

South Worcestershire Councils  
(Malvern Hills District, Worcester City and Wychavon District)  
Community Infrastructure Levy [CIL]

Examination of Draft Charging Schedule [SWCIL01]  
as amended by the Statement of Modifications [SWCIL04]

**Main issues and questions  
for discussion at the  
hearing**

**Issue 1**

**Does the amended Draft Charging Schedule comply with the requirements of the *Planning Act 2008* and the *CIL Regulations 2010*, as amended?**

Yes. This is addressed by the South Worcester Councils' (SWC) Statement of Compliance [SWCIL02]. The SWC will be asked to confirm compliance with the requirements verbally at the start of the hearing. In advance of any statement at the hearing the SWC affirm that the CIL has been prepared in accordance with the regulations.

**Issue 2**

**Do the amended Draft Charging Schedule and the accompanying maps set out with sufficient clarity what proposed CIL rates will apply to each category of development in each defined charging zone?**

Yes. Please refer to the Examiner's Further Initial Queries and Comments on the Draft Charging Schedule (DCS) (CIL/EX/07), to which the SWC responded on 1 November 2016. The SWC response has been posted on the CIL examination webpage (CIL/EX/09).

**Issue 3**

**Is the amended Draft Charging Schedule supported by appropriate available evidence in respect of infrastructure planning?**

a) Has the infrastructure funding gap been appropriately assessed?

The total infrastructure funding gap is not set out within the latest South Worcestershire Infrastructure Delivery Plan (SWIDP) updated (July 2016). However, the July 2016 SWIDP does state that the funding gap is £259.27m (para. 8.2, p.100); for the 'key infrastructure' provision (i.e. Transport, Education and Sports and Recreation). The SWC response (CIL/EX/02) to the Examiner's Initial Queries (CIL/EX/01) states that the revised funding gap is £207.5m for the key infrastructure provision.

Further work undertaken since the submission of this response has revealed an error in this calculation. The Sports and Recreation funding gap total includes

£2.05m which was funding required for Children's Social Care. Removal of this sum provides a revised Sports and Recreation funding gap of £53.75m with the total funding gap for key infrastructure revised down to **£205.45m**.

To summarise, the funding requirement is updated as follows:

- Funding required - key infrastructure only (Transport, Education and Sport and Recreation): **£399.4m**
- Funding obtained or identified for key items of infrastructure to date: **£191.9m**
- Key infrastructure funding gap: **£205.45m**

The funding gap for all other types of infrastructure in the SWIDP has proven difficult to quantify. However, the reality of the situation is that with Levy receipts estimated to only cover a small percentage of the infrastructure funding gap (see the response to Issue 3b below), it is unlikely that any other types of infrastructure in the SWIDP will be funded through CIL. The SWC have reassessed the funding gap and total infrastructure requirement and this is set out at Annex 1 Infrastructure Delivery Plan Funding Gap (October 2016) to this document.

- b) Has the target amount that the SWC propose to raise through CIL been appropriately assessed?

Indicative Levy receipts from CIL for south Worcestershire were calculated at approximately **£13,500,000** for the 'Justifying the Levy' Background Paper (April 2016). This was based on residential contributions only via a combination of those sites assessed as part of the viability studies in the greenfield typologies 1-5 and the 'Greenfield Medium' 10 typology (i.e. sites outside of the Main Urban Areas (MUA) that would be subject to £40m<sup>2</sup>), along with the two strategic sites that were subject to a CIL charge at that time (SWDP53 QinetiQ, Malvern and SWDP 51/1 Cheltenham Road, Evesham – both £40m<sup>2</sup>). An indicative discount of 40% was applied to all sites to account for affordable housing, with an average useable floorspace of 94m<sup>2</sup> per dwelling utilised for the calculation.

An indicative update, in October 2016, to this figure (see Annex 1) produced a much lower CIL receipts total of circa **£5,800,000**. The lower estimation is mainly due to the previous two strategic sites in the April 2016 calculation (i.e. SWDP53 QinetiQ, Malvern and SWDP 51/1 Cheltenham Road, Evesham) no longer being subject to CIL, as well as the removal of a number of sites in the viability study typologies that are no longer subject to CIL due to planning permission being granted. A modest windfall allowance (projecting to 2030 i.e. the end of the SWDP plan period) has been factored into this revised calculation, as well as an additional small number of SWDP sites not in the viability typologies which could still qualify for CIL, but the total receipts estimation is now significantly lower than initially projected.

It is important to also note that both receipts projections (April 2016 and October 2016) have not factored in a proportion of receipts that would be

passed onto parish or town councils either with or without a neighbourhood plan (i.e. either 15 or 25 %). While this is CIL money that will generally be used to fund infrastructure at the local level, it is a further deduction of the CIL receipts likely to be available to the SWC to spend on strategic infrastructure as identified in the SWIDP.

Overall, based on the updated figure for October 2016 (which again does not factor in the neighbourhood funding portion) it is estimated that projected CIL receipts will account for approximately 3% of the amount required to meet the strategic infrastructure costs identified in the funding gap.

- c) Is it sufficiently clear which projects or types of infrastructure are to be funded in whole or part by CIL and which site-specific matters will continue to be subject to s106 contributions?

Yes. The Regulation 123 List (and the accompanying Appendix A) in the DCS clearly delineates between these two infrastructure funding streams. Items to be paid for in full or in part by CIL are described in broader strategic terms, while site-specific (or specifically described infrastructure) will be delivered through planning obligations. The Regulation 123 List provides the flexibility to match infrastructure requirements with the most appropriate funding stream. The Developer Contributions SPD (adopted in October 2016) provides further details in relation to how non-CIL related planning obligations will be sought.

#### **Issue 4**

#### **Is the amended Draft Charging Schedule supported by appropriate available evidence in respect of economic viability?**

##### *Generic residential viability assessments*

- a) In respect of setting Benchmark Land Values:  
i. Is the overall approach appropriate?

Yes. The viability evidence builds on that provided to support the SWDP. The methodology used to consider CIL is the same as that used to assess the deliverability of the SWDP.

The work has been carried out by modelling a set of typologies and key strategic sites to represent the development in the area and using the 'Existing Use Plus' methodology in line with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which sets out (with our emphasis):

##### "PPG 10-006-20140306

*Assessing the viability of plans does not require individual testing of every site or assurance that individual sites are viable; site typologies may be used to determine viability at policy level. Assessment of samples of sites may be helpful to support evidence and more detailed assessment may be necessary for particular areas or key sites on which the delivery of the plan relies.*

##### PPG 10-015-20140306

*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”.*

The work has been done in line with the Harman Guidance ‘Viability Testing Local Plans Advice for planning practitioners’ (2012).

In line with the process set out in the Harman Guidance, the methodology was put to the development industry, with a briefing events held at County Hall on 25 April 2016, and alongside previous Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultations on 9 March 2015 and 23 October 2013. Whilst various aspects of the work has been commented on and challenged the basic approach and methodology has not been.

ii. Should comparable evidence be taken into account?

Yes. Comparable evidence has been used throughout the study to inform the assumptions of residential and non-residential properties.

The most recent residential evidence is set out at the start of Chapter 3 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14). The principal element of this is analysis of actual transactions recorded by the Land Registry which is brought together with information of the unit sizes from the Energy Performance Certificate Register. Full details are provided in Appendix 1 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

The most recent non-residential data is also set out towards the end of Chapter 3 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14). This draws on transactional property data collated by CoStar. Whilst this has not been presented (as there was general consensus that the assumptions are appropriate) in the submitted evidence, this is available if required.

The data on Student Accommodation was reviewed and updated and this is set out at the end of Chapter 3 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14)

It is accepted that the viability evidence does not include transactional evidence of land prices – although it is notable that none of the consultees have provided evidence either. In preparation for the CIL Examination, HDH have undertaken a review of recent transactional evidence from the Land Registry. This was not available at the earlier stages of the project.

For each of the council areas a Land Registry search has been undertaken to establish the price paid for the land subject to the 15 or so most recent, significant planning consents. A brief note is attached at Annex 3 Development Land Values Update (October 2016) to provide comparable evidence in this regard, although it should be noted the price paid is not available for all of the sites.

iii. Should an allowance be made for land promoter risk?

Paragraph 173 and 174 of the NPPF sets the framework for viability testing (selective quotes):

*"173... 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.*

*173... 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..."*

This is expanded on in Section 10 – Viability of the PPG.

Viability testing is a high-level test that is applied to all sites regardless of their nature and size. It is quite clear that a national housebuilder will have a different business model to regional developer or a small local builder producing a few homes each year. The PPG does not suggest different approaches are taken for each and that different business models are used – to the contrary a relatively simple high level assessment is made of all types using a similar approach and method. This is absolutely in line with the Harman Guidance and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) Guidance.

Leaving aside the fact that the PPG and Harman Guidance set out a process (that has been followed) it is not appropriate or necessary to consider land promoters separately.

The place of the land promoter is between the landowner and the developer. Some landowners may choose to promote their land themselves (bearing all the costs and risks of the process), others may enter into an option or similar arrangement with a developer whereby the developer will pay for and take the risk of promoting the land, and in return be able to buy the land for a discounted price (typically between 80% and 90% of the value with planning consent). The developer is rewarded for the risk through the discounted purchase price and a more certain land supply.

In some cases a site promoter may sit between the owner and developer. In this case the promoter will enter into an agreement with the owner, take the risk and bear the expense of obtaining a planning consent. As with the conventional option with a developer the promoter can then purchase the land at a discount to market value (with planning) and then sell the land with the benefit of planning. The promoter makes a return or profit through selling the land on to a developer, at the full market price, so is rewarded within the Existing Use Values plus methodology.

- b) Are the following factors in the assessments appropriate and soundly based on evidence:
  - i. sales values for market housing;

Yes. See the response to 4a) ii) above. A range of data sources have been drawn on and the assumptions tested through the consultation process.

- ii. values for affordable housing;

Yes. The values of affordable homes was derived from first principles and checked through the consultation process. As set out from 3.16 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) the changes in the affordable rent regime (that result in a fall in values) have been taken into account.

- iii. build costs;

The Harman Guidance suggests that the RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) is an appropriate base for the viability study. The analysis is based on the BCIS costs as set out at 4.6 of CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

Adjustments have been made for smaller sites in line with further advice from BCIS.

- iv. infrastructure costs?

As the plan-making process has developed (including through the SWDP Examination) the SWC have continued to update the IDP. Chapter 5 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) sets out the assumptions used. These figures were provided to HDH by the Councils, informed by a series of in-house workshops with infrastructure providers in the autumn of 2015, and expanded in Appendix 3 of CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14). These remain the best estimate of the costs of strategic infrastructure and mitigation that are required in relation to the strategic sites that can be requested from the site promoters bearing in mind the restrictions set out in CIL Regulations 122 and 123.

As set out in 6.7d of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (DocSWCIL14), for the smaller sites represented by the typologies an allowance of £2,000/unit (market and affordable) has been applied. This assumption is a little lower than that set out in 7.30 of the Local Plan Viability Update – September 2014 (Doc SWCIL12) where an assumption of £2,500 was used. The £2,000/unit is appropriate bearing in mind the restrictions on the use of S106 contributions set out in CIL Regulation 122 and CIL Regulation 123.

- c) Should an allowance be made in the assessments for:
  - i. abnormal costs;

The answer is equivocal. The approach to abnormal costs is set out from 4.8 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

It is important to ensure that the normal costs of development are reflected in the appraisals. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF says (with our emphasis):

*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.*

A normal cost is a cost that applies to most sites. Most brownfield sites will have additional costs of development (so is a normal abnormal cost) so an allowance of 5% of the construction costs is made on the brownfield sites.

It is not the purpose of viability testing to equalize the value of all sites by making adjustments to the abnormal allowances. Rather, as set out by the Gedling Local Plan Inspector (from 4.10 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) abnormal costs will be reflected in land values. A clean and easily developed site will command a higher price and value than one that is more difficult and expensive to develop.

ii. external works;

Yes. The approach is set out at from 7.19 of the Local Plan Viability Update – September 2014 (Doc SWCIL13). The BCIS costs do not include sites costs so an additional allowance of between 10% and 20% of the BCIS is made in this regard.

iii. provision of garages for market housing?

The modelling does not allow for garages. The CIL Regulations, the CIL Guidance and the PPG are all clear that appropriate available evidence should be used:

PPG 25-019-20140612

*A charging authority must use 'appropriate available evidence' (as defined in the Planning Act 2008 section 211(7A)) to inform their draft charging schedule. The Government recognises that the available data is unlikely to be fully comprehensive. Charging authorities need to demonstrate that their proposed levy rate or rates are informed by 'appropriate available' evidence and consistent with that evidence across their area as a whole.*

The CIL evidence was prepared with the SWDP evidence (as recommended by PPG 10-004-20140306 "Authorities should seek to align the preparation of their Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedules and their Local Plans as far as practical").

The modelling was subject to consultation from an early stage (as set out in the response to 4a) i) above and was agreed to be appropriate.

When undertaking the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) a survey of new build housing for sale was considered. The results of this survey are presented in Appendix 2 of that report. As set out at 3.9, at the time of the review there were about 180 newbuild homes being advertised for sale. Of these, the floor area information is available for about 140. 32% had an external garage. It is clear garages are only provided for a minority of houses.

Generally the costs of constructing garage will be more than outweighed by the extra value it would generate.

d) Has an appropriate viability buffer been applied?

The PPG says (with our emphasis).

PPG 25-019-20140612

*A charging authority's proposed rate or rates should be reasonable, given the available evidence, but there is no requirement for a proposed rate to exactly mirror the evidence. For example, this might not be appropriate if the evidence pointed to setting a charge right at the margins of viability. There is room for some pragmatism. It would be appropriate to ensure that a 'buffer' or margin is included, so that the levy rate is able to support development when economic circumstances adjust. In all cases, the charging authority should be able to explain its approach clearly.*

When considering the effect that CIL may have on viability (being the test set out in CIL Regulation 14) a number of 'tests' have been used. Before considering these it is timely to highlight that throughout the study a series of cautious assumptions have been made to ensure that the results are realistic and not based on a series of overoptimistic assumptions – thus building in a buffer at each and every stage.

1. Firstly an assessment of the Additional Profit was made. Additional Profit is an amount left in the appraisal having met the costs of the development and provided a competitive return to the willing landowner and willing developer. This analysis has been updated and provided at Annex 2 Maximum Capacity for CIL.

CIL is set as a relatively small proportion of the Additional Profit – being generally less than one third of the maximum.

2. The principal analysis used is to ensure that the Residual Value, having paid CIL is well in excess of the Viability Threshold. For residential development this analysis is set out at Table 6.1 of CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

There is a margin between the Residual Value and Viability Threshold – indicating that CIL is not set at the limit of viability.

3. CIL is considered as a proportion of the Residual Value. This is an indication of the amount by which land values may fall as a result of the introduction of CIL. This analysis is set out in Table 6.4 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

The fall is likely to be somewhat less than 15% on most sites, being well within the amounts considered reasonable (in the context of whether or not the Plan will be put at serious risk) elsewhere.

4. The fourth test is to consider CIL as a proportion of the overall value of the scheme. This analysis is set out in Table 6.5 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

Viability is not a precise science so this analysis is useful as it indicates that CIL would be less than 5% of a project value – i.e. a very small sum when considered in the round.

*Residential viability assessments for the strategic sites*



- e) For the Cheltenham Road, Evesham site (SWDP 51/1):
- Are the correct gross and net site areas used in the assessment?
  - Is there a consistent approach to modelling Benchmark Land Values and Residual Land Value in relation to gross or net site area?

No. See SWC response to Examiner titled 'Examiner's Query to the SWC concerning the Viability Update site area figures' (CIL/EX/08).

The following tables sets out a number of discrepancies between the SWDP Update 2014 and the CIL Update 2016. The reason for the differences was an error in the modelling.

Table 1: Residential viability assessments for strategic sites

Number		Units	Jan-16		Sep-14	
			Area Ha		Area Ha	
			Gross	Net	Gross	Net
45/1	South Worcs UE	2,609	247.00	140.00	247.00	140.00
45/2	Worcester West UE	2,150	134.49	61.50	134.49	61.50
WO135&136	Crown Packaging	230	15.56	5.83	6.83	5.83
48/1	Vines Lane	100	6.83	3.00	3.10	3.00
51/1	Cheltenham Road	500	11.70	11.50	19.00	11.50
53	QinetiQ	300	3.10	8.60	10.30	8.60
56	NE Malvern	800	19.00	22.85	56.84	22.85
11	Swinesherd Way	300	37.40	13.20	-	-

The corrected results are as follows. The results are shown in the May-16 column and are directly comparable to those in the £40 column in Table 6.1b which are shown in Sept-14 column below:

Table 2: Residential viability assessments for strategic sites - update

Number		Alternative Use Value	Viability Threshold	May-16	Sep-14
				Residual Value	
				£/ha	£/ha
Site 1	South Worcs UE	25,000	330,000	27,625	27,625
Site 2	Worcs West UE	25,000	330,000	74,436	74,436
Site 3	Crown Packaging	350,000	420,000	482,142	211,634
Site 4	Vines Lane	25,000	330,000	636,115	288,720
Site 5	Cheltenham Road	25,000	330,000	472,367	767,092
Site 6	QinetiQ	300,000	360,000	344,938	1,146,085
Site 7	NE Malvern	25,000	330,000	148,505	444,264
Site 8	Swinesherd Way	25,000	330,000	53,972	53,972

- Are the sales values for market housing appropriate and soundly based on evidence?

Yes. The same approach has been taken across all the sites. See response to 4b) i) above.

- Are the values for affordable housing appropriate and soundly based

on evidence?

Yes. The same approach has been taken across all the sites. See response to 4b) ii) above.

v. Are appropriate GIA figures used in the assessment?

Yes the number of units and thus the GIA figures are correct. The mix of housing is as advised by the SWC and is set out in the site makeup sheets of Appendix 5 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14).

*Viability assessment for sheltered retirement housing*

f) Does the viability assessment for older people's housing support the application of a CIL rate to sheltered retirement housing within use class C3?

As recommended at 6.21 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) a zero rate is recommended for older peoples housing.

It is accepted that not all types of older peoples housing falls conveniently into C3 (Dwelling Houses) or C2 (Residential Institutions) and that over the last few years a number of intermediate products have become more common a case can be made that a scheme could be in either Use Class.

The analysis set out at Table 6.6 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) indicates that neither Sheltered Housing (most likely to be C3) nor extra care (most likely to fall within C2) are able to bear the SWC full affordable housing target.

Therefore for clarity the SWC position is that CIL would not be sought on C2 development, or for sheltered/extra care accommodation classed as C3 (CIL/EX/09).

*Viability assessment for student accommodation*

g) In the student accommodation viability assessment, are valid assumptions made in respect of:  
i. Number of rooms;

No alternative modeling or appraisal assumptions have been provided by consultees.

The modelling is based on a scheme of 175 units. This is smaller than may be found in a major metropolitan centre (e.g. universities of Newcastle or Leicester) however, based on discussions with officers this was felt to be representative.

ii. Room sizes, communal and circulation space;

No alternative modeling or appraisal assumptions have been provided by consultees.

Student accommodation development has been based on HDH wider experience of

the sector. The modeled scheme assumes 175 rooms of 15m<sup>2</sup> and 35% circulation space. These are normal assumptions for such development.

iii. Build costs per room;

The construction costs are based on the BCIS Costs. Allowance is made for site costs, abnormalities (as such schemes are likely to be on brownfield sites), and fees (8%) etc.

iv. Rental income?

As set out in the response to 4a) i) above rents (and values) of Student Accommodation was reviewed and updated and this is set out at the end of Chapter 3 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14)

The SWC have met with the University of Worcester and have agreed the principle that the University would be CIL exempt for student accommodation given its charitable status. The two parties are working towards producing a Statement of Common Ground on this matter that, if it can be agreed, will be submitted to the Examiner prior to the hearing sessions. For the avoidance of doubt any student accommodation delivered by a separate developer/private party, that is not either a charity or the University, would remain liable for CIL.

*Viability assessment for retail development*

h) Should a minimum floorspace threshold be set for retail developments subject to CIL and if so, what should it be?

No. Differential rates may only be set with regard to viability and there is not sufficient, robust, evidence to take such an approach, for example there is no evidence to suggest rents above some particular size (such as the Sunday Trading Threshold) are more or less than any other retail rents.

For this reason the types of retail uses have been defined by description rather than an arbitrary threshold.

i) Does the viability evidence support the application of CIL to retail developments on brownfield sites?

The Councils have given careful consideration to where and what new retail development may come forward. The continued contraction of the highstreets and conventional comparison shopping is expected to continue and the combined area is well served by supermarkets. The principle type of retail development is likely to be smaller format supermarkets on larger sites.

CIL is only payable on the net new floor space created by a development (PPG 25-002-20140612) and therefore most retail brownfield development will only pay the CIL on a fraction of the total development floorspace.

j) Is the assessment of capital values for retail developments based on an appropriate methodology and sound evidence?

Yes. Evidence has been drawn on from both the SWDP area, but due to the low number of transactions wider evidence has also been drawn on.

## **Issue 5**

**Are the proposed charging rates in the amended Draft Charging Schedule informed by and consistent with the evidence on economic viability, and does the evidence demonstrate that the proposed charging rates would contribute towards the implementation of the Councils' relevant plans and support development across South Worcestershire?**

Yes. Please see earlier response to Issue 4 a); b).

### *Residential rate*

- a) Are the proposed CIL rates of £40 per square metre for residential developments in Malvern Hills and Wychavon, outside the Main Urban Areas (MUA), appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?

Yes. Please see earlier responses to Issue 4 a); b).

- b) Are the proposed CIL rates of £40 per square metre for residential development on sites SWDP50/7 (Land off Abbey Road, Evesham) and SWDP51/1 (Cheltenham Road, Evesham) appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?

The SWC have conceded that SWDP51/1 (Cheltenham Road, Evesham) can not bear a CIL charge (CIL/EX/08). With regard to SWDP50/7 (Land off Abbey Road, Evesham) the SWC reiterate the view that the site lies outside the MUA of Evesham. The site was not assessed for viability as one of the sample 'strategic sites', mainly due to Evesham already being covered by the inclusion of the Cheltenham Road site (SWDP51/1). Further the PPG advises that it is not necessary to undertake individual testing of every site or provide assurance that individual sites are viable (paragraph 10-006-20140306).

The position advanced by the developer is that the site should be dealt with as zero rated since it lies within the SWDP 2 development boundary, but this is not supported for CIL purposes as this is a policy demarcation which is different to the Office of National Statistics built up areas data of the town used for the MUA boundary of Evesham.

- c) Is a CIL rate of £40 per square metre for sheltered retirement housing appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?

No. As recommended at 6.21 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) a zero rate is recommended for older peoples housing (both C2 and C3 use classes).

- d) If the answers to (a), (b) and/or (c) are no, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate(s)?

Yes. Please see earlier response to Issue 4 f).

- e) What alternative residential rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?

As above.

*Student Accommodation rate*

- f) Will any student accommodation provided for or on behalf of the University of Worcester be exempt from CIL because of the University's charitable status?

Yes. See response to the Examiner's queries under CIL/EX/09 and above at Issue 4 g) iv).

- g) Is the proposed CIL rate of £100 per square metre for student accommodation appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?

Yes. As above. No alternative evidence has been presented.

- h) If not, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate?

NA

- i) What alternative student accommodation rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?

NA

*Food Retail (Supermarkets) and Retail Warehouses rate*

- j) Is the proposed CIL rate of £60 per square metre for food retail (supermarkets) and retail warehouses appropriate in the light of all the evidence submitted?

Yes. This reflects that most recent trend for development of smaller supermarkets on greenfield sites

- k) Is the rate appropriate for all types of supermarket including discount retailers?

Yes. This reflects that most recent trend for development of smaller supermarkets on greenfield sites.

- l) If the answers to (f) and/or (g) are no, which specific aspects of the evidence base are considered to fail to justify the proposed rate?

NA

- m) What alternative retail rate(s) would be appropriate, and why?

NA

SWC  
15/11/16

## ANNEX 1 Infrastructure Delivery Plan Funding Gap (October 2016)

Reference to Issue 3 part a) of the Examiner's Main issues and questions

Total amount of infrastructure required: Circa £550m (Source: IDP 2012)

**Table 1: Key Infrastructure (Transport, Education, Sport and Recreation) – approximately 73% of total infrastructure requirement costs**

Infrastructure Type	Funding Required	Funding Obtained or Available	Funding Gap	Date of last update	Notes
Transport	£228m	£108m	£120m	September 2016	IDP 2016 states: "Excludes improvements to Townsend Way/A449 Junction associated with the proposed Newlands development" (Appendix Y pages 113 to 114)
Education	£115.6m	£83.9m	£31.7m	September 2016	
Sport and Recreation	Required = £53.75m (down from £76.35m)	£0m (at least £20.5m discounted as delivered)	£53.75m	October 2014 (Partial updates Sept/Oct 2016)	<b>£2,050,000 for Children's Social Care removed from this funding area.</b> 'Community Facilities' of the IDP University of Worcester Arena (£10m) and new swimming pool at Perdiswell (£10.5m) have been discounted (£20.5m) <b>The revised total is £53.75m</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>£399.4m</b>	<b>£191.9m</b>	<b>£205.45m</b>	<b>October 2016</b>	

**Table 2: Other Infrastructure - approximately 27% of total infrastructure requirement costs**

Infrastructure Type	Funding Required	Funding Obtained or Available	Funding Gap	Date of last update	Notes
Utilities	At least £165m (delivered by utility companies)	£165m (i.e. Hartlebury Energy from Waste Plant)	£0m	October 2016	Hartlebury Energy from Waste Plant now delivered.
Flood Risk and Drainage	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	October 2016	

Communications Infrastructure	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	October 2016	
Waste Infrastructure	See Utilities Above	See Utilities Above	See Utilities Above	October 2016	
Health and Public Health	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	October 2016	
Social Care	£0m	£0m	£0m	October 2016	Worcestershire County Council has no plans for new facilities.
Children's Social Care	£2.05m	Unknown	£2.05m	October 2016	<b>This amount has been removed from the Sport and Recreation funding row above.</b>
Community Facilities (other than sport and recreation e.g. libraries)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	October 2016	
Emergency Infrastructure	£4.4m to £6.5m	Unknown (£0m)	£4.4m to £6.5m	October 2016	
Green Infrastructure	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	October 2016	
<b>Total</b>	<b>At least £150.6m</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>October 2016</b>	

### Total Infrastructure Required and Funding Gap Totals

The tables above demonstrate that for approximately 73% of the known main infrastructure costs, there is a substantive funding gap exceeding £200m. Although it is not possible to identify the funding gap for the remaining infrastructure costs (i.e. the other 27%), it is virtually certain that there will be one. The revised October 2016 infrastructure figures are therefore:

**Funding required (excluding other infrastructure): £399.4m**

**Funding obtained or available: £191.9m**

**Funding gap: £205.45m**

**Approximate projected CIL receipts residential only (October 2016): £5,828,000** (down from £13,502,160 in the April 2016 – 'Justifying the Levy' Background Paper). At portion of this could also be passed onto Parish and Town Councils (or Community Forums where no Parish or Town Council) and/or Neighbourhood Planning Areas.

The updated October 2016 projection is based on estimated residential takings on the greenfield typologies 1 to 5 and green medium typology 10 of the viability study, reflecting the approximate number of remaining SWDP sites in the rural areas of Malvern and Wychavon still liable for CIL, plus an element of projected windfall allowance (taken from delivery averages), and other SWDP sites that could still be liable for CIL that are not in the typologies above but fall

in the £40m<sup>2</sup> zones.

This is collected from Malvern Hills and Wychavon outside of the main urban areas at £40m<sup>2</sup> as these are the only areas where a residential charge is proposed. The total is based on an average English household usable floor area average of 94m<sup>2</sup> and a reduction of 40% on the dwellings total for affordable housing provision<sup>1</sup>.

The amount projected through CIL receipts has dropped significantly since April 2016. This is mainly due to two the strategic sites now no longer being subject to CIL (SWDP 53 - QinetiQ, Malvern and SWDP 51/1 - Cheltenham Road, Evesham) and a large number of SWDP sites that were part of the viability study typology updates that now have the benefit of planning permission and so are no longer eligible for CIL either.

Overall, based on the updated figure for October 2016, it is estimated that projected CIL receipts will account for approximately 3 per cent of the amount required to meet the infrastructure costs identified in the funding gap (NB this figure does not factor in the percentage of the receipts that will be allocated to neighbourhood funds).

<sup>1</sup> *The useable floor area average is based on private rented (78m<sup>2</sup>) and owner occupied (109m<sup>2</sup>) homes only. Social rented homes (66m<sup>2</sup>) have not been included in the average floor area calculation as these dwellings have already been discounted under the affordable housing portion. Source: English Housing Survey – Profile of English Housing 2013-14 Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Published July 2015*



## **ANNEX 2 Maximum Capacity for CIL**

The setting of CIL is a qualitative and quantitative process. As set out in Chapter 6 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) three main forms of analysis have been used to settle the final recommended rates:

- a) The comparison of the Residual Value to the Viability Threshold.
- b) Consideration of CIL as a proportion of the Residual Value (being an indication of the approximate amount the developer would be able to pay the landowner following the introduction of CIL.
- c) Consideration of CIL as a proportion the total worth of the project as an indication the impact CIL may have on the overall project.

Earlier on in the project, as set out in the Worcestershire CIL Viability Study – September 2014 (Doc SWCIL12), a calculation of the Additional Profit was made. The additional profit is the name HDH have used for the maximum capacity for CIL (other consultancies have given it different names such as 'headroom'). The additional profit is the Residual Value less the cost of the land, where the cost of the land is the 'Existing Use Value plus' (i.e. the viability threshold). It is the amount left in the appraisal having provided both the willing land owner and the willing developer a competitive return – so is the amount that CIL can be paid out of.

The additional profit data is set out in the appendices of the Worcestershire CIL Viability Study – September 2014 (SWCIL12).

HDH did not present the Additional Profit Analysis in the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) as we felt that it had a tendency to be interpreted by those outside the industry as the starting point for CIL – where in fact it is simply the size of the pot from which the developer could pay CIL.

The appraisals in the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) do include additional profit analysis – but it has not been presented in the report. The additional profit analysis has been extracted from the appraisals and is presented below. Analysis set out in the in the CIL Viability Update - January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14 - as out from paragraph 2.3) was carried out after the successful appeal by West Berkshire and Reading Councils in relation to the national affordable housing thresholds. These have now been reintroduced through the Planning Practice Guidance – these are being followed by the South Worcestershire Council (SWC) development management departments. The results of appraisals with and without the thresholds are presented in the CIL Viability Study. The following tables reflect the national affordable housing thresholds. All other matters remain unchanged.

The results are presented for the whole site and on a £/m<sup>2</sup> basis where the amount is divided by the area of the market housing.

The results for the strategic sites are net of the s106 strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs.

<b>Malvern Hills</b>								
				Site Area (ha)		Units	Additional Profit	
				Gross	Net		£/site	£/ha
Site 1	Greenfield1	Green	Agricultural	14.3	8.6	300	3,678,330	182
Site 2	Greenfield2	Green	Agricultural	9.5	5.7	200	1,863,084	138
Site 3	Greenfield3	Green	Agricultural	4.75	2.86	100	428,059	63
Site 4	Greenfield4	Green	Agricultural	2.4	1.4	50	377,597	112
Site 5	Greenfield5	Green	Agricultural	1.1	0.85	30	310,947	154
Site 6	Brown Redev L	Brown	Industrial	1.67	1.67	100	-1,417,118	-241
Site 7	Urban Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.6	0.6	60	-3,015,872	-1,077
Site 8	Brown Redev M	Brown	Industrial	0.5	0.5	30	-135,527	-77
Site 9	Brown Medium	Brown	Industrial	0.4	0.23	14	-94,817	-115
Site 10	Green Medium	Green	Agricultural	0.7	0.6	20	-116,562	-86
Site 11	Urban Edge	Green	Paddock	0.43	0.34	12	88,430	135
Site 12	Town Centre Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.15	0.15	10	125,171	242
Site 13	Ex Garage	Brown	Garage	0.2	0.2	12	-236,966	-370
Site 14	Village/Town Infill	Green	Paddock	1.15	0.12	4	-206,162	-461
Site 15	Small Village	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	3	91,401	249
Site 16	Village House	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	1	20,395	151
<b>Worcester City</b>								
				Site Area (ha)		Units	Additional Profit	
				Gross	Net		£/site	£/ha
Site 1	Greenfield1	Green	Agricultural	14.3	8.6	300	1,608,566	79
Site 2	Greenfield2	Green	Agricultural	9.5	5.7	200	1,113,885	83
Site 3	Greenfield3	Green	Agricultural	4.75	2.86	100	-228,233	-34
Site 4	Greenfield4	Green	Agricultural	2.4	1.4	50	467,586	138
Site 5	Greenfield5	Green	Agricultural	1.1	0.85	30	453,904	224
Site 6	Brown Redev L	Brown	Industrial	1.67	1.67	100	-378,678	-64
Site 7	Urban Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.6	0.6	60	-2,767,410	-988
Site 8	Brown Redev M	Brown	Industrial	0.5	0.5	30	269,563	153
Site 9	Brown Medium	Brown	Industrial	0.4	0.23	14	-20,953	-25
Site 10	Green Medium	Green	Agricultural	0.7	0.6	20	10,785	8
Site 11	Urban Edge	Green	Paddock	0.43	0.34	12	156,988	239
Site 12	Town Centre Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.15	0.15	10	155,008	299
Site 13	Ex Garage	Brown	Garage	0.2	0.2	12	-236,966	-370
Site 14	Village/Town Infill	Green	Paddock	1.15	0.12	4	-307,303	-687
Site 15	Small Village	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	3	21,479	58
Site 16	Village House	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	1	-4,657	-34
<b>Wychavon</b>								
				Site Area (ha)		Units	Additional Profit	
				Gross	Net		£/site	£/ha
Site 1	Greenfield1	Green	Agricultural	14.3	8.6	300	3,113,849	154
Site 2	Greenfield2	Green	Agricultural	9.5	5.7	200	6,479,022	480
Site 3	Greenfield3	Green	Agricultural	4.75	2.86	100	428,059	63
Site 4	Greenfield4	Green	Agricultural	2.4	1.4	50	797,547	236
Site 5	Greenfield5	Green	Agricultural	1.1	0.85	30	932,458	460
Site 6	Brown Redev L	Brown	Industrial	1.67	1.67	100	952,679	189
Site 7	Urban Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.6	0.6	60	-3,631,656	-1,513
Site 8	Brown Redev M	Brown	Industrial	0.5	0.5	30	96,542	64
Site 9	Brown Medium	Brown	Industrial	0.4	0.23	14	-186,090	-264
Site 10	Green Medium	Green	Agricultural	0.7	0.6	20	-411,855	-304
Site 11	Urban Edge	Green	Paddock	0.43	0.34	12	66,307	101
Site 12	Town Centre Flats	Brown	Industrial	0.15	0.15	10	6,131	12
Site 13	Ex Garage	Brown	Garage	0.2	0.2	12	40,272	63
Site 14	Village/Town Infill	Green	Paddock	1.15	0.12	4	-28,331	-63
Site 15	Small Village	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	3	227,537	619
Site 16	Village House	Green	Paddock	0.1	0.1	1	97,103	719
<b>Strategic Sites</b>								
				Site Area (ha)		Units	Additional Profit	
				Gross	Net		£/site	£/ha
Site 1	South Worcs UE	Green	Agricultural	247	140	2609	-68,311,207	-388
Site 2	Worcester West UE	Green	Agricultural	134.49	61.5	2150	-25,595,118	-176
Site 3	Crown Packaging	Brown	Industrial	15.56	5.83	230	-1,800,771	-99
Site 4	Vine's Lane	Green	Agricultural	6.83	3	100	209,067	31
Site 5	Cheltenham Road	Green	Agricultural	11.7	11.5	500	9,443,836	280
Site 6	Qinetiq	Brown	Industrial	3.1	8.6	300	4,823,379	204
Site 7	North East Malvern	Green	Agricultural	19	22.85	800	8,031,257	149
Site 8	Swinesherd Way	Green	Agricultural	37.4	13.2	300	-10,103,351	-576

## **Older People's Accommodation**

Table 6.6 of the CIL Viability Update – January 2016 (Doc SWCIL14) sets out the results of the analysis of Older Peoples Housing (sheltered housing and extra care housing). This showed that these types of development were unviable when subject to the SWC affordable housing targets. As CIL is set after the full policy burden has been bourn it was concluded that this type of development had no capacity to bear CIL.

## **ANNEX 3 Development Land Values Update (October 2016)**

Residential Development Land – Analysis of Land Registry Price Paid Data

The approach to viability thresholds is summarised in 6.31 of the LP Viability Update (September 2014):

*As set out in the Local Plan Viability Assessment, during the consultation process various ways of assessing viability were discussed – particularly in the context of the Harman and the RICS Guidance. It was universally agreed that the Existing Use Value Plus methodology suggested under the Harman Guidance did not reflect to actual working of the market, but it was a sensible and appropriate approach to take. It was largely (not universally) agreed that an appropriate Viability Threshold (the amount which the Residual Value should exceed for a site to viable) would be, across the whole site area, Existing Use Value plus 20% plus a further £300,000/ha on greenfield sites would be correct – so long as a value that was also in excess of £500,000 per net developable ha was achieved. We have used these two tests when considering the viability of the modelled and strategic sites.*

A number of comments have been made about the Viability Threshold and residential land values.

In order to supplement the evidence further information has been gathered on land prices. The following sheets set out the 15 or so most recent larger planning authorities for each district and also show the price paid taken from the Land Registry. The price is shown for the whole site, and per hectare and per unit. Where available the numbers of affordable units and developer contributions are also shown.

The price paid is not shown on all the sites; however there is sufficient information to be useful.

Consideration of this information should be done in the context of the PPG that says:

**Land Value - PPG: 10-014-20140306**

*Central to the consideration of viability is the assessment of land or site value. The most appropriate way to assess land or site value will vary but there are common principles which should be reflected.*

*In all cases, estimated land or site value should:*

- reflect emerging policy requirements and planning obligations and, where applicable, any Community Infrastructure Levy charge;*
- provide a competitive return to willing developers and land owners (including equity resulting from those building their own homes); and*
- be informed by comparable, market-based evidence wherever possible. Where transacted bids are significantly above the market norm, they should not be used as part of this exercise.*

*Revision date: 06 03 2014*

**Competitive return to developers and land owners - PPG: 10-015-20140306**

*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.*

The price information can be summarised as follows:

<b>Summary of Residential Land Prices Paid - ALL</b>		
	£/ha	£/unit
Worcester		
Minimum	£950,000	£9,259
Average	£3,297,323	£38,778
Median	£3,102,713	£31,118
Maximum	£8,281,250	£88,944
Malvern Hills		
Minimum	£20,619	£1,333
Average	£402,033	£15,629
Median	£269,623	£12,040
Maximum	£1,067,797	£50,400
Wychavon		
Minimum	£25,562	£875
Average	£961,955	£37,285
Median	£642,857	£25,000
Maximum	£3,133,087	£157,893
All		
Minimum	£20,619	£875
Average	£1,552,833	£31,399
Median	£941,549	£22,706
Maximum	£8,281,250	£157,893

The following table summarises the transactions – however in line with paragraph 14 of the PPG *'the transacted bids are significantly above the market norm'*, have been removed (being those above £5,000,000/ha (3 site) in Worcester, above £1,000,000 (1 site) in Malvern Hills and £3,000,000 (1 site) in Wychavon.

<b>Summary of Residential Land Prices Paid excluding</b>		
	£/ha	£/unit
Worcester		
Minimum	£950,000	£9,259
Average	£2,138,087	£38,778
Median	£1,865,606	£31,118
Maximum	£3,703,704	£88,944
Malvern Hills		
Minimum	£20,619	£1,333
Average	£328,060	£15,629
Median	£183,824	£12,040
Maximum	£892,857	£50,400
Wychavon		
Minimum	£25,562	£875
Average	£781,027	£37,285
Median	£620,707	£25,000
Maximum	£2,397,260	£157,893
All		
Minimum	£20,619	£875
Average	£1,014,812	£31,399
Median	£730,941	£22,706
Maximum	£3,703,704	£157,893

Leaving aside the Worcester City values (as residential development in Worcester City is zero rated) it is clear that approach to viability thresholds is well founded and reasonable.

**RS Drummond-Hay MRICS**  
**HDH Planning and Development Ltd**  
**15/10/16**

District	Planning Application Reference	Address	Site Area (ha)	Total Number Dwellings	Total Aff Housing Units	Total s106 contributions (excl. Aff Housing)	Total Contributions to offsite Aff Housing	Price Paid	Price Paid £/ha	Price Paid £/unit	Date
Worcester	P13A0087	White Ladies Close	0.22	37	?	£0	£0	£402,500	£1,829,545	£10,878	11.10.2013
Worcester	P13D0385	Site Area C St Peters Street Royal	0.28	39	0	£88,344	£0	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P14C0034	Maivern Gate, Bromwich Road (OL)	1.29	45	5	£150,000	£0	£4,002,500	£3,102,713	£88,944	8.11.2006
Worcester	P13A0155	Worcester College Barbourne Road	0.99	60	0	£15,000	£410,000	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P14J0046	Land to rear of 67 Martley Road	0.4	18	18	£15,618	£0	£380,000	£950,000	£21,111	12.12.2014
Worcester	P14C0012	73-77 Bromwich Road	0.14	11	0	£29,715	£0	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P14K0485	28 Bromyard Road	0.18	11	0	£6,611	£0	£342,300	£1,901,667	£31,118	10.9.2014
Worcester	P14D0123	Former Barbourne Filling Station	0.27	12	5	£62,760	£0	£1,000,000	£3,703,704	£83,333	20.8.2007
Worcester	P14E0368	Old Northwick Farm	2.46	52	21	£666,045	£0	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P15D0331	Former Worcester Fire Station	0.16	22	0	£75,000	£0	£1,325,000	£8,281,250	£60,227	30.10.2015
Worcester	P15A0441	New Baskerville, 24 Shrubbery Avenue	0.13	12	12	£0	£0	£700,000	£5,384,615	£58,333	22.7.2016
Worcester	P15G0315	Lichfield Avenue	0.14	12	12	£22,000	£0	£135,000	£964,286	£11,250	9.3.2016
Worcester	P15C0300	Leopard Hill	5.5	58	20	£317,483	£0	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P15A0561	Alliance House, 14 Pierpoint Street	0.06	17	0	£0	£0	£330,000	£5,500,000	£19,412	25.1.2016
Worcester	P15A0539	Cavalier Tavern, 107 St Georges Lane	0.12	13	13	£0	£0	£425,000	£3,541,667	£32,692	18.9.2015
Worcester	P15D0146	Rose Avenue/Albert Road	1.34	35	14	£231,924	£0	Not Disclosed			
Worcester	P15C0371	174 Bromyard Road	0.45	54	0	£125,000	£0	£500,000	£1,111,111	£9,259	26.2.2016
Worcester	P16K0125	Ambrose Close	1.16	38	38	£0	£0	Not Disclosed			

District	Planning Application Reference	Address	Site Area (ha)	Total Number Dwellings	Total Aff Housing Units	Total s106 contributions (excl. Aff Housing)	Total Contributions to offsite Aff Housing	Price Paid	Price Paid £/ha	Price Paid £/unit	Date
Malvern Hills	14/01633/REM	Ryall Road, Holly Green, Upton-upon-Severn	1.18	25	10	£257,310	£0	£1,260,000	£1,067,797	£50,400	14.11.2014
Malvern Hills	13/00009/FUL	Land at Welland Rd Upton Upon Severn	2.02	43	22	£212,255	£0	Not Disclosed			
Malvern Hills	14/00324/OUT	Elmhurst Farm, Hereford Rd, Leigh Sinton	2.3	35	14	£259,455	£0	£156,000	£67,826	£4,457	23.6.2009
Malvern Hills	14/01338/REM	The Old Post Office, Drake Street	1.63	30	12	£275,506	£0	Not Disclosed			
Malvern Hills	14/00170/OUT	Former Braithwaites Yard and Former	0.83	17	6	£146,544	£0	£295,000	£355,422	£17,353	28.6.2012
Malvern Hills	13/01405/OUT	Land at Pearl Lane Astley Cross Stourport	2.11	62	25	£610,243	£0	£100,000	£47,393	£1,613	18.6.2013
Malvern Hills	14/00375/OUT	Land at Bank House Bowling Club Bransford	0.68	13	4	£100,153	£0	£75,000 and £50,000			2.10.2002
Malvern Hills	13/01209/FUL	Land adj Broadwas School Broadwas	0.28	10	3	£114,870	£0	£250,000	£892,857	£25,000	11.12.2015
Malvern Hills	15/00394/REM	Land adj The Lawns, Kempsey	3.42	106	42	£1,271,955	£0	Not Disclosed			
Malvern Hills	14/00021/OUT										
Malvern Hills	15/00509/REM	Bight Farm 31 Main Road Kempsey	3.16	80	32	£932,585	£0	£2,309,774	£730,941	£28,872	16.9.2015
Malvern Hills	13/01130/OUT										
Malvern Hills	13/00216/OUT	Land at Sparrowhall Lane, Collets Green,	2.23	39	15	£316,115	£0	Not Disclosed			
Malvern Hills	14/01299/FUL	Upper Wick Lane Rushwick	0.33	14	4	£115,063	£0	£202,500	£613,636	£14,464	7.8.2015
Malvern Hills	13/01095/OUT	Land at Mill Lane, Charlock Road	5.01	63	26	£530,581	£0	£200,500	£40,020	£3,183	13.12.2005.
Malvern Hills	14/00617/OUT	Land at Hospital Lane Collets Green,	4.62	61	24	£490,576	£0	Not Disclosed			
Malvern Hills	14/00625/FUL	Post Office Lane, Kempsey	4.85	75	30	£933,065	£0	£100,000	£20,619	£1,333	16.12.2012



District	Planning Application Reference	Address	Site Area (ha)	Total Number Dwellings	Total Aff Housing Units	Total s106 contributions (excl. Aff Housing)	Total Contributions to offsite Aff Housing	Price Paid	Price Paid £/ha	Price Paid £/unit	Date
Wychavon	15/01305	Land South of, Bretforton Road, Bradsey	1.78	36.00	14.00			£45,500	£25,562	£1,284	13.6.2013
Wychavon	13/00680	Land at, Learnington Road, Broadway	5.30	125.00	50.00			£7,646,000	£1,442,642	£91,168	1.4.2016
Wychavon	14/00273	Land Opposite, Woodmead, Walcot Lane, Drakes Broughton	1.95	32.00	13.00			£301,000	£154,359	£9,406	4.6.2014
Wychavon	14/01611	Land Adjacent, Glassier, Worcester Road, Drakes Broughton	6.02	120.00	48.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	11/01073	Land North of Pulley Lane and, Newland Lane, Newland, Droitwich Spa	15.14	250.00	104.00	£0	£0	Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/01187	Land Rear of, Hill Top Farm, Newland Lane, Newland, Droitwich Spa	12.30	265.00	106.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	13/02538	Raven Hotel, St Andrews Street, Droitwich Spa, WR9 8DY	1.19	51.00	15.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/00923	Former Gas Depo, Common Road,	1.20	174.00	32.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/00303	Land West of Offenham Road & including South Bank, Offenham, Evesham,	20.40	325.00	0.00			£1,000,000	£49,020	£3,077	5.11.2012
Wychavon	15/01863	Aldington Lodge, Offenham Road, Evesham, WR11 8DX (Aldington)	2.84	70.00	28.00			£2,650,000	£933,099	£37,857	9.2.2016
Wychavon	14/02766	Brick Kiln Street Garage, Brick Kiln Street, Evesham, WR11 4AA	0.18	29.00	29.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/01526	Oddfellows Arms, Briar Close, Evesham,	0.15	14.00	14.00			£350,000	£2,397,260	£25,000	12.11.2015
Wychavon	15/02471	Lower Leys House, Lower Leys, Evesham	0.17	10.00	0.00			£243,000	£1,455,090	£24,300	31.5.2013
Wychavon	15/01760	The Black Shed, Broadway Lane, Fladbury, Pershore, WR10 2QF	0.84	18.00	7.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/00838	Grange Farm, High Street, Honeybourne, Evesham WR11 5PQ	4.16	75.00	30.00			£2,490,000	£598,558	£33,200	8.8.2014
Wychavon	15/02324	Land off, High Street, Honeybourne	0.89	14.00	4.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/00282	Land at the rear of and including, 28 Stonepit Lane, Inkberrow, Worcester	5.37	100.00	40.00			£6,900,000	£1,284,916	£69,000	02.10.2014
Wychavon	15/02736	Worcestershire Hunt Kennels, Kennels Lane, Fernhill Heath, Worcester, WR3	6.84	120.00	48.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	14/00308	Land Adjacent, Norton Farm Cottages, Harvington Lane, Norton	4.50	87.00	34.00			£1,450,000	£322,222	£16,667	22.4.2010
Wychavon	14/02069	Land off, Main Road, Ombersley (known as The Racks (east))	1.40	20	8			£900,000	£642,857	£45,000	6.4.2010
Wychavon	15/00766	Land West of Station Road, Pershore	1.08	30.00	9.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/03037	Land to the West of Station Road	4.33	86.00	30.00			£13,578,800	£3,133,087	£157,893	14.11.2014
Wychavon	15/01036	Land adjoining, Conningsby Drive,	12.70	176.00	70.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	14/00643	Land at, Hurst Meadows, Wyre Road,	0.95	25	0			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	13/01578	Land off, Wyre Road, Pershore	5.19	120.00	48.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	13/02604	Pershore Cottage Hospital, Defford Road, Pershore, WR10 1HZ	0.84	64.00	25.00			£56,000	£66,746	£875	9.10.2007
Wychavon	15/03239	Land Adjacent to Hyde Close off, Station Road, South Littleton	0.21	23	9			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	16/00810	Forest Lodge, Shinehill Lane, South Littleton, Evesham, WR11 8TP	0.86	20.00	8.00			Not Disclosed			
Wychavon	15/01877		0.65	21.00	8.00			Not Disclosed			