abnormals	£294,500	£1,518
Fees	£1,376,035	£7,093
Contingencies	£986,158	£5,083
<b>Total</b>	<b>£20,709,328</b>	<b>£106,749</b>

**Abnormals**

Landscape buffer (area assumed and in POS); No additional cost		
Low soil permeability; assumed no cost		£0
Cycle provision (3m wide tarmac; not lit)	610 m	£ 210 /m
		£128,100
<i>Improvements to existing path ways etc</i>		£50,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	194 Nr	£600
		£116,400
<b>Total of abnormals</b>		<b>£294,500</b>



**H1c** **Fields Farm, Abbott Road**

Site area	<b>7.59 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>32.83%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>57143 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>18757 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3135 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	13655 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>200 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

			<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	14 Nr	58 m2	812 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	60 Nr	75 m2	4500 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	46 Nr	90 m2	4140 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	44 Nr	90 m2	3960 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	30 Nr	120 m2	3600 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	6 Nr	150 m2	900 m2
		<b>200 Nr</b>		<b>17912 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£12,061,332	£60,307
External Works within curtilage costs	£935,139	£4,676
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£1,091,055	£5,455
Garages	£459,607	£2,298
Drainage costs	£934,074	£4,670
Inc Services costs	£743,013	£3,715
Public Open Space	£301,632	£1,508
Costs of play facilities	£194,947	£975
Preliminaries for 58 months	£1,354,407	£6,772
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£18,075,205</b>	<b>£90,376</b>
Abnormals	£145,000	£725
Fees	£1,366,515	£6,833
Contingencies	£979,336	£4,897
<b>Total</b>	<b>£20,566,057</b>	<b>£102,830</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Habitat improvement; extra cost over POS</i>				£10,000
Inclusion of rights of way; assumed no cost				£0
Off-site open space; excluded				£0
Archaeological survey and actions				£25,000
Low soil permeability; assumed no cost				£0
Allowance for effect of sloping site	200 Nr	£300		£60,000
<i>Allowance for protection of heritage asset</i>				£50,000
<b>Total of abnormals</b>				<b>£145,000</b>

**H1d Three Thorn Hollow Farm**

Site area	<b>7.14 ha</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
PoS % (of net)	<b>32.93%</b>	2
Net Dev area	<b>53714 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>17686 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3140 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	13676 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>188 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>	<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00% 13 Nr	58 m2	754 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%	0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%	75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00% 56 Nr	75 m2	4200 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%	90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00% 43 Nr	90 m2	3870 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00% 42 Nr	90 m2	3780 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00% 28 Nr	120 m2	3360 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00% 6 Nr	150 m2	900 m2
	<b>188 Nr</b>		<b>16864 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£11,474,194	£61,033
External Works within curtilage costs	£888,545	£4,726
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£1,036,460	£5,513
Garages	£438,482	£2,332
Drainage costs	£887,370	£4,720
Inc Services costs	£705,862	£3,755
Public Open Space	£287,428	£1,529
Costs of play facilities	£197,021	£1,048
Preliminaries for 55 months	£1,298,014	£6,904
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£17,213,376</b>	<b>£91,561</b>
Abnormals	£267,388	£1,422
Fees	£1,311,057	£6,974
Contingencies	£939,591	£4,998
<b>Total</b>	<b>£19,731,412</b>	<b>£104,954</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Allowance for Enhanced cycle links</i>			£35,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	188 Nr	£300	£56,400
<i>Ecological buffers; extra over POS</i>			£25,000
POS and play area; included in POS above			£0
<i>Allowance for improvement to water Quality</i>			£50,000
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000
<i>Allowance for protection of heritage asset</i>			£50,000
Provision of hedged boundaries	945 m	£ 27.50/m	£25,988

**Total of abnormals £267,388**

**H1e Land at Redruth Drive**

Site area	<b>4.98 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>17.51%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>42381 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>7419 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3764 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	16395 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>178 Nr (42.0dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	12 Nr	58 m2	696 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	53 Nr	75 m2	3975 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	41 Nr	90 m2	3690 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	40 Nr	90 m2	3600 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	27 Nr	120 m2	3240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	5 Nr	150 m2	750 m2
		178 Nr		<b>15951 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£10,854,025	£60,978
External Works within curtilage costs	£747,634	£4,200
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£895,972	£5,034
Garages	£411,932	£2,314
Drainage costs	£840,169	£4,720
Inc Services costs	£668,316	£3,755
Public Open Space	£120,574	£677
Costs of play facilities	£197,021	£1,107
Preliminaries for 53 months	£966,538	£5,430
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£15,702,181</b>	<b>£88,215</b>
Abnormals	£88,400	£497
Fees	£1,184,294	£6,653
Contingencies	£848,744	£4,768
<b>Total</b>	<b>£17,823,619</b>	<b>£100,133</b>

**Abnormals**

Allowance for Enhanced cycle links		£35,000
On site POS; inc in POS costs above		£0
Allowance for effect of sloping site	178 Nr	£300
		£53,400

**H1f Former Rosebrook Primary School**

Site area	<b>5.10 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>33.21%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>38286 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>12714 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3137 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	13667 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>134 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	9 Nr	58 m2	522 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	40 Nr	75 m2	3000 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	31 Nr	90 m2	2790 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	30 Nr	90 m2	2700 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	20 Nr	120 m2	2400 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	4 Nr	150 m2	600 m2
		134 Nr		<b>12012 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£8,259,153	£61,635
External Works within curtilage costs	£640,164	£4,777
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£746,619	£5,572
Garages	£314,098	£2,344
Drainage costs	£639,145	£4,770
Inc Services costs	£508,411	£3,794
Public Open Space	£208,808	£1,558
Costs of play facilities	£199,094	£1,486
Preliminaries for 42 months	£773,998	£5,776
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£12,289,490</b>	<b>£91,713</b>
Abnormals	£100,200	£748
Fees	£929,227	£6,935
Contingencies	£665,946	£4,970
<b>Total</b>	<b>£13,984,862</b>	<b>£104,365</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Allowance for Enhanced cycle links</i>			£35,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	134 Nr	£300	£40,200
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000

**Total of abnormals £100,200**

**H1g Abbott Road**

Site area	<b>5.54 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>62.94%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>34000 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>21400 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 2683 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>4 per month</b>	11686 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>102 Nr (30.0dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	7 Nr	58 m2	406 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	31 Nr	75 m2	2325 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	23 Nr	90 m2	2070 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	23 Nr	90 m2	2070 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	15 Nr	120 m2	1800 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	3 Nr	150 m2	450 m2
		102 Nr		<b>9121 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£6,271,741	£61,488
External Works within curtilage costs	£540,746	£5,301
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£613,853	£6,018
Garages	£234,693	£2,301
Drainage costs	£486,513	£4,770
Inc Services costs	£386,999	£3,794
Public Open Space	£351,454	£3,446
Costs of play facilities	£158,026	£1,549
Preliminaries for 34 months	£810,855	£7,950
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£9,854,879</b>	<b>£96,616</b>
Abnormals	£130,920	£1,284
Fees	£748,935	£7,343
Contingencies	£536,737	£5,262
<b>Total</b>	<b>£11,271,471</b>	<b>£110,505</b>

**Abnormals**

Removal of hard surfaces including fill in place (assumed non-contaminated)	6990 m2	£ 8/m2	£55,920
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000
On site POS; inc in POS costs above			£0
Low soil permeability; assumed no cost			£0
<i>Allowance for enhancement of football pitches</i>			<i>£50,000</i>

**H1h Centenary Road**

Site area	<b>2.42 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>24200 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3509 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	15284 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>95 Nr (39.3dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	7 Nr	58 m2	406 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	29 Nr	75 m2	2175 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	22 Nr	90 m2	1980 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	20 Nr	90 m2	1800 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	14 Nr	120 m2	1680 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	3 Nr	150 m2	450 m2
		95 Nr		<b>8491 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£5,901,587	£62,122
External Works within curtilage costs	£424,833	£4,472
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£504,902	£5,315
Garages	£225,637	£2,375
Drainage costs	£457,845	£4,819
Inc Services costs	£364,195	£3,834
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 40 months	£963,884	£10,146
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£8,842,883</b>	<b>£93,083</b>
Abnormals	£43,500	£458
Fees	£675,270	£7,108
Contingencies	£483,944	£5,094
<b>Total</b>	<b>£10,045,596</b>	<b>£105,743</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Improvement of access to POS</i>			£15,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	95 Nr	£300	£28,500

**H1i Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)**

Site area	<b>1.63 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>30.40%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>12500 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>3800 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3515 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	15313 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>75 Nr (60.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>	<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	12 Nr	44 m2	533 m2
2b OM-Semi		0 m2	0 m2
2b OM-Terraced	21 Nr	60 m2	1264 m2
2b-OM-Semi	40 Nr	60 m2	2408 m2
2b-OM-terraced		0 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached		0 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Semi		0 m2	0 m2
4b-OM-Detached	2 Nr	95 m2	189 m2
5b-OM-Detached		0 m2	0 m2
	75 Nr `		<b>4394 m2</b>

Subs and Superstructures	£3,075,041	£41,001
External Works within curtilage costs	£243,074	£3,241
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£298,889	£3,985
Garages	£0	£0
Drainage costs	£361,457	£4,819
Inc Services costs	£287,522	£3,834
Public Open Space	£63,058	£841
Costs of play facilities	£88,406	£1,179
Preliminaries for 33 months	£542,185	£7,229
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£4,959,632</b>	<b>£66,128</b>
Abnormals	£422,500	£5,633
Fees	£404,851	£5,398
Contingencies	£290,143	£3,869
<b>Total</b>	<b>£6,077,126</b>	<b>£81,028</b>

**Abnormals**

Allowance for lifting an crushing of concrete slabs foundations and leaving for reuse	12500 m2	£ 8/m2	£100,000
Allowance for abnormal foundations due to existing site use	75 No	£2,000	£150,000
<i>New habitat; extra over POS costs above</i>			<i>£10,000</i>
<i>Allowance for protection of heritage asset</i>			<i>£25,000</i>
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000
Allowance for work in connection with levels	12500 m2	£ 5/m2	£62,500
Allowance for imported fill			£50,000

**Total of abnormals £422,500**





**H1k Bellamy Road**

Site area	<b>2.14 ha</b>		
PoS %	<b>60.90%</b>		<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>13300 m2</b>	Stated area	
PoS Area	<b>8100 m2</b>		Floorspace/area 2680 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3.0 per month</b>		11673 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>40 Nr (30.1dph)</b>		

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	3 Nr	58 m2	174 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	12 Nr	75 m2	900 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	9 Nr	90 m2	810 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	9 Nr	90 m2	810 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	6 Nr	120 m2	720 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	1 Nr	150 m2	150 m2
		40 Nr		<b>3564 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£2,553,797	£63,845
External Works within curtilage costs	£220,371	£5,509
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£250,453	£6,261
Garages	£94,570	£2,364
Drainage costs	£198,739	£4,968
Inc Services costs	£158,088	£3,952
Public Open Space	£138,570	£3,464
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 21 months	£355,698	£8,892
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£3,970,286</b>	<b>£99,257</b>
Abnormals	£37,000	£925
Fees	£300,546	£7,514
Contingencies	£215,392	£5,385
<b>Total</b>	<b>£4,523,224</b>	<b>£113,081</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Improved road crossings</i>	<i>Item</i>		£25,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	40 Nr	£300	£12,000

**Total of abnormals £37,000**

**H11 High Oakham Farm (east)**

Site area	<b>1.57 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>17.65%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>13333 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>2353 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3584 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	15613 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>40 Nr (30.0dph)</b>	

		<b>Mix Data</b>	<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	2 P	3 Nr	58 m2	174 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	4 P		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	4 P	3 Nr	75 m2	225 m2
2b-OM-Semi	4 P		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-terraced	4 P		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	5 P		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Semi	5 P	2 Nr	90 m2	180 m2
4b-OM-Detached	6 P	20 Nr	120 m2	2400 m2
5b-OM-Detached	8 P	12 Nr	150 m2	1800 m2
	<b>244 P</b>	<b>40 Nr</b>		<b>4779 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£3,395,079	£84,877
External Works within curtilage costs	£225,407	£5,635
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£250,208	£6,255
Garages	£312,788	£7,820
Drainage costs	£198,739	£4,968
Inc Services costs	£158,088	£3,952
Public Open Space	£40,253	£1,006
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 21 months	£355,698	£8,892
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£4,936,260</b>	<b>£123,406</b>
Abnormals	£79,500	£1,988
Fees	£376,182	£9,405
Contingencies	£269,597	£6,740
<b>Total</b>	<b>£5,661,539</b>	<b>£141,538</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Improved access to Shining Cliff Plantation</i>	<i>Item</i>		£25,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	40 Nr	£300	£12,000
<i>Allowance for protection of heritage asset</i>			£12,500
<i>Enhanced habitat connections</i>	<i>Item</i>		£30,000

**Total of abnormals £79,500**

**H1m Land off Balmoral Drive**

Site area	<b>0.85 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>8500 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3684 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	16046 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>35 Nr (41.2dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	2 Nr	58 m2	116 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	11 Nr	75 m2	825 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	8 Nr	90 m2	720 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	8 Nr	90 m2	720 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	5 Nr	120 m2	600 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	1 Nr	150 m2	150 m2
		<b>35 Nr</b>		<b>3131 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£2,241,859	£64,053
External Works within curtilage costs	£156,746	£4,478
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£187,333	£5,352
Garages	£82,714	£2,363
Drainage costs	£173,897	£4,968
Inc Services costs	£138,327	£3,952
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 20 months	£338,760	£9,679
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£3,319,636</b>	<b>£94,847</b>
Abnormals	£25,500	£729
Fees	£250,885	£7,168
Contingencies	£179,801	£5,137
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,775,822</b>	<b>£107,881</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Allowance for integration of pathways</i>			<i>£15,000</i>
Allowance for effect of sloping site	35 Nr	£300	£10,500

**Total of abnormals** **£25,500**

**H1n Sherwood Close**

Site area	<b>0.60 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>6000 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 4675 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	20365 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>33 Nr (55.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>	<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced		58 m2	0 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	11 Nr	75 m2	825 m2
2b-OM-terraced		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22 Nr	90 m2	1980 m2
4b-OM-Detached		120 m2	0 m2
5b-OM-Detached		150 m2	0 m2
	<b>33 Nr</b>		<b>2805 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£2,027,968	£61,454
External Works within curtilage costs	£125,432	£3,801
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£156,565	£4,744
Garages	£0	£0
Drainage costs	£167,239	£5,068
Inc Services costs	£133,031	£4,031
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 19 months	£328,258	£9,947
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£2,938,494</b>	<b>£89,045</b>
Abnormals	£84,900	£2,573
Fees	£226,755	£6,871
Contingencies	£162,507	£4,924
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,412,655</b>	<b>£103,414</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Creation of green corridor and cycleway; cost extra to POS cost above</i>			<i>£50,000</i>
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	33 Nr	£300	£9,900

**Total of abnormals £84,900**

**H1o****Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane**

Site area	<b>1.11 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>17.73%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>9429 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>1671 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3146 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	13703 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>33 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	2 Nr	58 m2	116 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	10 Nr	75 m2	750 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	8 Nr	90 m2	720 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	7 Nr	90 m2	630 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	5 Nr	120 m2	600 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	1 Nr	150 m2	150 m2
		33 Nr		<b>2966 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£2,166,886	£65,663
External Works within curtilage costs	£167,689	£5,081
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£195,374	£5,920
Garages	£84,368	£2,557
Drainage costs	£167,239	£5,068
Inc Services costs	£133,031	£4,031
Public Open Space	£29,166	£884
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 19 months	£328,258	£9,947
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£3,272,011</b>	<b>£99,152</b>
Abnormals	£9,900	£300
Fees	£246,143	£7,459
Contingencies	£176,403	£5,346
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,704,457</b>	<b>£112,256</b>

**Abnormals**

Allowance for effect of sloping site	33 Nr	£300	£9,900
--------------------------------------	-------	------	--------

**Total of abnormals** **£9,900**

**H1q South of Debdale Lane**

Site area	<b>1.08 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>18.13%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>9143 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>1657 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3146 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	13703 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>32 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	2 Nr	58 m2	116 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	10 Nr	75 m2	750 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	7 Nr	90 m2	630 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	7 Nr	90 m2	630 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	5 Nr	120 m2	600 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	1 Nr	150 m2	150 m2
		32 Nr		<b>2876 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£2,100,988	£65,656
External Works within curtilage costs	£162,404	£5,075
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£189,421	£5,919
Garages	£80,625	£2,520
Drainage costs	£162,171	£5,068
Inc Services costs	£129,000	£4,031
Public Open Space	£28,916	£904
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 19 months	£328,258	£10,258
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£3,181,784</b>	<b>£99,431</b>
Abnormals	£84,200	£2,631
Fees	£244,949	£7,655
Contingencies	£175,547	£5,486
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,686,479</b>	<b>£115,202</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Enhancement of right of way</i>			£5,000
<i>Creation of Habitat buffer; extra over POS cost</i>			£15,000
Archaeological survey and actions			£25,000
<i>Allowance for wildlife site access management measures</i>			£20,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	32 Nr	£600	£19,200

**Total of abnormals £84,200**

**H1r****Land off Holly Road**

Site area	<b>0.46 ha</b>		
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>		<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>4600 m2</b>		
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>		Floorspace/area 3028 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	6	13192 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>16 Nr (34.8dph)</b>		

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	1 Nr	58 m2	58 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	5 Nr	75 m2	375 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	4 Nr	90 m2	360 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	4 Nr	90 m2	360 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	2 Nr	120 m2	240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%		150 m2	0 m2
		16 Nr		<b>1393 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£1,048,380	£65,524
External Works within curtilage costs	£83,870	£5,242
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£97,975	£6,123
Garages	£32,606	£2,038
Drainage costs	£83,470	£5,217
Inc Services costs	£66,397	£4,150
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 13 months	£200,376	£12,524
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£1,613,074</b>	<b>£100,817</b>
Abnormals	£34,800	£2,175
Fees	£123,591	£7,724
Contingencies	£88,573	£5,536
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,860,038</b>	<b>£116,252</b>

**Abnormals**

<i>Creation of N/S linkages; assumed off-site</i>			£30,000
Allowance for effect of sloping site	16 Nr	£300	£4,800

**Total of abnormals** **£34,800**

**H1s****Land at Cox's Lane**

Site area	<b>0.47 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.71%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>4667 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>33 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 2631 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	11463 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>14 Nr (30.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	1 Nr	58 m2	58 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	4 Nr	75 m2	300 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	3 Nr	90 m2	270 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	4 Nr	90 m2	360 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	2 Nr	120 m2	240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%		150 m2	0 m2
		14 Nr		<b>1228 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£923,658	£65,976
External Works within curtilage costs	£81,119	£5,794
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£92,278	£6,591
Garages	£28,752	£2,054
Drainage costs	£73,037	£5,217
Inc Services costs	£58,097	£4,150
Public Open Space	£599	£43
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 13 months	£184,963	£13,212
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£1,442,504</b>	<b>£103,036</b>
Abnormals	£12,000	£857
Fees	£109,088	£7,792
Contingencies	£78,180	£5,584
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,641,771</b>	<b>£117,269</b>

**Abnormals**

Allowance for effect of sloping site	14 Nr	£500	£7,000
<i>Allowance for protection of heritage</i>			<i>£5,000</i>
<i>RoW portection; assumed no cost</i>			<i>£0</i>

**Total of abnormals** **£12,000**



**H1t****Land off Ley Lane**

Site area	<b>0.47 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>4667 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 2631 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	11463 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>14 Nr (30.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	1 Nr	58 m2	58 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	4 Nr	75 m2	300 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	3 Nr	90 m2	270 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	4 Nr	90 m2	360 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	2 Nr	120 m2	240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%		150 m2	0 m2
		14 Nr		<b>1228 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£923,658	£65,976
External Works within curtilage costs	£81,119	£5,794
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£92,278	£6,591
Garages	£28,752	£2,054
Drainage costs	£73,037	£5,217
Inc Services costs	£58,097	£4,150
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 13 months	£184,963	£13,212
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£1,441,905</b>	<b>£102,993</b>
Abnormals	£52,000	£3,714
Fees	£112,043	£8,003
Contingencies	£80,297	£5,736
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,686,245</b>	<b>£120,446</b>

**Abnormals**

Allowance for effect of sloping site	14 Nr	£500	£7,000
Archaeological survey and actions			£15,000
Allowance for minor demolitions and additional site clearance to part			£30,000

**Total of abnormals** **£52,000**

**H1u Land off Rosemary Street**

Site area	<b>0.29 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>2900 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3045 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	13264 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>10 Nr (34.5dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	1 Nr	58 m2	58 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	3 Nr	75 m2	225 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	2 Nr	90 m2	180 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	2 Nr	90 m2	180 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	2 Nr	120 m2	240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%		150 m2	0 m2
		10 Nr		<b>883 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£666,039	£66,604
External Works within curtilage costs	£57,743	£5,774
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£65,792	£6,579
Garages	£24,899	£2,490
Drainage costs	£52,169	£5,217
Inc Services costs	£41,498	£4,150
Public Open Space	£0	£0
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 11 months	£156,507	£15,651
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£1,064,648</b>	<b>£106,465</b>
Abnormals	£0	£0
Fees	£79,849	£7,985
Contingencies	£57,225	£5,722
<b>Total</b>	<b>£1,201,721</b>	<b>£120,172</b>

**Abnormals**

No abnormal development works costs £0

**Total of abnormals £0**

**H1v Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop**

Site area	<b>16.28 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>54.66%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>105263 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>57537 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3403 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>5 per month</b>	14825 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>400 Nr (38.0dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	28 Nr	58 m2	1624 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	120 Nr	75 m2	9000 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	92 Nr	90 m2	8280 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	88 Nr	90 m2	7920 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	60 Nr	120 m2	7200 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	12 Nr	150 m2	1800 m2
		400 Nr		<b>35824 m2</b>

	TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures	£23,609,416	£59,024
External Works within curtilage costs	£1,734,013	£4,335
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£2,049,646	£5,124
Garages	£899,656	£2,249
Drainage costs	£1,828,399	£4,571
Inc Services costs	£1,454,408	£3,636
Public Open Space	£905,560	£2,264
Costs of play facilities	£190,799	£477
Preliminaries for 88 months	£1,736,979	£4,342
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£34,408,876</b>	<b>£86,022</b>
Abnormals	£232,000	£580
Fees	£2,598,066	£6,495
Contingencies	£1,861,947	£4,655
<b>Total</b>	<b>£39,100,889</b>	<b>£97,752</b>

**Abnormals**

POS costs included above			£0
Allowance for effect of sloping site	400 Nr	£300	£120,000
<i>RoW portection; assumed no cost</i>			£0
<i>Habitat buffers; extra over POS</i>			£50,000
<i>Access arrangementm to minimise impact; asuumed no cost</i>			£0
Retention of hedgerows; relaying	2480 m	£ 25/m	£62,000

**Total of abnormals £232,000**

**H1w****Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop**

Site area	<b>1.21 ha</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
PoS % (of net)	<b>17.64%</b>	2
Net Dev area	<b>10286 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>1814 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 3100 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	13506 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>36 Nr (35.0dph)</b>	

	<b>Mix Data</b>		<b>GFA/unit</b>	<b>Total GFA</b>
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	3 Nr	58 m2	174 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	11 Nr	75 m2	825 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	8 Nr	90 m2	720 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	8 Nr	90 m2	720 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	5 Nr	120 m2	600 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%	1 Nr	150 m2	150 m2
		36 Nr		<b>3189 m2</b>

	<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>COST / DWG</b>
Subs and Superstructures	£2,285,589	£63,489
External Works within curtilage costs	£178,593	£4,961
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage	£208,914	£5,803
Garages	£82,714	£2,298
Drainage costs	£178,865	£4,968
Inc Services costs	£142,279	£3,952
Public Open Space	£31,038	£862
Costs of play facilities	£0	£0
Preliminaries for 20 months	£338,760	£9,410
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>£3,446,752</b>	<b>£95,743</b>
Abnormals	£0	£0
Fees	£258,506	£7,181
Contingencies	£185,263	£5,146
<b>Total</b>	<b>£3,890,521</b>	<b>£108,070</b>

**Abnormals**

No abnormal development works costs £0

**Total of abnormals £0**

**H1x Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale**

Site area	<b>0.32 ha</b>	
PoS % (of net)	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>17 12 2018</b>
Net Dev area	<b>3200 m2</b>	
PoS Area	<b>0 m2</b>	Floorspace/area 2759 m2/ha
Sales rate	<b>3 per month</b>	12020 ft2/acre
No of dwellings	<b>10 Nr (31.3dph)</b>	

	Mix Data		GFA/unit	Total GFA
1b-OM-terraced	7.00%	1 Nr	58 m2	58 m2
2b bungalow-OM-Semi	0.00%		0 m2	0 m2
2b-Aff-Semi	0.00%		75 m2	0 m2
2b-OM-Semi	30.00%	3 Nr	75 m2	225 m2
2b-OM-terraced	0.00%		90 m2	0 m2
3b-OM-Detached	23.00%	2 Nr	90 m2	180 m2
3b-OM-Semi	22.00%	2 Nr	90 m2	180 m2
4b-OM-Detached	15.00%	2 Nr	120 m2	240 m2
5b-OM-Detached	3.00%		150 m2	0 m2
		10 Nr		<b>883 m2</b>

			TOTAL COST	COST / DWG
Subs and Superstructures			£666,039	£66,604
External Works within curtilage costs			£56,173	£5,617
Road and footpath works beyond curtilage			£64,495	£6,450
Garages			£24,899	£2,490
Drainage costs			£52,169	£5,217
Inc Services costs			£41,498	£4,150
Public Open Space			£0	£0
Costs of play facilities			£0	£0
Preliminaries for 11 months	11 mths	£15,000	£161,123	£16,112
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>			<b>£1,066,396</b>	<b>£106,640</b>
Abnormals			£75,000	£7,500
Fees			£85,605	£8,560
Contingencies			£61,350	£6,135
<b>Total</b>			<b>£1,288,351</b>	<b>£128,835</b>

**Abnormals**

Demolitions of school house and removal hard surfaces	Item	£75,000
--	------	---------

**Total of abnormals £75,000**

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **BUNGALOW GENERIC COSTS**

**SUMMARY FOR DENSITY 25 BUNGALOWS PER HECTARE – BROWNFIELD**

**DECEMBER 2018**

	BROWNFIELD SITE			Garages (No & Area)		Sales Rate & Construction Period		Site Areas		
	Total Cost	Av Cost per Dwelling	Av cost per m2					Net	POS	Gross
<b>Scheme 1 10 Dwellings</b>	£1,222,071	£122,207	£1,587	3 Nr	42 m2	N/A	8 Months	4,000 m2	0 m2	4,000 m2
<b>Scheme 2 20 Dwellings</b>	£2,408,466	£120,423	£1,564	6 Nr	84 m2	N/A	10 Months	8,000 m2	800 m2	8,800 m2

**Assumptions**

Floor areas and accommodation as follows:

2b Bungalow-OM-Semi	68.00 m2
3b Bungalow-OM-Semi	83.00 m2
3b Bungalow-OM-Detached	83.00 m2

**SUMMARY FOR DENSITY 25 BUNGALOWS PER HECTARE – GREENFIELD**

**DECEMBER 2018**

	GREENFIELD SITE			Garages (No & Area)		Sales Rate & Construction Period		Site Areas		
	Total Cost	Av Cost per Dwelling	Av cost per m2					Net	POS	Gross
<b>Scheme 1 10 Dwellings</b>	£1,159,769	£115,977	£1,506	3 Nr	42 m2	N/A	8 Months	4,000 m2	0 m2	4,000 m2
<b>Scheme 2 20 Dwellings</b>	£2,283,459	£114,173	£1,483	6 Nr	84 m2	N/A	10 Months	8,000 m2	800 m2	8,800 m2

**Assumptions**

Floor areas and accommodation as follows:

2b Bungalow-OM-Semi	68.00 m2
3b Bungalow-OM-Semi	83.00 m2
3b Bungalow-OM-Detached	83.00 m2



## **APPENDIX 5**

### **ALLOCATIONS, ASSUMPTIONS AND RESULTS**

**APPENDIX 5**

**MANSFIELD ALLOCATIONS SUMMARY RESULTS**

Ref	Address	Zone	Site Type	Capacity	Gross Site Area (ha)	Density	Net Area (ha)	Net Area (acres)	POS	Gross Net Ratio	POS % Net	Net Sales Price (per sq.m)	Land Value Benchmark (per ha)	Land Value Benchmark	Base Surplus per sq.m	AH Option 1 Surplus per sq.m	AH Option 2 Surplus per sq.m
H1a	Clipstone Road East	1	GF	511	17.09	35	14.60	36.06	2.49	85%	17%	£1,884	£284,000	£4,146,400	£201	£170	£188
H1b	Land off Skegby Lane	2	GF	194	8.32	30.3	6.40	15.81	1.92	77%	30%	£2,200	£654,500	£4,188,800	£174	£90	£109
H1c	Fields Farm, Abbott Road	1	GF	200	7.59	35	5.71	14.11	1.88	75%	33%	£1,884	£284,000	£1,622,857	£159	£125	£146
H1d	Three Thorn Hollow Farm	1	GF	188	7.14	35	5.37	13.27	1.77	75%	33%	£1,884	£284,000	£1,525,486	£142	£109	£128
H1e	Land at Redruth Drive	1	GF	178	4.98	42	4.24	10.47	0.74	85%	18%	£1,884	£284,000	£1,203,619	£202	£167	£187
H1f	Former Rosebrook Primary School	1	GF	134	5.1	35	3.83	9.46	1.27	75%	33%	£1,884	£284,000	£1,087,314	£150	£107	£137
H1g	Abbott Road	1	GF	102	5.54	30	3.40	8.40	2.14	61%	63%	£1,884	£284,000	£965,600	£75	£42	£57
H1h	Centenary Road	1	BF	95	2.42	39	2.42	5.98	Assume off site provision			£1,884	£494,000	£1,195,480	£74	£59	£68
H1i	Former Mansfield Brewery (part a)	1	BF	75	1.63	60	1.25	3.09	0.38	77%	30%	£1,884	£494,000	£617,500	-£92	-£112	-£100
H1j	Cauldwell Road	2	GF	42	1.3	38	1.11	2.73	0.19	85%	18%	£2,200	£654,500	£723,395	£155	£74	£91
H1k	Bellamy Road	1	GF	40	2.14	30	1.33	3.29	0.81	62%	61%	£1,884	£284,000	£378,667	£47	£16	£32
H1l	High Oakham Farm (east)	2	GF	40	1.57	30	1.33	3.29	0.24	85%	18%	£2,200	£654,500	£872,667	£259	£197	£211
H1m	Land off Balmoral Drive	1	GF	35	0.85	41	0.85	2.10	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£241,400	£122	£86	£106
H1n	Sherwood Close	1	GF	33	0.6	55	0.60	1.48	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£170,400	£128	£92	£117
H1o	Ladybrook Lane / Tuckers Lane	1	GF	33	1.11	35	0.94	2.33	0.17	85%	18%	£1,884	£284,000	£267,771	£81	£54	£70
H1q	South of Debdale Lane	1	GF	32	1.08	35	0.91	2.26	0.17	85%	18%	£1,884	£284,000	£259,657	£52	£24	£41
H1r	Land off Holly Road	1	GF	16	0.46	35	0.46	1.14	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£130,640	£29	-£1	£5
H1s	Land at Cox's Lane	1	GF	14	0.46	30	0.46	1.14	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£130,640	£18	-£10	£12
H1t	Land off Ley Lane	1	BF	14	0.47	30	0.47	1.16	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£494,000	£232,180	-£99	-£127	-£105
H1u	Land off Rosemary Street	1	GF	10	0.29	34	0.29	0.72	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£82,360	£12		
H1v	Stonebridge Lane / Sookholme Lane, Market Warsop	1	GF	400	16.28	38	10.53	26.00	5.75	65%	55%	£1,884	£284,000	£2,989,474	£203	£171	£189
H1w	Sherwood Street / Oakfield Lane, Market Warsop	1	GF	36	1.21	35	1.03	2.54	0.18	85%	18%	£1,884	£284,000	£292,114	£106	£71	£89
H1x	Former Warsop Vale School, Warsop Vale	1	GF	10	0.32	31	0.32	0.79	Assume off site POS provision			£1,884	£284,000	£90,880	-£91		

Impact Per sq.m			Ave Dwelling Size	Floorspace (sq.ft) per acre
Education	Highways	Other S106		
£58	£292	£9	90	13,657
£52	£2	£10	90	11,829
£56	£2	£10	90	13,660
£53	£1	£10	90	13,682
£52	£1	£10	90	16,402
£54	£9	£10	90	13,673
£54	£3	£10	89	11,691
£54		£10	89	15,290
£90		£16	58	15,263
£59		£11	89	14,703
£54	£4	£11	89	11,649
£48		£8	119	15,620
£58		£11	89	16,052
£59		£11	85	20,373
£55		£10	90	13,709
£59		£10	90	13,708
£75		£12	87	13,197
£59		£11	88	11,634
£59		£11	88	11,386
£68		£11	88	13,269
£50	£39	£9	90	14,831
£60		£11	89	13,511
£69		£11	88	12,025