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1 Introduction

The Study Scope

1.1 Porter Planning Economics Ltd (PorterPE) has been commissioned by City of York Council (CYC) to provide high-level viability update advice relating to plan making in the City. The update is to provide evidence to inform the policy requirements in the City of York Local Plan Publication Draft 2018 Regulation 19 Consultation (hereon shortened to ‘PDRC 2018’). In assessing the emerging Local Plan, this study will inform policy decisions based on the policy aspirations of achieving sustainable development and the realities of economic viability within the PDRC 2018 to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

1.2 This update report builds on the work undertaken for the Council by Peter Brett Associates (PBA) in their City of York Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment Final Report September 2017. The PBA 2017 report assessed the viability of the Pre-Publication Draft Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation document (PPDRC 2017), along with an assessment of introducing Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charges within the City.

1.3 This report by PorterPE updates the work undertaken by PBA to account for the following proposed changes in the PDRC 2018:

▪ Policy H1 changes in sites and the planned numbers of dwellings following the consultation on the PPDRC 2017. This includes changing the:
  - general site typology profiles to those used in an earlier PBA study (2014)\(^1\), which better reflects the density and locations of sites in the Council’s Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2017) informing the PDRC 2018.
  - strategic site areas and potential yields (residential unit numbers) in line with those being proposed in Table 5.1 of the PDRC 2018.

▪ Policy H10 in relation to off-site affordable housing financial contributions for sites with fewer than 15 units.

1.4 All other assumptions remain as tested in the PBA 2017 report; and where information in the PBA 2017 report remains relevant, it is reproduced in this report for ease of reference.\(^2\) It is therefore important to note that this report replaces the City of York Local Plan and CIL Viability Assessment Final Report September 2017 (hereon referred to as the PBA 2017 report).

Study Approach

1.5 This report and the accompanying appraisals have been prepared in line with the Local Housing Delivery Group and chaired by Sir John Harman ‘Viability Testing Local Plans’ advice for planning practitioners, June 2012 (the Harman Report). The viability assessments have also been prepared in line with and the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) valuation guidance. However, it is first and foremost a supporting

---

\(^1\) PBA, *City of York Local Plan Viability Study Draft Report*, September 2014

\(^2\) Through permission by PBA and CYC.
document to inform the Local Plan evidence base and planning policy, in particular policy concerned with the planning, funding and delivery of infrastructure needed to support delivery of the plan.

1.6 The approach to assessing plan viability in this report should be recognised as providing only a high-level assurance that the policies within the PDRC 2018 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 should be viable for most sites.

1.7 It should therefore be noted that as per Professional Standards 1 of the RICS Valuation Standards – Global and UK Edition, the advice expressly given in the preparation for, or during negotiations or possible litigation does not form part of a formal “Red Book” valuation and should not be relied upon as such. No responsibility whatsoever is accepted to any third party who may seek to rely on the content of the report for such purposes.

Defining Local Plan Level Viability

1.8 The Harman Report defines local plan viability (on page 14) as follows:

'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.

At a Local Plan level, viability is very closely linked to the concept of deliverability. In the case of housing, a Local Plan can be said to be deliverable if sufficient sites are viable (as defined in the previous paragraph) to deliver the plan's housing requirement over the plan period.'

1.9 It should be noted that the approach to Local Plan level viability assessment does not require all sites in the Plan to be viable. The Harman Report says that a site typologies approach (i.e. assessing a range of example development sites likely to come forward) to understanding plan viability is sensible. Whole plan viability:

'does not require a detailed viability appraisal of every site anticipated to come forward over the plan period... (p.11)

[we suggest] rather it is to provide high level assurance that the policies within the plan are set in a way that is compatible with the likely economic viability of development needed to deliver the plan. (p.15)

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'. (p.11).

1.10 The Harman Report states that the role of the typologies testing is not required to provide a precise answer as to the viability of every development likely to take place during the plan period.
'No assessment could realistically provide this level of detail...rather, [the role of the typologies testing] is to provide high level assurance that the policies within the plan are set in a way that is compatible with the likely economic viability of development needed to deliver the plan.' (p.18)

1.11 Indeed, the report also acknowledges that a:

'plan-wide test will only ever provide evidence of policies being 'broadly viable’. The assumptions that need to be made in order to carry out a test at plan level mean that any specific development site may still present a range of challenges that render it unviable given the policies in the Local Plan, even if those policies have passed the viability test at the plan level. This is one reason why our advice advocates a 'viability cushion' to manage these risks.’ (p.18)

1.12 The report later suggests that once the typologies testing has been done:

'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'. (p.38)

1.13 The Harman Report points out the importance of minimising risk to the delivery of the plan. Risks can come from policy requirements that are either too high or too low. So, planning authorities must have regard to the risks of damaging plan delivery with excessive policy costs - but equally, they need to be aware of lowering standards to the point where the sustainable delivery of the plan is not possible. Good planning in this respect is about 'striking a balance' between the competing demands for policy and plan viability.

Local Plan Viability Methodology

1.14 The PorterPE development appraisal model has been used to test the potential policies in the PDRC 2018. The outcome is to identify Plan delivery based on viability and to ascertain a CIL charge for securing funding towards strategic infrastructure investment. In doing so this has involved 'high level' testing of many hypothetical schemes that represent the future allocation of development land in the City, including the identified strategic sites.

1.15 The viability testing and study results are based on establishing a residual land value for different land uses relevant to different parts of the Local Plan area. The approach takes the difference between development values and costs, and compares the 'residual value' (i.e. what is left over after the cost of building the site is deducted from the potential sales value of the completed site/buildings) with a benchmark/threshold land value (i.e. the value over and above the existing use value a landowner would accept to bring the site to market for development) The costs include allowances for policy requirements as illustrated in the Figure 1.1.
Figure 1.1 Approach to residual land value assessment for whole plan viability

Less development costs – including build costs, fees, finance costs etc

Value of completed development scheme

Benchmark land value - to incentivise delivery and support future policy requirements

Balance - available to contribute towards policy requirements (can be + or -)

Less developer’s return (profit) – minimum profit acceptable in the market to undertake the scheme

1.16 From the viability testing and study results the 'residual value' headroom (i.e. what is left over after the cost of the minimum land purchase value and building the site is established) to determine the balance that could be available to support a CIL charge. This is a standard approach, which is advocated by the Harman Report. The broad method for establishing the headroom is illustrated in the Figure 1.2.

Figure 1.2 Approach to estimating the headroom for securing CIL

1.17 The arithmetic of residual land value assessment is straightforward (PorterPE use a bespoke spreadsheet model for the assessments). However, the inputs to the
calculation are hard to determine for a specific site (as demonstrated by the complexity of many S106 negotiations). The difficulties grow when making calculations that represent a typical or average site - which is what is required by CIL regulations for estimating appropriate CIL charges. Therefore, our viability assessments in this report are necessarily broad approximations, subject to a margin of uncertainty.

1.18 The viability methodology applied is appropriate for whole plan and CIL analysis purposes but should not be taken as the de facto approach for every individual development proposal which will be subject to its own site opportunities and constraints.

1.19 Examples of the residential and a non-residential site assessment sheets are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation

1.20 The Council arranged a viability workshop for the local development industry to enable PBA to test the assumptions contained in their 2017 report which are included within this report. The workshop took place in September 2016 and was attended by a mix of property and development experts, including local agents, house builders and land promoters. Following the meeting, the Council circulated the meeting note to the attendees inviting comment on the assumptions but little further evidence to inform the assumptions in this report was submitted and therefore most of those assumptions presented at the time remain or have changed because of anecdotal commentary from the workshop and/or further research. A copy of the workshop meeting note is in Appendix 2.

Report Structure

1.21 The rest of this report is set out as follows:

- Chapter 2 sets out the policy and legal requirements relating to the Local Plan viability, affordable housing and CIL, which the study assessment must comply with;
- Chapter 3 sets out the PDRC 2018 policies, identifying any that may require testing for their potential impact on viability;
- Chapter 4 outlines the planning and development context describes the local residential and non-residential market and development context, including a review of past delivery;
- Chapters 5 outlines the development scenarios to be tested, the site typologies and assumptions informing their viability;
- Chapter 6 reviews the viability findings for residential and non-residential sites; and
- Chapter 7 translates the findings into recommendations for Local Plan policies and CIL charging.
2 National Policy Context

Introduction

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that "Plans should be deliverable" and that the cumulative effects of policy should not render plans unviable. It is necessary, therefore, to demonstrate that the emerging Local Plan is deliverable in the context of policy requirements. This chapter of the report summarises the relevant extracts of the NPPF in this regard.

2.2 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a discretionary planning charge based on legislation that came into force on 6 April 2010 and has been amended through updated regulations. The levy allows local authorities in England and Wales to raise contributions from development to help pay for infrastructure that is needed to support planned development as a whole. Local authorities who wish to charge the levy must produce a draft charging schedule setting out CIL rates for their areas, which are to be expressed as pounds (£) per square metre, as CIL will be levied on the gross internal floorspace of the net additional liable development. Before it is approved by the Council, the draft charging schedule must be tested by an independent examiner.

2.3 Below, we summarise the key points from these various documents.

National Framework on Plan Viability

2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that the ‘developer funding pot’ or residual value is finite and decisions on how this funding is distributed between affordable housing, infrastructure and other policy requirements, which must be considered as a whole and cannot be separated out.

2.5 The NPPF advises that cumulative effects of policy should not combine to render plans unviable:

‘Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the 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’. ³

2.6 Regarding non-residential development, the NPPF states that local planning authorities ‘...should have a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area. To achieve this, they should... understand their

---

changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability.’

2.7 The NPPF does not state that all sites must be viable now to appear in the plan. Instead, the NPPF is concerned to ensure that the bulk of the development is not rendered unviable by unrealistic policy costs.

**Deliverability and Developability Considerations in the NPPF**

2.8 As noted above, the NPPF does not state that all sites must be viable now to appear in Local Plans. Nevertheless, sites identified for the first five-year period need to be available and achievable while meeting any Local Plan policy requirements, which are considered through the testing results in Chapter 6 of this report. In addition, the national framework over the plan period as whole is concerned to ensure that the bulk of the development proposed in the plan is not rendered unviable by unrealistic policy costs. Such policy costs, as set out in the PDRC 2018, are considered in Chapter 3 of this report.

2.9 It is important to recognise that economic viability will be subject to economic and market variations over the Local Plan timescale. In a free market, where development is largely undertaken by the private sector, the Local Planning Authority can seek to provide suitable sites to meet the demand for sustainable development. It is not within the authority’s control to ensure that delivery takes place; this will depend on the willingness of a developer to invest and a landowner to release the land. So, in considering whether a site is deliverable with policy now or developable in the future, the assumptions underpinning our viability assessment should be informed by a review of local market conditions.

2.10 Within these general principles, which apply to all development, the NPPF sets out more detailed policies relating to deliverability and viability, which vary between housing and employment uses. These two land uses are discussed in turn below.

**Housing**

2.11 In relation to housing development, the NPPF creates the two concepts of ‘deliverability’ (which applies to residential sites which are expected in years 0-5 of the plan) and ‘developability’ (which applies to year 6 of the plan onwards). The NPPF defines these two terms as follows:

- To be deliverable, ‘sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable, with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable.’

---

4 Ibid (para 160)
5 See para 173, which notes that plans should be deliverable, but importantly this goes onto state that the plans should not be subject to such a scale of obligation and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. This is clearly about ensuring that policy burden does not threaten viability and not necessarily that the development must be viable even if there is not a high policy burden. For example, infrastructure requirements are understood and will not impede delivery (see NPPF para 160).  
6 Ibid (para 47, footnote 12)
To be developable, sites expected from year 6 onwards should be able to demonstrate a ‘reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged’. 7

2.12 The NPPF advises that a more flexible approach may be taken to the sites coming forward from year 6 onwards. These sites might not be viable now and might instead only become viable at a future point in time (e.g. when a lease for the land expires or property values improve). This recognises the impact of economic cycles, variations in values and policy changes over time. Consequently, some sites might be identified with marginal unviability however a small change in market conditions over the Plan may make them viable. Such sites could contribute to the Local Plan housing target in the later period of the Plan.

2.13 NPPF paragraph 14 makes very clear that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Paragraph 49, also says that the relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) is clear that authorities should have an identified five-year housing supply at all points during the plan period, and that housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans should be used as the starting point for calculating the five-year land supply. However, where the evidence supporting that housing requirement has become outdated, the latest information provided in the assessment of housing needs should be considered or the latest household projections used as a starting point; but it is important to recognise that neither of these will have been tested. 8

2.14 It will be important for the Council to ensure that all the sites identified to come forward within either the plan period or the 5-year period are viable in meeting Local Plan Policies as much as possible, to ensure that the plan is deliverable.

Economic uses

2.15 About economic land uses, the NPPF states that local planning authorities:
‘...should have a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area. To achieve this, they should... understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability’.

2.16 This is quite different to housing. Local authorities are expected to have a general understanding of possible obstacles to delivering employment uses, including viability. But they are not under specific requirements to predict the timing of delivery or demonstrate that sites are deliverable / developable according to precise criteria or within a given time frame.

2.17 In relation to employment uses specifically, the NPPF also advises that ‘...planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose’. 9 Again, this is a less demanding test than for housing. It implies that authorities should allocate sites

---

7 Ibid
8 NPPG – 3-030-20140306
9 NPPF para 22.
for employment only if they expect those sites to be viable to develop (or, if already built up, viable to maintain) for employment uses. But for economic uses, unlike housing, this requirement relates to the plan period as a whole; there is no requirement that sites be viable now or in the next five years.\(^{10}\)

2.18 The commercial property market works differently to the residential market. Consequently, the achievability of non-residential sites remains important, but this requires a different method to the viability assessments which often suggest that speculative development for employment uses is not viable, because the open market value of the completed development would be below the cost of delivering it. The implication is that the development would not be worthwhile for an institutional investor. But for an owner-occupied or pre-let development, the same scheme may well be worthwhile. This may be because the property is worth more to the business than its open market price, for example because its location or other features are an especially good match to the requirements of a particular business. Such factors/considerations cannot be captured in a standard viability appraisal because they are specific to individual occupier businesses and individual sites.

2.19 The upshot is that many sites may be successfully developed for employment uses when a standard viability assessment would suggest that they are not viable for such development. Therefore, a standard viability assessment is not necessarily a helpful tool for predicting which sites will be successfully delivered in the future. To assess the prospects of individual sites, authorities use different evidence, comprising both market indicators and qualitative criteria.

2.20 In summary, non-residential development, including for employment uses, does not lend itself to standard viability assessment that is used for housing. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the NPPF sets out specific requirements in relation to housing land supply that do not apply to other land uses. Secondly, non-residential property markets, including employment, work differently to housing markets. Therefore, the present report tests the impact of policies only on housing sites and not employment sites, which are considered through a separate exercise in the Council’s Employment Land Review (2016) and Employment Land Review (2017).

**National Policy on Affordable Housing**

2.21 In informing future policy on affordable housing, it is important to understand national policy on affordable housing. The NPPF states:

> "To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, local planning authorities should\(^{11}\):

- Plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);

---

\(^{10}\) See NPPF para 47

\(^{11}\) Ibid (para 50 and bullets)
• Identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand; and

• Where they have identified that affordable housing is needed, set policies for meeting this need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified (for example to improve or make more effective use of the existing housing stock) and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time’. 12

2.22 The NPPF accepts that in some instances, off site provision or a financial contribution of a broadly equivalent value may contribute towards creating mixed and balanced communities.

2.23 Finally, the NPPF recognises that market conditions change over time, and so when setting long term policy on affordable housing, incorporating a degree of flexibility is sensible to reflect changing market circumstances.

Affordable housing exemption on 10 units or fewer

2.24 In November 2014, the Government introduced an exemption policy for small housebuilders (defined as developments of 10 dwellings or fewer) to exclude them from paying s106 and contribute to AH. Following a High Court ruling this was later quashed (West Berkshire District Council & Anr v The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, C1/2015/2559). However, in May 2016, the Government won a legal challenge against this, meaning that this threshold was to be upheld, and therefore the advice in this appraisal is based on smaller sites (10 units and fewer) being exempt from these contributions.

2.25 Despite the Government’s successful legal challenge, the threshold is only a material consideration, albeit recommended by the Secretary of State, and there have been Examinations and cases where the minimum threshold is held not to apply based on supporting evidence.

Housing and Planning Act 2016

2.26 In July 2016, the Housing and Planning Act 2016 received Royal Assent. The Act is national policy and will eventually feed into Regulations. The Act sets out changes to the delivery of affordable housing in England, as below:

‘The Secretary of State may by regulations provide that an English planning authority may only grant planning permission for a residential development of a specific description if the starter homes requirement is met.’

‘The “starter homes requirement” means a requirement, specified in the regulations, relating to the provision of starter homes in England.’

Regulations under this section may, for example, provide that an England planning authority may grant planning permission only if a person has entered into a planning

12 Ibid (p13, para 50)
obligation to provide a certain number of starter homes or to pay a sum to be used by the authority for providing starter homes.”

2.27 This indicated that there will be a requirement for starter homes, set by Government, which relates to each local authority in England. However, the Housing White Paper was published in February 2017, and the plans to impose a legal duty on Local Authorities to ensure provision of at least 20% Starter Homes on all reasonably sized development sites was dropped.

2.28 Consequently, the implications of the Housing and Planning Act remain unclear at the time of reporting, and the Act does not provide any levels or thresholds relating to Starter Homes or density levels. However, the Council will need to be mindful of future changes in national planning policies or regulations which would impact on the viability of development and the overall Local Plan, which could be tested within the viability model as the detail will come within the secondary legislation and regulations.

Consultation on Draft NPPF (March 2018)

2.29 Just as this report was being published, the Government presented for consultation its draft amendments to the National Framework, with the expectation that the revised NPPF will be available with immediate effect sometime in the summer 2018. The amendments include a new approach to viability, through which plans are expected to be clear about the contributions expected in association with development. This will help ensure that requirements on developments set through plan policies are deliverable. Some of the key points worth noting, albeit briefly, here are:

- Para 58 notes that where proposals for development accord with all the relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan, no viability assessment should be required to accompany the application unless, at the discretion of the local planning authority, certain criteria are meet.

- In setting out the viability assessments for either plan making and/or planning permission (where the site fits the criteria that justifies submitting an alternative viability assessment) this must reflect the Government’s recommended approach which is set out in draft revised national planning guidance (published at the same time as the draft NPPF). The draft planning practice guidance on viability states that any benchmark land value should be set at Existing Use Plus; and 20% profit on open market GDV and 6% on affordable market GDV should be sufficient. Where a viability appraisal is submitted with an application on the basis that it fits the criteria, then this must be prepared in the same way that is used for viability testing plan-making, including being transparent and publicly available.

- Para 65 expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership on major housing sites. Also, the definition of affordable housing has changes (according the draft NPPF glossary) so that it also includes Starter homes, Build to Rent scheme discounted at 20% of market rent, discounted market sales housing sold at least 20% below local market value; other affordable routes to home

---

13 Housing and Planning Act 2016 (para 5(1) (4) (5))
ownership such as the current shared ownership, relevant equity loans, other low cost homes for sale and rent to buy.

- Para 69 seeks to promote the development of a good mix of sites, so that local planning authorities should identify at least 20% of the sites for housing in their plans are of half a hectare or less; use tools such as area-wide design assessments and Local Development Orders to help bring small sites forward; and support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions.

- Paragraph 78 provides that authorities should consider imposing a planning condition to bring forward development within two years, except where a shorter timescale could hinder the viability or deliverability of a scheme.

- Para 123 seeks minimum density standards for city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, but this can be considered for other parts of the plan area too.

**National Policy on Infrastructure**

2.30 The NPPF requires local planning authorities to demonstrate that infrastructure will be available to support development:

‘It is equally important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion. To facilitate this, it is important that local planning authorities understand district-wide development costs at the time Local Plans are drawn up.’

2.31 It is not necessary for local planning authorities to identify all future funding of infrastructure when preparing planning policy. The NPPF states that standards and policies in Local Plans should ‘...facilitate development across the economic cycle,’ suggesting that in some circumstances it may be reasonable for a local planning authority to argue that viability is likely to improve over time, that policy costs may be revised, that some infrastructure is not required immediately, and that mainstream funding levels may recover.

**National Space Standards for Housing**

2.32 The Government published ‘Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard’ (NSS) in March 2015. The NSS replaces the existing different space standards used by local authorities. It is not a building regulation and remains solely within the planning system as a new form of technical planning standard.

2.33 The NSS deals with the internal space of new dwellings and sets out the requirement for Gross Internal Area (GIA). GIA is defined as the total floor space measured between the internal faces of perimeter walls. The standard is organised by number of bedrooms; number of bed spaces; number of storeys and provides an area for built-in storage.

---

15 Ibid (p42, para 174)
2.34 NSS states that the minimum prescribed GIA:

‘...will not be adequate for wheelchair housing (Category 3 homes in Part M of the Building Regulations) where additional internal area is required to accommodate increased circulation and functionality to meet the needs of wheelchair households.’

The criteria for meeting accessible homes and wheelchair user homes categories, are now included within Building Regulations as Category M2 (Accessible and adaptable buildings) and Category M3 (wheelchair user dwellings) dwellings.

National Policy on Community Infrastructure Levy

2.35 The requirements which a CIL charging schedule must meet are set out in:

- The Planning Act 2008 as amended by the Localism Act 2011;
- The CIL Regulations 2010\(^{17}\), as amended in 2011\(^{18}\), 2012\(^{19}\), 2013\(^{20}\) and 2014\(^{21}\); and
- National Planning Practice Guidance on CIL (NPPG CIL).\(^{22}\)

2.36 The 2014 CIL amendment Regulations have altered key aspects of setting the charge for charging authorities who publish a draft charging schedule for consultation.

Striking the appropriate balance

2.37 The revised Regulation 14 requires a charging authority to ‘...strike...an appropriate balance between:

The desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the... cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area...; and

The potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.’

2.38 A key feature of the 2014 Regulations is to give legal effect to the requirement in this guidance for a charging authority to ‘...show and explain...’ their approach at examination. This explanation is important and worth quoting at length:

‘The levy is expected to have a positive economic effect on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.

This balance is at the center of the charge-setting process. In meeting the regulatory requirements (see Regulation 14(1)), charging authorities should be able to show and

---

\(^{16}\) Para. 9, Technical Housing Standards, CLG (March 2015)


\(^{22}\) DCLG (February 2014) Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance and DCLG (June 2014) National Planning Practice Guidance: Community Infrastructure Levy (NPPG CIL)
explain how their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area.

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in England (paragraphs 173 – 177), the sites and the 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. The same principle applies in Wales.’

2.39 In other words, the ‘appropriate balance’ is the level of CIL which maximises the delivery of development and supporting infrastructure in the area. If the CIL charging rate is above this appropriate level, there will be less development than planned, because CIL will make too many potential developments unviable. Conversely, if the charging rates are below the appropriate level, development will also be compromised, because it will be constrained by insufficient infrastructure.

2.40 Achieving an appropriate balance is a matter of judgement. It is not surprising, therefore, that charging authorities are allowed some discretion in this matter. For example, Regulation 14 requires that in setting levy rates, the Charging Authority:

‘...must strike an appropriate balance...’ i.e. it is recognised there is no one perfect balance;

‘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.’

‘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 ...... There is room for some pragmatism.’

2.41 Thus, the guidance sets the delivery of development firmly within the context of implementing the Local Plan. This is linked to the plan viability requirements set out in the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 173 and 174. This point is given emphasis throughout the guidance. For example, in guiding examiners, the guidance makes it clear that the independent examiner should establish that:

‘...evidence has been provided that shows the proposed rate (or rates) would not threaten delivery of the relevant Plan as a whole...’

2.42 This also makes the point that viability is not simply a site-specific issue but one for the plan as a whole.

2.43 The focus is on seeking to ensure that the CIL rate does not threaten the ability to develop viably the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan. Accordingly, when considering evidence, the guidance requires that charging authorities should:

---

23 DCLG (June 2014) NPPG CIL (para 009)
24 Ibid (para 019)
25 Ibid (para 038)
‘...use an area based approach, involving a broad test of viability across their area’, supplemented by sampling ‘...an appropriate range of types of sites across its area...’ with the focus ‘...on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan relies and those sites where the impact of the levy on economic viability is likely to be most significant (such as brownfield sites).’

2.44 This reinforces the message that charging rates do not need to be so low that CIL does not make any individual development schemes unviable (some schemes will be unviable with or without CIL). The levy may put some schemes at risk in this way, so long as, in striking an appropriate balance overall, it avoids threatening the ability to develop viably the sites and scale of development identified in the Local Plan.

The future of CIL

2.45 In the Autumn Budget 2017, the Government noted that it is to consult on proposals to allow authorities to ‘set rates which better reflect the uplift in land values between a proposed and existing use’, with an ‘option of a different rate for different changes in land use (agricultural to residential, commercial to residential, industrial to residential)’. The Government will also be consulting on ‘speeding up the process of setting and revising CIL to make it easier to respond to changes in the market’. Another important element is that the Government may remove the S106 pooling restrictions where an authority has an adopted CIL.

2.46 While the changes may not be as radical as envisaged following the review of CIL by the Government’s CIL panel, it is likely that CIL will remain as a key source for charging land owners for the benefits of infrastructure that CIL will be used to pay for. The Government has yet to publish its proposed changes, so for now CIL should be planned as set out in current regulations and guidance.

Summary

2.47 The NPPF requires councils to ensure that they ‘do not load’ policy costs onto development if it would hinder the site being developed. The key point is that policy costs will need to be balanced so as not to render a development unviable but should still be considered sustainable.

2.48 The Council should be aware that there could be potential impacts on viability testing from changes in national policy.

2.49 The infrastructure needed to support the plan over time will need to be planned and managed. Plans should be backed by a thought-through set of priorities and delivery sequencing that allows a clear narrative to be set out around how the plan will be delivered (including meeting the infrastructure requirements to enable delivery to take place). This study confines itself to the question of development viability. It is for other elements of the evidence base to investigate the other ingredients in the definition of deliverability (i.e. location, infrastructure and prospects for development). Though the

26 Ibid (para 019)
study will draw on infrastructure costs (prepared by the Council) to inform the impact on viability where relevant.

2.50 The introduction of a CIL charging schedule published as a draft for consultation must strike an appropriate balance between the desirability of funding (in whole or in part) infrastructure needed to support the development and the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area. This means that the net effect of the levy on total development across the area should be positive.

2.51 CIL may reduce the overall amount of development by making certain schemes which are not plan priorities unviable. Conversely, it may increase the capacity for future development by funding infrastructure that would not otherwise be provided, which in turn supports development that otherwise would not happen. The law requires that the net outcome of these two impacts should be judged to be positive. This judgment is at the core of the charge-setting and examination process. Following the Autumn Budget 2017, it is likely that the Government will introduce is to some legislative modifications to CIL following a future consultation to make the CIL more focused on an uplift in land value and easier to implement.
3 Local Policy Impacts on Viability

Introduction

3.1 To assess the implications of local policy requirements on development viability, PBA reviewed the policy requirements within the PPDRC 2017 document. PorterPE have used this work by PBA, as copied into this chapter, and updated it to reflect changes in the PDRC 2018.

3.2 The policies were assessed by PBA and PorterPE to determine whether there is likely to be a cost implication over and above that required by the market to deliver the defined development. For those policies where there will be, or could be, a cost implication, we have undertaken a broad assessment of the nature of that cost, including whether the cost is likely to be district-wide or site specific, whether costs are related to specific timescales or apply for the entire life of the plan and whether costs are likely to be incurred directly by the developer through on site or off site development or via financial contributions made by the developer to other agencies or developers towards wider schemes within the city.

Local Plan Policies

3.3 A review of each PDRC 2018 policy’s assessed impact on development is provided in Table 3.1 using a 'traffic light' system.

3.4 A green colour indicates the assessed policy to have been assumed as incurring no cost and therefore negating a need to test, amber indicates either no impact or a slight impact able to be addressed through design with little bearing on viability, and red means that the policy would have some bearing on the viability of sites and should be tested.
### Table 3.1 Viability Policy Matrix for the PDRC 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP1</td>
<td>York Sub Area</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sets out the overall type and volume of development expected in York which may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td>Typology sites shall reflect the number of homes for proposed allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP2</td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP3</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP4</td>
<td>Approach to Development Management</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS1</td>
<td>Delivering Sustainable Growth for York</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sets out the overall type and volume of development expected in York which may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td>Typology sites shall reflect the number of homes for proposed allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS2</td>
<td>The Role of York’s Green Belt</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS3</td>
<td>York City Centre</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sets out the overall type and volume of development expected in York.</td>
<td>Typology sites shall reflect the number of homes for proposed allocations costed based on build cost data for York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of higher quality design and materials on build costs</td>
<td>Other evidence (e.g. the Employment Land Review) is used to determine the required supply of non-residential uses over the life of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Determine the likely non-residential uses in the city centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS4</td>
<td>York Central (ST5)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of:</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Min 1,500 dwellings in plan period</td>
<td>Planning principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,700 to 2,100 dwellings overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100,000 sqm of office space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SS5         | Castle Gateway (ST20)                         | 38    | Planning principles are set out in the PDRC 2018
|             |                                               |       | Refers to a key strategic site of:
|             |                                               |       | • 1,200 dwellings in plan period
| SS6         | British Sugar (ST1)                           | 41    | The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development
|             |                                               |       | Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.                                                                                                                                                          | Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values |
| SS7         | Former Civil Service Sports Ground (ST2)      | 43    | The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development
|             |                                               |       | Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.                                                                                                                                                          | Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment                                                                                                                                       |
| SS8         | Land adj. Hull Road (ST4)                     | 44    | The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development
|             |                                               |       | Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.                                                                                                                                                          | Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values |
| SS9         | Land East of Metcalfe Lane (ST7)              | 45    | The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development
<p>|             |                                               |       | Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.                                                                                                                                                          | Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment                                                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDRC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS10</td>
<td>Land North of Monks Cross (ST8)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 968 dwellings in plan period • The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018.</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS11</td>
<td>Land North of Haxby (ST9)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 735 dwellings in plan period • The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS12</td>
<td>Land West of Wigginton Road (ST14)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 1,200 dwellings in plan period • 1,348 dwellings overall • The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS13</td>
<td>Land West of Elvington Lane (ST15)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>A key strategic site of: • 2,200 dwellings in plan period • 3,339 dwellings overall • Key principles regarding the strategic creation of a new ‘garden’ village are set out in the PDRC 2018. • The specified demand amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development.</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS14</td>
<td>Terry's Extension Sites</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Refers to key strategic urban development sites of: • 111 dwellings in plan period, including: The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS15</td>
<td>Nestle South (ST17)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 863 dwellings in plan period The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td>Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS16</td>
<td>Land at Tadcaster Road (ST31)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 158 dwellings in plan period The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td>Site to be included as a strategic site in testing (i.e. consultation with stakeholders + Input from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)) to ascertain specific costs and values. Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS17</td>
<td>Hungate (ST32)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 328 dwellings in plan period The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development Planning principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDR Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS18</td>
<td>Station Yard, Wheldrake (ST33)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 147 dwellings in plan period</td>
<td>Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS19</td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Barracks (ST35)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 500 dwellings over the plan period and beyond, with development anticipated to start in 2023</td>
<td>Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS20</td>
<td>Imphal Barracks (ST36)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Refers to a key strategic site of: • 769 dwellings from the end of the plan period, with development anticipated to post 2031</td>
<td>Key principles as listed in PDRC 2018 to be embedded into viability assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of specified growth may affect the realised value of development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key principles are set out in the PDRC 2018 document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS21</td>
<td>Land South of Elvington Airfield Business Park (ST22)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Employment site</td>
<td>Not tested within this appraisal — see section below about Strategic Employment Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS22</td>
<td>University of York Expansion (ST27)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Employment site</td>
<td>Not tested within this appraisal — see section below about Strategic Employment Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS23</td>
<td>Land at Northminster Business Park (ST19)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Employment site</td>
<td>Not tested within this appraisal — see section below about Strategic Employment Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS24</td>
<td>Whitehall Grange (ST37)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Employment site</td>
<td>Not tested within this appraisal — see section below about Strategic Employment Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Provision of Employment Land</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Sets out the requirement for employment land</td>
<td>Non-residential typology sites will be tested for potential CIL contributions based on the volume and type of floorspace expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Loss of Employment Land</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>Business and Industrial Uses within Residential Areas</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sets out the requirement for tourism</td>
<td>Tourism uses, such as a hotel, to be included in non-residential testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC5</td>
<td>Rural Economy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Retail Hierarchy and Sequential Approach</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>District and Local Centres and Neighbourhood Parades</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>York City Centre Retail</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Out of Centre Retailing</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Housing Allocations</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Sets out the location for new development expected in York</td>
<td>Appraisal should be tailored to ensure typologies match these allocations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>Density of Residential Development</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Sets out the expectation for development to achieve:</td>
<td>Typologies to reflect these densities and other densities that are considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100 units/ha within the city centre</td>
<td>appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 50 units/ha within the York urban area</td>
<td>Bespoke strategic site densities as stated in the PDRC 2018 to override general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 40 units/ha within the suburban area and Haxby / Wigginton</td>
<td>typology densities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 35 units/ha in the rural area and villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Balancing the Housing Market</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Requires that dwellings reflect the requirement set out in the latest SHMA and be informed by up to date evidence of need including at a local level and the nature of the development site and the character of the local surrounding area.</td>
<td>Typologies should reflect the local policy on mix/type/size of units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Promoting and Custom House Building</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>The strategic sites will be required to make available for self-builders / custom build a minimum of 5% of the total housing delivered on site.</td>
<td>There is no evidence to support the minor requirement for self-build within development to increase cost on delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| H5           | Gypsies and Travellers       | 106    | To meet the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers, provision will be made in the following ways:  
|              |                              |        | a) To meet the need of Gypsies and Travellers that meet the planning definition, 3 additional pitches will be identified within the existing three Local Authority sites.  
|              |                              |        | b) To meet the need of those 44 Gypsies and Traveller households that do not meet the planning definition                                                                                                         | Sites in appraisal should make allowance for costs associated with this policy     |
|              |                              |        | The requirements for this policy (in strategic sites) will be based on the hierarchy below:  
|              |                              |        | • 100-499 dwellings – 2 pitches should be provided  
|              |                              |        | • 500-999 dwellings - 3 pitches should be provided  
|              |                              |        | • 1000-1499 dwellings - 4 pitches should be provided  
|              |                              |        | • 1500-1999 dwellings - 5 pitches should be provided  
|              |                              |        | • 2000 or more dwellings - 6 pitches should be provided                                                                                                                                                    |                                                                                     |
| H6           | Travelling Showpeople Sites  | 107    | To meet the need of Travelling Showpeople that meet the planning definition, 3 plots will be allocated SP1: The Stables, Elvington:                                                                                     |                                                                                     |
| H7           | Student Housing              | 110    | Indicates a need for student accommodation                                                                                                                                                                | Student housing to be included in non-residential testing                           |
| H8           | Houses in Multiple Occupation | 111    | Strategic sites should incorporate the appropriate provision of accommodation types for older persons within their site masterplanning. For sheltered/Extra-care accommodations a mix of tenures will be supported.  
<p>|              |                              |        | Where development falls within Use Class C3 affordable housing will be required (in accordance with Policy H10 Affordable Housing)                                                                           | Older person housing to be included in the residential testing and non-residential testing |
| H9           | Older Persons Specialist Housing | 114 |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDRC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Support for residential schemes for two or more dwellings which provide the affordable housing in accordance with the following dwelling / size (gross) thresholds:</td>
<td>Policy taken into consideration in appraisal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              |                              |        | • Brownfield sites = > 15 dwellings 20%  
• Greenfield sites = > 15 dwellings 30%                                                                                                                                  |                                                        |
|              |                              |        | For sites with 2 to 15 dwellings, an off site financial contribution (OSFC) equivalent to the following affordable housing percentages is targeted:                                                                 |                                                        |
|              |                              |        | • Urban, Suburban and Rural sites 11-14 dwellings 20%  
• Urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings 15%  
• Urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings 19%  
• Urban brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings 6%  
• Urban greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings 10%  
• Sub-urban brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings 10%  
• Sub-urban greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings 15%  
• Sub-urban brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings 2%  
• Sub-urban greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings 7%  
• Rural brownfield sites 5-10 dwellings 11%  
• Rural brownfield sites 2-4 dwellings that 3%  
• Rural greenfield sites 5-10 dwellings 17%  
• Rural greenfield sites 2-4 dwellings 8%  
• Average York Property price – Average York Fixed RP Price x % Target = OSFC per dwelling \[AH \text{ is based on the SHMA (2016) 80:20 ratio between social rented or affordable rented (80%) and intermediate (20%).}][2] |                                                        |
|              |                              |        | The formula for the OSFC is as follows:  
• Average York Property price – Average York Fixed RP Price x % Target = OSFC per dwelling  

AH is based on the SHMA (2016) 80:20 ratio between social rented or affordable rented (80%) and intermediate (20%). |                                                        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDRC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HW2</td>
<td>New Community Facilities</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>York’s built sports facilities will, where appropriate, be enhanced</td>
<td>Need to ascertain costs for such facilities, if required, in strategic sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW3</td>
<td>Built Sports Facilities</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Requiring proportionate new or improved facilities to accompany new residential development</td>
<td>Need to ascertain costs for such facilities, if required, in, primarily, the strategic sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW4</td>
<td>Childcare Provision</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>New childcare facilities may be required where there is an identified need, including strategic housing allocations</td>
<td>Need to ascertain costs for such facilities, if required, in strategic sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW5</td>
<td>Healthcare Services</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>New Primary healthcare facilities may be required to meet the needs of future occupants from new development, including strategic housing allocations</td>
<td>Need to ascertain costs for such facilities, if required, in strategic sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| HW6        | Emergency Services   | 129    | The following sites have been identified as requiring additional spoke facilities:  
  • ST7: Land East of Metcalfe Lane  
  • ST8: Land North of Monks Cross  
  • ST9: Land North of Haxby  
  • ST15: Land West of Wigginton Road  
  • ST16: Terry’s Extension Sites 1 and 2  | Sufficient allowance is made in the assumed gross to net site area and S106/CIL headroom for supporting this policy                                           |
| HW7        | Healthy Places       | 130    | Residential development design principles:  
  • Well-designed streetscapes  
  • Safe, attractive and easy to navigate footpaths / cycle paths  
  • Good pedestrian and cyclist connections to neighbouring communities and green spaces  
  • Spaces for communities to come together  
  • Adaptations for those with limited mobility  
  • Designing-out crime and improving perceived safety  
  • Buildings that are adaptable to the changing needs of residents  | Need to ascertain potential costs for meeting the design principles                          |
<p>| ED1        | University of York   | 133    | Address the need for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers.                                                                                          | Student housing to be included in non-residential testing                                      |
| ED2        | Campus West          | 134    |                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDRC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>Campus East</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Impact of Strategic Employment site ST27</td>
<td>Student housing to be included in non-residential testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>key strategic site of 25ha university related space including research/science city and student accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED4</td>
<td>York St. John University Lord Mayor’s Walk Campus</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Address the need for any additional student housing which arises because of its future expansion of student numbers.</td>
<td>Student housing to be included in non-residential testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED5</td>
<td>York St. John University Further Expansion</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED6</td>
<td>Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Provision of Preschool, Primary and Secondary Education, as required to support strategic and non-strategic housing allocations</td>
<td>Need to ascertain costs for such facilities based on financial contributions built into typologies and on-site provision for strategic sites where identified in the planning principles for the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED7</td>
<td>York College and Askham Bryan College</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED8</td>
<td>Community Access to Sports and Cultural Facilities on Education Sites</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Placemaking</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Detailed design points (criteria) may affect build costs and realised levels of development</td>
<td>Allow sufficiently in the sales values and build costs for adhering to the detailed design points (criteria).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Landscape and Setting</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Impact on build costs for higher quality soft and hard landscaping etc. that make a positive contribution</td>
<td>Allow sufficiently in the build costs for higher quality soft and hard landscaping etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Cultural Provision</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Conservation Areas</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Listed Buildings</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Potential for significant archaeological desk-based studies and / or site surveys associated with the preparation of the heritage statement</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in the professional fees assumptions for undertaking studies or surveys and potential mitigation costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Porter Planning Economics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPDRC Policy</th>
<th>Policy name</th>
<th>Page #</th>
<th>Nature of costs</th>
<th>How cost is treated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>The Significance of Non-Designated Heritage Assets</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Historic Parks and Gardens</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>City of York Historic Environment Record</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>York City Walls and St Mary’s Abbey Walls (York Walls)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Potential impacts of height restrictions on amount of development permitted and of higher quality design and materials on build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in build costs and sales values for the potential impacts of height restrictions and higher quality design and materials, as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Extensions and Alterations to Existing Buildings</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12</td>
<td>Shopfronts</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13</td>
<td>Advertisements</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>Security Shutters</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI1</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Potential impacts of providing, maintaining or enhancing recreational open space and / or green corridors on sales values and build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in the assumed gross to net site area and S106/CIL headroom for supporting this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI2</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Access to Nature</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Potential impacts of retaining, managing and enhancing features that improve biodiversity and access to nature on sales values and build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in site opening costs, as required, to support this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI3</td>
<td>Green Infrastructure Network</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Potential impacts of maintaining and enhancing the integrity and management of green infrastructure on sales values and build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in site opening costs, as required, to support this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI4</td>
<td>Trees and Hedgerows</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Potential impacts of retaining or supplementing the existing tree stock / hedgerows on sales values and build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in site opening costs, as required, to support this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI5</td>
<td>Protection of Open Space and Playing Pitches</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Potential impacts of re-providing open space on build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in site opening costs, as required, to support this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI6</td>
<td>New Open Space Provision</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Impact providing new open space on sales values (due to effects on gross : net ratios) and build costs</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made in site opening costs, as required, to support this policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI7</td>
<td>Burial and Memorial Grounds</td>
<td>172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB1</td>
<td>Development in the Green Belt</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB2</td>
<td>Development in Settlements “Washed Over” by the Green Belt</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB3</td>
<td>Reuse of Buildings</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Policy sets out the guidelines associated with considering ‘exception sites’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB4</td>
<td>‘Exception’ Sites for Affordable Housing in the Green Belt</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>New buildings must achieve a reasonable reduction in carbon emissions of at least 28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic sites will be required to produce energy masterplans to ensure that the most appropriate low carbon, renewable and energy efficient technologies are deployed at each site</td>
<td>Appraisal will be required to test these policies based on information from the Carbon Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation and Storage</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Policy sets out the requirements for • Sustainable Design and Construction of New Development • Conversion of Existing Buildings and Change of Use • Consequential Improvement to Existing Dwellings</td>
<td>Appraisal will be required to test these policies based on information from the Carbon Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>Sustainable Design and Construction</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>All new developments will be required to connect to (C)CHP distribution networks where they exist or incorporate the necessary infrastructure for connection to future networks, unless demonstrated that doing so is not feasible or that using a different energy supply would be more sustainable.</td>
<td>Appraisal will be required to test these policies for strategic sites and, if required, in typologies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3</td>
<td>District Heating and Combined Heat and Power Networks</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>The site selection methodology should have eliminated all sites that are at risk from flooding. However, some sites (e.g. brownfield sites) may still be in locations that require flood mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>Relevant typologies and strategic sites to be identified and ‘abnormal costs’ for mitigating flood risk to be tested, if necessary (specific costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV2</td>
<td>Managing Environmental Quality</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV3</td>
<td>Land Contamination</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV4</td>
<td>Flood Risk</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>The site selection methodology should have eliminated all sites that are at risk from flooding. However, some sites (e.g. brownfield sites) may still be in locations that require flood mitigation measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV5</td>
<td>Sustainable Drainage</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Potential additional costs Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) instead of traditional piped SW drainage</td>
<td>Sufficient allowance is made, as required, in the sales values and development costs for providing, maintaining or enhancing SUDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDRC Policy</td>
<td>Policy name</td>
<td>Page #</td>
<td>Nature of costs</td>
<td>How cost is treated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM1</td>
<td>Sustainable Waste Management</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Potential provision of frequent high quality public transport</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM2</td>
<td>Sustainable Minerals Management</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Development that for all modes provide safe, appropriate access, are permeable and provide secure covered cycle storage</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Sustainable Access</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Potential provision of frequent high quality public transport</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developments that for all modes provide safe, appropriate access, are permeable and provide secure covered cycle storage</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Strategic Public Transport Improvements</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>York Railway Station and Associated Operational Facilities</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Strategic Highway Network Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Strategic Cycle and Pedestrian Network Links and Improvements</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Development at or Near Public Transport Corridors, Interchanges and Facilities</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Minimising and Accommodating Generated Trips</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>Informed the tested site typologies.</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Demand Management</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Alternative Fuel Fuelling stations and Freight Consolidation</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI1</td>
<td>Communications Infrastructure</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM1</td>
<td>Infrastructure and Developer Contributions</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Provision of stated improvements</td>
<td>Specific site costs sourced from Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) / Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (IDS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Employment Sites

3.5 Regarding non-residential development, the NPPF states that local planning authorities ‘should have a clear understanding of business needs within the economic markets operating in and across their area’. To achieve this, they should... ‘understand their changing needs and identify and address barriers to investment, including a lack of housing, infrastructure or viability.’

3.6 The PDRC 2018 includes strategic employment sites with respective planning principles. These specific sites have been viability tested for plan making purposes, but the emphasis here is not to identify viability for the reasons noted in Chapter 2 para 2.15 to 2.20 of this report, but to identify where non-residential uses are viable under full policy compliance, whether there would be enough headroom to contribute towards infrastructure through CIL. For this reason, generic employment sites are discussed in Chapter 5 and tested in Chapter 6 for the purposes of identifying a potential headroom for setting CIL charges.

Past and Future Residential Development

3.7 Patterns of past development can often provide a guide to the likely patterns of future development. Figure 3.1 shows the net delivery of dwellings in York according to the latest Housing Monitoring Report, which has varied considerably over the period 2006 to 2015. Other than the last monitoring year, 2015-16, the net dwelling gain has fallen below the target level.

Figure 3.1 Residential net annual completions in York

Source: City of York Council Housing Monitoring Report, 2016

3.8 The latest emerging an annual housing target is 923 (867 housing target plus 56 annualised shortfall) net dwellings per annum. To meet this housing target, the PDRC 2018 Policy H1 (Table 5.1) identifies the strategic sites and housing allocations that will

---

28 NPPF page 39, para 160
29 City of York Council (2016), Housing Monitoring Update for Monitoring Year 2015/16
contribute to achieving the figure. In total, it is estimated that the strategic sites listed in Table 5.1 of the PDRC 2018, copied in Table 3.2 below, could provide approximately 15,191 dwellings towards this requirement, with the other housing allocations and windfalls providing around another 4,400 units.

Table 3.2 Number of units to each type of housing allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of housing allocations (units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic areas</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1 British Sugar (1,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2 Civil Service Sports Ground (266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3 The Grain Stores Water Lane (175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4 Land adj Hull Road (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5 York Central (1,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 Land East of Metcalfe Lane (845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross (968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST9 Land North of Haxby (735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST14 Land to West of Wigginton Road (1,348)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST15 Land to west of Elvington Lane (3,339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST16 Terrys (398)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST17 Nestle South (863)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST22 Germany Beck Site East of Fordlands Road (655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST23 Phase 3 Land to West of Metcalfe Lane Osbalwick (192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST28 Land adj to and R/O Windy Ridge and Brecks Lane, Huntington (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST31 Land South of Tadcaster Rd, (158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST32 Hungate (878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST33 Station Yard, Wheldrake (147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST35 Queen Elizabeth Barracks (500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST36 Imphal Barracks (600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing allocations
H1 Former Gas Works (336)
H3 Burnholme School (72)
H5 Lowfield School (162)
H6 Land r/o The Square (older person housing)
H7 Bootham Crescent (86)
H8 Askham Bar Park and Ride (60)
H10 Barbican (187)
H20 Oakhaven EPH (56)
H22 Heworth Lighthouse (15)
H23 Former Grove House (11)
H29 Land at Moor Lane, Copmanthorpe (88)
H31 Eastfield Lane, Dunnington (76)
H38 Land RO Rufforth (33)
H39 North of Church Lane, Elvington (32)
H46 Land to North of Willow Bank and East of Haxby Rd, New Earswick (104)
H52 Willow House EPH (15)
H53 Land at Knapton Village (4)
H55 Land at Layerthorpe (20)
H56 Land at Hull Road (70)
H58 Clifton Without primary school (25)
H59 Queen Elizabeth Barracks (45)

3.9 Figure 3.2 shows where the housing development is expected to be delivered. This includes a substantial delivery within central areas and fewer developments located outside the outer ring road. To gain an appreciation of expected values in delivering these sites, the allocations are plotted on a heatmap with current average sales values for detached houses (where darker colours symbolise areas of higher achieved values).
Figure 3.2 Future residential development overlaying average sales values

Source: PBA using Land Registry data
4 Local Development Context

Introduction

4.1 This chapter intends to provide a summary of the development context and market conditions within the City of York and surrounding areas. The information was collected and reviewed by PBA during the summer of 2017, and has been copied into this chapter supplemented with further analysis by PorterPE.

Residential Market Overview

4.2 Recent analysis by Experian\(^\text{30}\) has identified\(^\text{31}\) that the national housing market has been relatively volatile in recent months, with prices declining and rising monthly, with annual growth between 2.1% in May to 2.9% in July 2017. Recent RICS surveys have confirmed that overall market trends remain lacklustre, with new buyer enquiries declining in the second quarter of 2017, which is mostly likely to reflect a high degree of uncertainty around economic prospects and because relative income is being threatened by rising inflation. Consequently, potential buyers are increasingly less able to enter the housing market as affordability issues come to the fore. Also, nationally the number of new housing delivery instructions by developer institutions continues to fall in the face of economic uncertainty with the UK’s future relationship with the EU, weakening the UK’s credit rating and the sterling currency, higher transaction costs and falling incomes in real terms deterring potential sellers.

4.3 DCLG data shows that annual completions were around 148,000 in the year to 2017q1, significantly less than the 250,000-estimated needed to fulfil demand, suggesting that the supply crisis will remain a defining feature of the UK housing market in the years to come. Consequently, tight supply conditions have supported prices and prevented these from falling more steeply than they would have otherwise in a prolonged period of uncertainty.

4.4 Activity levels, measured by the agreed sales indicator in the RICS survey, has also been either flat or negative since the beginning of 2017 and the latest survey shows no change in this trend. HM Revenue & Customs data shows that the seasonally adjusted estimate of the number of residential property transactions decreased by 3.3% between May 2017 and June 2017.

4.5 Whilst guidance on viability dictates that decisions on costs and values must be made on current data, it is also useful to gain an understanding of likely future residential values forecast. Looking forward in Figure 4.1, the latest projections of second hand house prices prepared by Savills in their Residential Property Focus\(^\text{32}\) shows house price growth to slow next year as uncertainty weighs down the market. But Savills’s research also points towards more growth later, albeit reduced by expectations relating to interest rate rises. This means that the UK house price growth is projected to be limited

\(^{30}\) Experian, UK Housing market round-up – August 2017 (online)
\(^{31}\) Based on house price data from Nationwide.
\(^{32}\) Residential Property Focus 2016 Q4, Savills Research (2016)
to 14% over the next five years, which is half the level experienced over the last five years. The Yorkshire and Humber region, which includes the City of York, is expected to grow over the next 5 years by around 10%, which is below Savills’ expectation for national sales prices. However, the City of York tends to achieve better than the rest of the region, and is more likely to mirror the changes being experienced by regions at the top of the expected forecasts.

Figure 4.1 Projected regional increases in average resale residential values

![Figure 4.1 Projected regional increases in average resale residential values](image)

Source: Savills World Research (2017), Residential Property Focus 2017

**Local Residential Market**

4.6 Using data of actual transactions of detached properties since 2010 from the HM Land Registry, Figure 4.2 gives the average sales value for all detached residential property. To give a suitable comparison of values in York (shown by the dashed red line) against neighbouring authorities, only detached properties are reported to avoid skewing average values should one authority have a higher proportion of one type of housing.

4.7 Apart from Harrogate, Figures 4.2 shows York to have marginally higher average sales values than its neighbours, with values rising the greatest, from around £300,000 in 2010 to around £350,000 in 2016.

4.8 For properties just within York, Figure 4.3 provides achieved sales prices by type of dwelling for new and existing properties over the previous three years, 2014 to 2016. This shows that whilst the average for new detached properties is rather high, the average achieved sales values for new semi-detached, terraced and flats are similar.

4.9 Additionally, Figure 4.3 indicates that the premium for new builds is significant for both detached properties and flats, but comparatively small for semi-detached and terraced properties.
Within York, Figure 4.4, Figure 4.5, Figure 4.6 and Figure 4.7 look at achieved sales within York since January 2013 by different housing types so that the data is not skewed by an over representation of a particular type. These ‘heatmaps’ are used to indicate where values may differ by mapping average price values based on postcode sectors across the city. Postcodes with lighter shading refer to areas where values are lower compared with darker areas where the average is higher.
Figure 4.4 Average prices of detached houses in York, Jan’13 to Jun’16

Source: PBA prepared using Land Registry data

Figure 4.5 Average prices of semi-detached houses in York, Jan’13 to Jun’16

Source: PBA prepared using Land Registry data
4.11 This exercise is important regarding Local Plan testing and/or identifying a scope for CIL as clearly defined locations where there are significantly different sales values could necessitate a requirement for different policies or CIL rates. Guidance states that “Charging authorities can set differential rates for different geographical zones provided that those zones are defined by reference to the economic viability of development.”
Based on the values, there is no clearly defined pattern where values are notably different across all four heatmaps. There are instances where a postcode is considered a higher value area on one heatmap for one type of dwelling also appears to be a lower value area for a different type.

To test these findings, PBA presented these heatmaps to the developer workshop in September 2016. The attendees suggested that this was an accurate conclusion, and that there was no suggestion that values would be distinctly different between locations. The conclusion from this analysis, therefore, is that there is not sufficient evidence to support an approach where multiple value areas are considered.

The analysis up until now has been based on the full average prices achieved for residential units. Whilst this analysis is useful it only tells part of the picture. Land Registry data is useful in providing the average sales value of a property but does not adequately take into consideration the size of the property. For instance, it would be reasonable to assume that, all things being equal, larger properties attract higher values than smaller ones. It is also reasonable to assume that property sizes are likely to be larger, in general, in rural areas compared to their urban counterparts.

Therefore, it is also useful to gain an understanding of the sales values per square metre of these properties. By using Land Registry data of new property transactions, and by obtaining the corresponding floorspace data for each property from their Energy Performance Certificate (EPC), it is possible to derive the achieved per square metre sales value for each transaction. From a sample of over 320 new build transactions that have taken place between January 2015 and May 2016, which are listed in Appendix 3, the average value in the City of York is £2,621 per sqm for houses and £3,514 per sqm for flats.

Sales values of older persons’ housing on the market at November 2016 are shown in Table 4.1. Most of these recent transactions are for re-sale properties, which are likely to be substantially lower than new builds that achieve a premium. Additionally, the data in Table 4.1 reflects the marketed price and it is acknowledged that the transactional price can often be different, often under the market price.

Owing to the lack of extra-care units currently on the market, the values in Table 4.1 are all for retirement properties. In general, from these recent transactions, it can be taken that sales values for existing properties could be considered as being in the region of £2,900 per sqm. But there will be a significant premium for new properties over the resale of these properties. Similarly, there will be further sales premiums for open market specialist care products owing to the increased adaptability of these homes and shared facilities.

---

33 DCLG (2016) Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance (para 34)
Table 4.1 Sales values for retirement properties currently on the market (as of Nov 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sales value</th>
<th>Sales value per sqm</th>
<th>New or existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfry Court</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>£2,652</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village, Wiggington</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>£2,702</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village, Haxby</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£169,500</td>
<td>£3,198</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Plows Avenue</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£145,000</td>
<td>£2,900</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Court, Acombe Road</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£2,885</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 1 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£181,999</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 2 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£320,499</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 3 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£385,999</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rightmove/Zoopla

Non-residential Market

4.17 Data on non-residential transactions is more limited than residential transactions, and there are varieties in development types. This section has therefore considered historical comparable evidence for new values at a local, regional and national level based on the work carried out by PBA in the summer of 2017. The full list of market data for different non-residential units is shown in Appendix 4.

Employment Uses

City centre offices and business parks

4.18 Owing to the constraints of the city centre’s historical core, recent new build offices in York have been developed in edge of centre locations. This has left a limited supply of new build office units within the city centre.

4.19 Consultation with local agents revealed that the office market is not particularly strong, and that York has several vacant units. However, according to data from the commercial property information service, CoStar, vacancy rates for office units have fallen from 9% in 2012 to approximately 7% at the time of the report. Asking rents increased from £12 per sqft (£129 per sqm) in 2012 to almost £14.50 per sqft (£156 per sqm) at the start of 2016, but since then rents have fallen back to just over £12.50 per sqft (£135 per sqm). Between 2011 and 2016, average yields predominantly fluctuated around 8%.

4.20 Table 4.2 shows a sample of second-hand office units currently listed on commercial property websites (for instance Rightmove and Zoopla). Research and consultation indicates that rental values differ considerably based on the quality of the unit. In summary, acceptable rental values were thought to be in the region of £160 per sqm, with business parks achieving marginally higher rents.
### Table 4.2 Office units recently on the market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Lancaster House</td>
<td>£128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Melrosegate</td>
<td>£139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Skipworth Rd</td>
<td>£108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Rose Avenue</td>
<td>£279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Audax Rd</td>
<td>£280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Innovation Centre</td>
<td>£323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>London Ebor Business Park</td>
<td>£146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Aviator Court</td>
<td>£124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre office</td>
<td>Merchant House</td>
<td>£89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre office</td>
<td>Clifton Park</td>
<td>£129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre office</td>
<td>Lavender grove</td>
<td>£123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre office</td>
<td>Goodramgate</td>
<td>£91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

### 4.21

In terms of transactional data, the sample in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 indicates that rental rates of around £160 to £180 per sqm are considered appropriate and yields average in the region of 8%.

### Table 4.3 Transactional data of offices – rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Fulford Industrial Estate</td>
<td>£172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Holgate Business Park</td>
<td>£129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Holgate Business Park</td>
<td>£129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Centurion House</td>
<td>£145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Wellington Row</td>
<td>£178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>12 George Hudson St</td>
<td>£209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>12 George Hudson St</td>
<td>£123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>12 George Hudson St</td>
<td>£188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Stamford House</td>
<td>£144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>37 Tanner Row</td>
<td>£172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>George Hudson St</td>
<td>£178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Rougier St</td>
<td>£140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Mill House, North St</td>
<td>£172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>East Coast House</td>
<td>£135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>16 Toft Green</td>
<td>£124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar
Table 4.4 Transactional data of offices – yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>All in yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Fulford Industrial Estate</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Holgate Business Park</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Holgate Business Park</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Centurion House</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>James House - James St</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>Wellington Row</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>12 George Hudson St</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Stamford House</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>37 Tanner Row</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Saxby House</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Rowntree Wharf</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>George Hudson St</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Rougier St</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>Mill House, North St</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre</td>
<td>East Coast House</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

**Industrial/warehousing units**

4.22 Industrial and warehouse spaces are treated as a single use, covering Use Classes B1c (light industrial), B2 (general industrial) and B8 (warehousing and distribution). Most of the new space is likely to be small units, largely occupied by services and light industry rather than traditional heavy manufacturing.

4.23 There are four main areas where most transactions have taken place. These are at York Business Park, Clifton Moor, Stirling Park and Hazel Court. From consultation it is noted that York Business Park has achieved £60 and £85 per sqm in rents in recent years.

4.24 Table 4.5 displays several recent transactions, indicating that a figure between £60 and £85 per sqm is a reasonable assumption for this type of unit. The yields for this type of development are in the region of 8%.

Table 4.5 Industrial units recently on the market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Mansfield St</td>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Unit 7-8 - Ebor Industrial Estate</td>
<td>£67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Unit 7-8 - Ebor Industrial Estate</td>
<td>£69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Unit 1-4 - Hazel Court, James St</td>
<td>£99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Unit 5-7 - Hazel Court, James St</td>
<td>£81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>9 The Crescent</td>
<td>£74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Leeman Rd</td>
<td>£56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Pyramid Court, Rosetta Way</td>
<td>£86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Units 1-6A - The Rose Centre Business Park</td>
<td>£91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

**Retail**

**City centre retail**

4.25 Many consultees at the PBA workshop noted a significant degree of variance in rental values by location. This is seen in Table 4.6 which shows a sample of high street units being marketed on various commercial property websites (such as Rightmove).
Table 4.6 Retail units currently on the market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>Front Street, York</td>
<td>£105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>Blossom Street, York</td>
<td>£173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>York Road, York</td>
<td>£164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>Lendal Rd, York</td>
<td>£667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>Feasegate, York</td>
<td>£196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

4.26 The sample of transactional data in Table 4.7 indicates a similar variation in retail values, ranging from £100 to £890 per sqm. City centre retail units sold achieve yields of around 7.5%, which is considered as an appropriate benchmark in the viability testing.

Table 4.7 City centre retail rents in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual asking rent</th>
<th>Size (Sqm)</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>72 Low Petergate</td>
<td>£57,500</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>£307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>12A Coney St</td>
<td>£97,000</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>£144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>99 Low Petergate</td>
<td>£46,000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>£466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>11 Coney St</td>
<td>£105,000</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>£898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>50A York Rd</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>£230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>28 Back Swinegate</td>
<td>£13,950</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>£480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>74 Goodramgate</td>
<td>£39,500</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>£159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>19 Market St</td>
<td>£60,000</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>£333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>68 Micklegate</td>
<td>£7,500</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>12 Hudson Street</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>£188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City centre retail</td>
<td>50 Low Petergate</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

4.27 Consultation revealed that the retail market in York is “healthy” in relation to other city centres across the UK. The city centre offers high quality and provides an attractive shopping environment which has remained comparatively buoyant over recent years.

4.28 This is corroborated by information by CoStar, which notes that vacancy rates in York also have fallen in recent years, from 3% in 2011 to just under 1% in 2016. Unsurprisingly, asking rents have risen during this time from £25 per sqft (£269 per sqm) in 2011 to just over £35 per sqft (£377 per sqm). Retail yields, whilst varying considerably by type and location, are averaging around 7%.

Out of city centre retail

4.29 York has several large retail parks including Monks Cross, Clifton Moor and Foss Island. These parks contain leading national multiples that are expected of retail centres in these locations.

4.30 PBA’s reported discussions with local agents provided mixed and varied views with respect to the out of town retail market sector within York. Appropriate rental levels, with respect to stand alone out of town retail units were thought to be in the range of £170 per sqm, whilst incentives offered to tenants often range from 9 to 18 month rent free periods. Yields were believed to be very dependent on tenant covenant strength.
and length of leases, but with many notable failures amongst out of centre retailers, yields have risen in recent years typically ranging from 7% to 8.25%.

4.31 Interestingly, sales value data appeared to contradict discussions with local agents. Tables 4.8 and 4.9 set out rental values and yields for recent transactions. The tables indicate that rental values have been consistently between £160 and £200 per sqm with yields closer to 6%.

Table 4.8 Out of town retail units in York - Rents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Suite Unit 5 - Stirling Rd</td>
<td>£161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Vangerde Shopping Park - Jockey Ln</td>
<td>£597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Unit 14B Phase 2 - Stirling Rd</td>
<td>£135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Unit 2 Phase 4 - Stirling Rd</td>
<td>£91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Unit 1 - Foss Islands Rd</td>
<td>£215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Unit 18 Monks Cross Shopping Park</td>
<td>£538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Units 8-9 Phase 3 - Hurricane Way</td>
<td>£280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Suite Unit 3 - Foss Islands Rd</td>
<td>£219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Unit 1 B&amp;M - Stirling Rd</td>
<td>£166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Units 1-9 Phase 1 - Stirling Rd</td>
<td>£205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

Table 4.9 Out of town retail units in York – Yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Clifton Moor Retail Park</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Foss Islands Rd</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Stirling Rd, York</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Stirling Rd, York</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Warehouse</td>
<td>Stirling Rd, York</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

Convenience stores and supermarkets

4.32 Convenience retail operates in a different market to comparison retailing. While both have been influenced by the increasing popularity of online shopping, the convenience sector continues to undergo significant structural change because of an increasingly competitive market and a fundamental change in the way customers shop. This has affected the type of units that are being developed, as seen by the increasing prominence of budget retailers (such as Aldi and Lidl) and smaller format stores.

4.33 Tables 4.10 and 4.11 show samples of rental values and yields transactional data for properties sold in the past ten years. It is worth noting that the sample contains predominantly second-hand units, and it is thought that a rental premium could be achieved above these for new units.

Table 4.10 Convenience Retail in and around York – Rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Convenience</td>
<td>Penley Grove, York</td>
<td>Londis</td>
<td>£195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Convenience</td>
<td>The Square, Hessle</td>
<td>Somerfield</td>
<td>£169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Convenience</td>
<td>Grandale, Hull</td>
<td>Sainsbury Local</td>
<td>£83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Convenience</td>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>Sainsbury Local</td>
<td>£116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Convenience Retail – Yields

#### Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tenant</th>
<th>Annual rent per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Convenience</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Tesco Express</td>
<td>£94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>High St, Doncaster</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>£111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>Kirkstall, Leeds</td>
<td>Poundland</td>
<td>£169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>Beckett Rd, Doncaster</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>£144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Supermarket</td>
<td>Foss Island, York</td>
<td>Waitrose</td>
<td>£95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Supermarket</td>
<td>Abbey Walk, Selby</td>
<td>Sainsbury</td>
<td>£183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Supermarket</td>
<td>Drummond St, Rotherham</td>
<td>Tesco Extra</td>
<td>£199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CoStar

### Hotels, Student accommodation and Care homes

4.34 Transactional data and responses from consultees about hotel, student accommodation and care home development are relatively less abundant. Where possible PBA, in their 2017 report, endeavoured to use local data but where this was not available they used research from a wider location to establish trends and typical values.

#### Hotels

4.35 A transaction for a 142-bed Holiday Inn on Tadcaster Road recently leased for £3,150 per room.

4.36 Yields in York for hotels were considered to vary considerably. For instance, the Premier Inn on Blossom Street traded at a yield of 5.85%, the sale of the Holiday Inn on Tadcaster Road represented a yield of 9.25% and the Mercure Fairfield Manor Hotel achieved a yield of 7.2%.

#### Student accommodation

4.37 Research conducted by Knight Frank\(^{34}\) noted that 2015 was a record year for the student accommodation investment market. In terms of rental values, research conducted by Bilfinger GVA\(^{35}\) indicates that the average weekly rent in York was £133 per week. Based on the assumption that rent is paid for 40 weeks (as student accommodation is rarely occupied for the full year) and allowing for management costs (assumed at 35%), this equates to a figure in the region of £3,500 per bed.

---

\(^{34}\) Knight Frank research (2015), Student Market review.

\(^{35}\) Bilfinger GVA (2015), Student Housing review, Research report, Autumn 2015
4.38 Knight Frank provides evidence to demonstrate that yields for regional student accommodation has fallen from 6.5% on 2009 to between 5.5% and 6% in December 2015.

**Care homes and other specialist housing**

4.39 Research, also by Knight Frank\(^\text{36}\), indicated that care homes in the Yorkshire and Humber area achieved values of just under £8,000 per bed space.

4.40 In another research document by Knight Frank\(^\text{37}\), it was suggested that prime care homes traded at yields of between 5% and 6%, with secondary quality assets trading with yields at 7.5% to 8%.

---

\(^{36}\) Knight Frank research (2015), 2015 Care Homes Trading Performance Review

\(^{37}\) Knight Frank research (2015), Healthcare Capital Markets 2015
5 Residential Viability: Assumptions

Introduction

5.1 It is not always possible to get a perfect fit between a site, the site profile and cost/revenue categories but a best fit in the spirit of the Harman Report. For this, the viability testing requires a series of assumptions about site typologies, the site coverage and floorspace mix to generate an overall sales turnover and value of land, which along with viability assumptions are discussed here for residential testing.

5.2 The viability testing is for whole plan purposes and not for individual site viability assessments, and has been informed by the work in the PBA September 2017 Report with further updates by PorterPE in this report. Additionally, PBA had consulted with the development industry to check and challenge the appropriateness and suitability of these assumptions based on their own evidence. A copy of the meeting notes for this event is provided in Appendix 2.

Residential Typologies

Generic typologies

5.3 The objective of this section is to formulate a list of typologies, or hypothetical developments, that are likely to be brought forward in the plan period and assign them to broad locations within the City. The starting point is understanding where development is likely to take place. After consultation with the Council and with reference to an earlier study undertaken by PBA in 2014, this study used the broad typologies as set out in Table 5.1. Although determined by the characteristics of known developments sites, most of the typologies are hypothetical which allows the study to deal efficiently with the very high level of detail that would otherwise be generated by an attempt to viability test each site. This approach is set out in the CIL guidance (2014), which suggests that:

‘...a charging authority should directly sample an appropriate range of types of sites across its area, in order to supplement existing data. This will require support from local developers. The exercise should focus on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan relies, and those sites where the impact of the levy on economic viability is likely to be most significant (such as brownfield sites). The sampling should reflect a selection of the different types of sites included in the relevant Plan, and should be consistent with viability assessment undertaken as part of plan-making.’

5.4 The Harman Report states that the role of the typologies testing is not required to provide a precise answer as to the viability of every development likely to take place during the plan period:

‘No assessment could realistically provide this level of detail...rather, [the role of the typologies testing] is to provide high level assurance that the policies within the plan are...’

---

39 DCLG CIL Guidance 2014 page 16.
set in a way that is compatible with the likely economic viability of development needed to deliver the plan.”

5.5 Indeed, the Report also acknowledges that a:

‘plan-wide test will only ever provide evidence of policies being ‘broadly viable.’”

5.6 The assumptions that need to be made to carry out a test at Plan level mean that any specific development site may still present a range of challenges that render it unviable given the policies in the Local Plan, even if those policies have passed the viability test at the plan level. This is one reason why a ‘viability cushion’ is used to manage these risks.

5.7 Taking the Harman guidance into consideration, the starting point is understanding where, and at what scale, development is likely to take place. These typologies that have been chosen are the same as those which informed the PBA 2014 report. They differ slightly from the typologies tested in the PBA 2017 report because following consultation with the Council, it was agreed that these revisions would better reflect the housing allocations in the emerging Local Plan, and therefore where future development is to be expected.

5.8 East site typology’s net to gross land area and associated density of units per net hectare are based on the ratios taken from an earlier PBA 2014 report, which also informed CYC’s SHLAA (2017).

5.9 Where sites have 15 or more units, the PDRC 2018 has a basic affordable housing policy based on land type, with an expectation of 20% on brownfield and 30% on greenfield sites. Both land types also come with different potential site costs, which are also considered in the viability testing. Therefore, the typologies are split into greenfield and brownfield sites.

5.10 The tested typology site profiles are listed in Table 5.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology and broad location</th>
<th>Land type</th>
<th>Gross area (ha)</th>
<th>Gross: net ratio</th>
<th>Net area (ha)</th>
<th>No of units</th>
<th>Density (dph)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Large</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Large</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Medium</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Small</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Large</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Medium</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Small</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural - Village - 122 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural - Large</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 Local Housing Delivery Group (2012), op cit (para 15).
41 Ibid (para 18).
Typology and broad location | Land type  | Gross area (ha) | Gross: net ratio | Net area (ha) | No of units | Density (dph) |
-----------------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
Rural - Medium               | Greenfield | 0.20           | 100%            | 0.20         | 7           | 35           |
Rural - Small                | Greenfield | 0.03           | 100%            | 0.03         | 1           | 35           |
Centre/ City Centre Extension - Large | Brownfield | 1.00           | 95%             | 0.95         | 95          | 100          |
Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium | Brownfield | 0.50           | 100%            | 0.50         | 50          | 100          |
Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small | Brownfield | 0.20           | 100%            | 0.20         | 20          | 100          |
Urban - Large                | Brownfield | 1.00           | 95%             | 0.95         | 45          | 47           |
Urban - Medium               | Brownfield | 0.50           | 100%            | 0.50         | 25          | 50           |
Urban - Small                | Brownfield | 0.20           | 100%            | 0.20         | 10          | 50           |
Suburban - Large             | Brownfield | 4.00           | 88%             | 3.50         | 140         | 40           |
Suburban - Medium            | Brownfield | 1.00           | 95%             | 0.95         | 38          | 40           |
Suburban - Small             | Brownfield | 0.20           | 100%            | 0.20         | 8           | 40           |
Rural - Village              | Brownfield | 5.00           | 70%             | 3.50         | 122         | 35           |
Rural - Large                | Brownfield | 1.00           | 95%             | 0.95         | 33          | 35           |
Rural - Medium               | Brownfield | 0.20           | 100%            | 0.20         | 7           | 35           |
Rural - Small                | Brownfield | 0.03           | 100%            | 0.03         | 1           | 35           |

Strategic Sites

5.11 The Council are considering many strategic sites for inclusion within their PDRC 2018, which have been already been listed in Table 3.2 in Chapter 3. High-level viability assessments have been carried out on them to identify whether these sites may be deliverable with the PDRC 2018 policies, and whether they would be able to support a CIL charge.

5.12 The strategic site assessments have been informed by each site’s areas, yields (number of units) and expected delivery rates provided by the Council. Where the net areas have not been provided, the site densities for the different locations in Table 5.1 has been applied. Additionally, other generic allowances for items such as site opening costs, brownfield site costs and policy requirements have been applied based on the generic assumptions that are discussed in the rest of this chapter. The list of tested strategic sites and site profiles are summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Strategic sites in York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land type</th>
<th>Site area (ha)</th>
<th>No of units</th>
<th>Density (dph)</th>
<th>Build (yrs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1 British Sugar</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2 Civil Service Sports Ground</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4 Land adj Hull Road</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5 York Central</td>
<td>City Centre Extn</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 Land East of Metcalfe Lane</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST9 Land North of Haxby</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST14 Land to West of Wigginton Road</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST15: Land to west of Elvington Lane</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing dwelling type profile categories

5.13 Each typology is closely based on a mix of the dwelling types prescribed in the latest SHMA (2016), as identified in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing type</th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 beds</th>
<th>3 beds</th>
<th>4+ beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>35-40%</td>
<td>35-40%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>35-40%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of York SHMA (2016)

5.14 Based on the findings of the SHMA, for the tested generic typologies and strategic sites, the following housing mixes have been applied based on the density of each site:

- Sites with fewer than 100 dwellings per net hectare:
  - Open Market: 45% 2 bed houses, 37.5% 3 bed houses and 17.5% 4+ bed houses
  - Affordable: 70% 2 bed houses, 22.5% 3 bed houses and 7.5% 4+ bed houses

- Site with 100+ dwellings per net hectare:
  - Open Market: 100% 1-2 bed flats
  - Affordable: 100% 1-2 bed flats

5.15 While there is no specific policy relating to dwelling size standards, the tested unit sizes are shown in Table 5.4, which are informed by the minimum size national space standards for future development and the developer consultation workshop. Table 5.4 includes sizes for the net lettable areas for flatted developments for estimating sales values, and the gross area to account for the additional shared circulation space such as stairwells etc., which have no direct value but do have a cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit size (sqm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 bed flats</td>
<td>55 NIA; 63 GIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.16 *Older person and supported living accommodation*

It is important to define what types of specialist accommodation will be tested. Different types of provision will have different characteristics and values. The types of specialist homes tested within this report include accommodation for care, assisted living and retirement living. These have been informed by recent new build schemes or planning applications either in City of York or in similar places elsewhere in the region and are defined as follows:

- **Retirement dwellings** – also known as sheltered housing, these are defined as groups of dwellings, often flats and bungalows, which provide independent, self-contained homes. In addition to this, there will likely be some element of communal facilities, such as a lounge or warden. A service charge will be in place to cover the normal ongoing costs but also incur additional costs to upkeep communal facilities as described.

- **Extra care** – also known as assisted living by the private sector. It is provided across a range of tenures (owner occupied, rented, shared ownership/equity). This is housing with care whereby people live independently in their own flats but have access to 24-hour care and support. These are defined as schemes designed for an elderly population that may require further assistance with certain aspects of their day to day life. Arrangements for care provision vary between care provided according to eligible assessed need by the local authority and people purchasing privately who may not have such a high level of need which is on site and is purchased according to need. For private sector developments the care facilities are normally part of a care package with additional fees to pay for the service and facilities, which are on top of normal service charges and the cost of purchasing the property. The schemes will often have their own staff and may provide one or more meals per day. These schemes have a greater proportion of communal space than retirement homes and are likely to be built to standards suitable for wheelchair access and better designed bathroom facilities.

- **Care homes** – residential or nursing homes where 24-hour personal care and/or nursing care are provided together with all meals. People occupy under a license arrangement. These are considered within the non-residential viability appraisals as many of their properties are more akin to these types of development.

5.17 A 60-unit retirement home and a 50-unit Extra-care development, which is a standard size for new schemes in the specialist housing market, has been tested. The retirement homes have an assumed density of 120 dph and extra-care developments at 100 dph, which have been informed by guidance from the Retirement Housing Group (RHG)\(^42\).

5.18 The saleable net internal area of the units for specialist housing is 60 sqm for retirement homes and 71 sqm for extra care schemes, which are based on appropriate sizes for 1 and 2 bed properties and based on a 60:40 split between the two. Additionally, the build costs include additional floorspace considered as non-chargeable functions and communal space. The appraisals allow for 25% additional gross area for retirement

\(^{42}\) Community Infrastructure Levy and Sheltered Housing/Extra-care Developments, A Briefing Note On Viability, prepared for Retirement Housing Group by Three Dragons, May 2013, Amended February 2016.
properties and 35% for extra care schemes. It is therefore assumed that the gross internal floorspace per unit is 80 sqm for retirement properties and 109 sqm for extra care units. Again, these sizes have been informed by the RHG guidance.

**Residential Values and Cost Assumptions**

**Sales values**

5.19 Current residential revenues and other viability variables are obtained from a range of sources, including:

- Land Registry matched with EPC records, as discussed in Chapter 4, provides a wealth of transactional data for a local area for new properties;
- Direct research with developers and agents operating in the area.

5.20 From these sources discussed in Chapter 4, the sales values per square metre were derived as an average for 320 new build transactions that have taken place between January 2015 and May 2016, which are listed in Appendix 3. These values have been used for testing open market sales values in the viability assessment and are identified as a rounded value in Table 5.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>£ per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>2,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: PBA derived from 320 Land Registry and EPC records

**Sales values for older person and specialist accommodation**

5.21 PBA researched sales values of specialist housing that were on the market at the end of 2016, which are shown in Table 5.6. Owing to the lack of extra-care units currently on the market, the figures below are all for retirement properties. Most of the recent transactions are for re-sale properties, which are likely to be substantially lower than new builds that achieve a premium. Additionally, the values in Table 5.6 reflect the marketed price, and it is acknowledged that the transactional price can often be different, often under the market price. In general, from these recent transactions, it can be inferred that sales values for existing properties could be considered as being in the region of £2,900 per sqm, with a significant premium for new properties over resale properties, and further still for extra-care properties which tend to have higher values to account for the additional facilities associated with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sales value</th>
<th>Sales value per sqm</th>
<th>New or existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belfry Court</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>£2,652</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Village, Wilgington</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>£2,702</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using average new build values for the past two years and floorspace from the Energy Performance Certificate to ascertain an average sales value per square metre.
### Table 5.2 Sales Values for Retirement Living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sales value</th>
<th>Sales value per sqm</th>
<th>New or existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Village, Haxby</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£169,500</td>
<td>£3,198</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Plows Avenue</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£145,000</td>
<td>£2,900</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax Court, Acombe Road</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£2,885</td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 1 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£181,999</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 2 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£320,499</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillington Oaks 3 bedroom</td>
<td>Retirement Living</td>
<td>£385,999</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.22 To corroborate these findings, PBA also followed the RHG guidance that suggests that the sales prices for 1-bed retirement homes are in the region of 75% of the average price for existing 3-bed semi-detached houses in that location, with 2-bed retirement properties equal to the full value of a 3-bed semi-detached house. Assuming a scheme comprised an equal number of 1 and 2-bed units, this would indicate a value of 87.5% of the average 3-bed semi-detached houses. The RHG guidance assumes that the sales values for extra-care schemes are on average 25% higher.

5.23 The PBA 2017 report noted the Rightmove average value for a semi-detached property in York was £230,000. Applying the same 60:40 weighting between 1 bed and 2 bed dwellings to the RHG guidance, this suggests that retirement housing should be considered in the region of 85% of the total value, which in this case is £195,500.

5.24 PBA also followed the RHG guidance for extra-care properties and applied a 25% uplift on Retirement homes to calculate a value for extra-care schemes. PBA therefore based their assumed values on a sales value of £287,500.

5.25 Using the same method set out in the PBA 2017 report, the sales values used in testing older person and specialist open market accommodation in the City of York are shown in Table 5.6.

### Table 5.6 Tested older person and specialist accommodation values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>£ per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracare / assisted living homes</td>
<td>£3,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Build Costs

5.26 Residential build costs are based on actual tender prices for new builds in the market place over a 15-year period from the Build Cost Information Service (BCIS), which is published by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). The data used by PBA was derived from the 3rd quarter 2015 median average figures and reflects actual construction data as opposed to later figures that are based on estimated figures.

5.27 While later figures were available these would have been forecast estimates and therefore less reliable. In addition, the tested (actual) build costs are more comparable
with the tested sales values in Tables 5.5 and 5.6 which are taken from prices between January 2015 and May 2016, and therefore the average is probably likely to reflect the mid-point around values around the 3rd quarter 2015.

5.28 The tender price data is also rebased to York prices using BCIS defined adjustments, to give the median build costs for small, medium and large schemes, and specialist accommodation, as shown in Table 5.7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>£ per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats / Apartments</td>
<td>£1,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (small house builder 3 and under)</td>
<td>£1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (medium house builder 4 to 14)*</td>
<td>£1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (large house builder 15 and above)</td>
<td>£958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement homes</td>
<td>£1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracare homes / assisted living</td>
<td>£1,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BCIS; * PBA derived

5.29 Based on experience, volume and regional house builders (typically building schemes with 50+ houses) can comfortably operate within the median cost figures in Table 5.7, especially given that they are likely to achieve significant economies of scale in the purchase of materials and the use of labour. Many smaller and medium sized developers of houses are usually unable to attain the same economies, so their construction costs may be higher, which reflects the higher costs for schemes with 3 or fewer houses (from BCIS) and for 4-14 houses (taken as a mid-point between the larger and small schemes).

5.30 The BCIS build costs are exclusive of external works, fees, contingencies, VAT and finance charges, plus other revenue costs. These additional costs are discussed below.

*Other Development Costs*

*External works*

5.31 This input incorporates all additional costs associated with the site curtilage of the built area. These include incidental landscaping costs including trees and hedges, soft and hard landscaping, estate access roads and connections to the site infrastructure such as sewers and utilities.

5.32 The external works variable had been set at a rate of 10% of build cost.

*Professional fees*

5.33 This input incorporates all professional fees associated with the build, including fees for designs, planning, surveying, project managing, etc, at 8% of build cost plus externals.

*Contingency*

5.34 For site specific viability studies, it is standard to allow a contingency for the risk associated with each site. But for high level policy informing studies such as this, where the assumptions are generic and will vary up or down in value, it might not be necessary to allow for any contingencies.
5.35 However, for consistency in testing the typologies and sample of strategic sites, a contingency applied at 4% of build cost plus externals has been used based on industry standards.

**Greenfield site costs**

5.36 On larger greenfield sites there may be a need to allow for opening costs such site service installations and strategic infrastructure such as drainage, strategic landscaping, and public open space, etc. The assumptions in Table 5.8 are applied to identify scale of site infrastructure based on the number of units per scheme.

5.37 For sites classified as ‘mixed’, costs are reduced by half the values shown in Table 5.8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of units per scheme</th>
<th>Cost per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 - 199</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 499</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 +</td>
<td>£17,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.38 The Council informs us that the approach to infrastructure requirements on the strategic sites will vary and could be considered through both S106 and CIL. However, at this stage the specific requirements are unknown, so when determining a suitable level of CIL, a sufficient headroom needs to be available to fund other likely infrastructure requirements on the strategic sites.

**Brownfield site costs**

5.39 Brownfield sites may have costs associated with them such as site clearance and remediation, which does vary significantly depending on the site’s specific characteristics. The additional costs associated with residential site development on brownfield sites are assumed on a per hectare basis, as shown in Table 5.9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site abnormal costs</th>
<th>Per net hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land purchase costs**

5.40 The land value needs to reflect additional purchase cost assumptions, shown in Table 5.10. These are based on surveying costs and legal costs to a developer in the acquisition of land and the development process itself, which we have established from discussions with developers and agents and are also reflected in the Harman Report (2012) as industry standard rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land purchase costs</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveyor’s fees</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>land value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal fees</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>land value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp Duty Land Tax</td>
<td>HMRC</td>
<td>rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.41 A Stamp Duty Land Tax is payable by a developer when acquiring development land. This factor has been recognised and applied to the residual valuation as percentage cost based on the HM Customs & Revenue variable rates against the residual land value.

Sales fees

5.42 The Gross Development Value (GDV) on open market housing units needs to reflect additional sales cost assumptions relating to the disposing of the completed residential units. This will include legal, agents and marketing fees at the rate of 3% of the open market unit GDV, which is based on industry accepted scales established from discussions with developers and agents.

Delivery rates and finance

5.43 For the generic testing, the scheme delivery rates, and therefore phasing of costs, follows a formula based on the number of units and site areas. For the strategic sites, the delivery rates reflect the Council’s trajectory, with delivery times shown in Table 5.2.

5.44 A monthly cashflow is used, based on a finance cost of 6.5% pa on negative revenue throughout the site appraisals. This is used to account for the cost of borrowing and the risk associated with the current economic climate and the near-term outlook and associated implications for the housing market.

Developer profit

5.45 The developer's profit is the expected and reasonable level of return that a private developer would expect to achieve from a specific development scheme. For open market residential sales, profit is assumed to be 20% of open market values. This also allows for internal central overheads.

5.46 For the affordable housing element, because they will have some, albeit much lower, risks to the developer, profit is assumed to be 6% of the affordable housing transfer value.

Tested Policy Costs

5.47 In the policy testing the impact of different policies, including S106, affordable housing and improved sustainability standards are assessed. The assessed policies are discussed here.

S106 costs (excluding affordable housing)

5.48 Aside from affordable housing, the Council is likely to continue to seek S106 costs to mitigate the impacts from future developments. The Council has provided details of S106 contributions received from around 30 sites in recent years. From this sample, S106 receipts have averaged around £3,300 per unit, however this will vary based on the individual sites. For policy testing we rely on the mean average across the range where a S106 has been applied.

Policy H10 Affordable Housing

5.49 One of the most significant items of S106 sought from residential development sites is affordable housing, which cannot be paid for through CIL. The PDRC 2018 sets out a
requirement for the following affordable housing requirements, which have informed the site appraisals:

- Brownfield sites of 15 units and over: 20%
- Greenfield sites of 15 units and over: 30%

5.50 For sites with 2 to 15 units, the offsite financial contributions (OSFC) in Table 5.11 have been tested. This is equal to the affordable percentages set out in policy H10 based on the formula that is also prescribed in policy H10, which are referred to in Chapter 3 Table 3.1. The OSFC have been informed by a separate exercise undertaken by Porter PE for the Council, which is shown in Appendix 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land type</th>
<th>AH target</th>
<th>OSFC per unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£33,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£33,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£24,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£24,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£9,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£9,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£16,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£24,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£18,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>£28,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£4,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>Village/Rural</td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£13,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.51 The policy also requires affordable housing tenures to align with the SHMA (2016) recommendations, and therefore the following affordable housing tenure types are tested:

- 20% Intermediate
- 80% Social and Affordable Rented housing (equally split in testing)

5.52 The appraisal assumes that affordable housing will command a transfer value to a Registered Provider at lower than market rates. The values had been confirmed by the Council Housing team but updated to reflect national changes in affordable housing provision, such as the rent review. The testing applies the transfer values set out in Table 5.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing tenure</th>
<th>Value of open market units</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Flat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social rent</td>
<td>40% =</td>
<td>£1,060</td>
<td>£1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable rent</td>
<td>50% =</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate/ shared ownership</td>
<td>70% =</td>
<td>£1,855</td>
<td>£2,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Policy CC1, CC2 & CC3 costs associated with Sustainable Design and Construction*

5.53 As noted in Chapter 3, through the PDRC 2018 policies CC1 to CC3, the Council is seeking higher design standards. As a minimum, residential development will need to
comply with the energy performance standards set in the building regulations. A report by the Carbon Trust for CYC\textsuperscript{44} identifies the potential average cost of the three policies, and these costs have been tested in the following assumptions:

- **Policy CC1 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation** – No costs have been provided since the Carbon Trust notes that further work is required. Potentially this will be a wider infrastructure cost that could be supported through CIL charging rather than a specific scheme contribution.

- **Policy CC2 Energy efficiency and water policy** and **Policy CC3 District Heating and CHP Networks connection** have been costed by the Carbon Trust, as summarised in **Table 5.13**

**Table 5.13 Tested costs associated with policies CC1, CC2 & CC3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Per unit ‘process’ cost to developer</th>
<th>Per unit build costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small scheme (5 homes)</td>
<td>Medium scheme (50 homes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2 Energy efficiency: 19% reduction in carbon energy*</td>
<td>£686</td>
<td>£136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2: Water policy: 110 litres per person per day</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3: District Heating and CHP Networks connection</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>£723</strong></td>
<td><strong>£142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carbon Trust, Climate Change section of the City of York PDRC 2018

**Policy H5 Gypsy & Travellers**

5.54 Policy H5 includes a requirement for the provision of Gypsy and Traveller sites. This is based on a hierarchy of the number of dwellings in the development set out in the policy, as follows:

- 100-499 dwellings – 2 pitches should be provided
- 500-999 dwellings – 3 pitches should be provided
- 1000-1499 dwellings – 4 pitches should be provided
- 1500-1999 dwellings – 5 pitches should be provided
- 2000 or more dwellings – 6 pitches should be provided

5.55 The cost of providing a serviced and ‘ready to go’ plot varies depending on specification, however an average may be around £150,000 per pitch. This figure has been informed by consultation with providers who have tendered for these types of development based on schemes of between 3 and 20 pitches, which have been accounted for in the appraisals.

\textsuperscript{44} Climate Change section of the City of York Local Plan, Carbon Trust report, Draft version: 01/06/2017
Residential Benchmark Land Values

5.56 After systematically removing the various costs detailed above from the sales values, the result is the residual land value. To ascertain the level of likelihood towards delivery and the level of risk associated with development viability, the resulting residual land values are measured against a benchmark value which reflects a value range that a landowner would reasonably be expected to sell/release their land for development.

5.57 In setting a benchmark at which a landowner is prepared to sell to enable a consideration of viability can be a complex process. There are a wide range of site specific variables which affect land sales (e.g. position of the landowner – are they requiring a quick sale or is it a long-term land investment?). There are a wide range of permutations here where the land values on future individual sites are unknown, so a pragmatic approach is required. For the scope of this exercise, which is for policy purposes, the viability assessments are assumed as being planning led, i.e. as set out in national planning guidance which advises “…land or site value should reflect policy requirements, planning obligation requirements, and where applicable the CIL.”

5.58 Whilst the assessments seek to test a range of likely market conditions evident within the City of York, we also seek to ensure that, as far as is possible in all other respects, we are comparing like with like. For this purpose, it is assumed that the benchmark land value should be the minimum value that a reasonable landowner would accept for their site based on the existing use (pre-planning consent, pre-site preparation, pre-policy costs, etc,) plus a premium for the inconvenience in selling for an alternative use. This differs to a market value that may be achieved, say through an auction, where by the price is the demand value of the site rather than the minimal price that a landowner would be willing to accept.

5.59 PBA consulted many sources to determine what could be a suitable value in which a landowner could reasonably be willing to sell the land for. For instance, PBA reviewed websites such as CoStar, confidential appraisals held by the local council and websites of local land agents to identify an approximate sales value, albeit accepting that most of this data would reflect the market value rather than minimum value.

5.60 From this, a sample of data from CoStar indicated that brownfield land values averaged around £1,000,000 per hectare, although there were some exceptions. For instance, a site of almost half a hectare in York recently sold for £1.05m per hectare and two other sites of approximately 1.5 hectares in nearby Knaresborough which sold for almost £900,000.

5.61 Some of the land where larger, new residential development will take place is likely to be agricultural. The VOA’s 2011 Property Market Report indicates that the highest average value agricultural land in North Yorkshire is worth approximately £21,000 per hectare. To inform residential land values, a multiplier of between 15 and 20 times is often applied. This would suggest that residential land values on large greenfield sites should be in the region of £315,000 per ha and £420,000 per ha.

45 NPPG 2014 ("Viability and decision taking" paragraph 023)
5.62 In coming to a view on the benchmark land value, PBA also considered available evidence in other comparable locations in the sub-region and the residential values being achieved there and their relative strength or weakness as a residential location in comparison to York. Table 5.14 shows a sample of benchmark land values used in recent appraisals in neighbouring areas.

Table 5.14 Land values in neighbouring authorities’ CIL and/or plan viability studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Benchmark Land value per ha</th>
<th>Appraisal date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>Low areas: £450,000</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate areas: £650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High areas: £900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>High Density: £1,684,227</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Density: £1,012,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Density: £365,247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryedale</td>
<td>Low areas: £600,000</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate areas: £750,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High areas: £900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.63 This uncertainty is considered when drawing conclusions and recommendations. From PBA’s research, it is concluded that the values in Table 5.15 are appropriate benchmarks for policy testing. For older person properties, developers tend to prefer city centre locations and therefore we apply a city centre rate for older person and specialist accommodation schemes.

Table 5.15 Benchmark land values for residential sites without planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site location/type</th>
<th>Per hectare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City centre/extension</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban &amp; suburban</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village /rural</td>
<td>£800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic site</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older person/specialist housing schemes</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.64 It is important to appreciate that assumptions on benchmark/threshold land values can only be broad approximations subject to a wide margin of uncertainty.

Non-residential Testing Assumptions

5.65 The review of the PDRC 2018 identified few policies that would likely to be burdensome to non-residential development, so the primary purpose for looking at the current viability of non-residential uses is to identify any headroom that might be used for supporting infrastructure funding through CIL and/or S106/S278.

5.66 Non-residential viability testing requires a series of assumptions about site typologies based on different use types, along with site coverage, rents and yields to generate an overall sales turnover and value of land, which along with viability assumptions are discussed here for non-residential testing. Therefore, the previous work by PBA has been copied into this report to be considered in the recommendations in Chapter 7.
Non-residential Site Typologies

5.67 For identifying a potential for CIL, the typologies shown in Table 5.16 are to be tested. These have been agreed with the Council and were sense checked against the views of the development industry to ensure they reflect the character of development likely to come forward in the plan period.

Table 5.16 Non-residential use typologies for testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>GIA (sqm)</th>
<th>NIA (sqm)</th>
<th>Site area (ha)</th>
<th>Site cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: City centre office</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: City/town centre retail</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation (100 bed)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care home (40 bed)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-residential Values and Cost Assumptions

Establishing gross development value (GDV)

5.68 In establishing the GDV for non-residential uses for the variety of development types, PBA had considered historical comparable evidence for new values on a local, regional and national scale, as discussed in Chapter 4. The tested value assumptions for a variety of non-residential uses, expressed in square metres of net rentable floorspace, are summarised in Table 5.17.

Table 5.17 Tested non-residential rents and yields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Rents (per sqm*)</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: City centre office</td>
<td>£160</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>£170</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>£180</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>£180</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>£165</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>£160</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: City centre retail</td>
<td>£195</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>£3,300 per bed</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation (100 unit)</td>
<td>£3,500 per bed</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care home (40 bed)</td>
<td>£8,000 per bed</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*apart from hotels, student accommodation and care homes, which are based on a per bed value

Source: PBA research

Build cost assumptions

5.69 Build cost inputs have been established from the BCIS values, rebased to City of York prices at 2015 Q3 at the following values shown in Table 5.18.
Table 5.18 Tested non-residential build costs in York at Q3 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Cost per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: City centre office</td>
<td>£1,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>£1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>£773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>£1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>£1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>£1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>£641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: City centre retail</td>
<td>£1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>£1,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation (100 unit)</td>
<td>£1,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care home (40 bed)</td>
<td>£1,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BCIS

Other development assumptions

5.70 Table 5.19 sets out the other development assumptions that are used for high level testing. The assumptions remain identical to those used in the PBA September 2017 Report. Developer contributions also have an impact on the viability of a project, but rather than including a specific figure within the appraisal, this is considered when looking at the potential CIL rate from the viability headroom at the final stage of the appraisal.

Table 5.19 Tested other development cost assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rates used in appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Externals</td>
<td>These covers external build costs for site preparation and includes items such as internal access roads, car parking, landscaping, drainage, utilities and services within the site.</td>
<td>15% of build costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>Professional fees are based upon accepted industry standards.</td>
<td>10% of build costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Contingency is based upon the risk associated with each site.</td>
<td>4% of construction cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale costs</td>
<td>This is an allowance for legal, surveyor and marketing fees and based on industry accepted scales.</td>
<td>3% of gross development value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance costs</td>
<td>Based upon the likely cost of development finance we have used current market rates of interest.</td>
<td>7% of negative cashflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Gross development profit (including central overheads).</td>
<td>20% of total development costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees on land purchase</td>
<td>This input represents the fees associated with the lands purchase and are based upon the following industry standards.</td>
<td>1% for surveyors and 0.75% for legal costs of the residual land value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamp duty</td>
<td>A Stamp Duty Land Tax is payable by a developer when acquiring development land.</td>
<td>Standard variable rates set out by HMRC depending on size of the residual land value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tested Policy Costs

Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction
5.71 As identified in the policy matrix in Chapter 3, the PDRC 2018 indicates that all new non-residential buildings should achieve BREEAM Excellent (or equivalent). Based on a report from the Carbon Trust\(^{46}\), the following assumptions apply for meeting standard:

- 0.77% for office development;
- 0.4% for warehouse development; and
- 0.24% for supermarket development.

5.72 For all other uses, 0.5% has been added to the build cost.

Non-residential Benchmark Land Values

5.73 PBA consulted several sources to determine what could be a suitable existing use value in which a landowner could reasonably be willing to sell the land for. For instance, PBA reviewed websites such as CoStar, confidential appraisals held by the local council and websites of local land agents to gain an approximate sales value. The benchmark values are given in Table 5.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Per net ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: City centre office</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>£850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: City centre retail</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation (100 unit)</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care home (40 bed)</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{46}\) Climate Change section of the City of York Local Plan, Carbon Trust report, Draft version: 01/06/2017
6 Viability: Results

Introduction

6.1 This chapter sets out the viability assessments of PDRC 2018 policies to identify and assess their burden on future development within the City of York. This is based on running iterative viability appraisals, introducing PDRC 2018 policies including the cumulative impacts of S106, the affordable housing policies and renewable energy standards on future residential development.

6.2 In addition, the potential viability headroom for different uses for introducing CIL charging, and the maximum value of any charges, is considered in balance with local policies on residential and non-residential developments, which are considered in turn.

6.3 Appendix 1 includes full policy compliant viability appraisals examples for a 20 dwellings typology in the City of York and a non-residential appraisal using a supermarket typology.

PDRC 2018 Policies Testing on Residential Development

6.4 Each residential typology site has been tested through a detailed development appraisal with cashflow analysis. The impacts of policy costs impacts are considered by adding further policy 'layers' to judge the cumulative impact of policies. These are tested as follows:

- Policy layer 1 – This is a base layer, which includes open space and design cost allowances, but no policy layer applied;
- Policy layer 2 – This layer adds an S106 contribution at £3,300 per unit to the Policy layer 1;
- Policy layer 3 – This layer includes Policy layer 2 and the policy requirement for affordable housing as set out in the PDRC 2018 policy H10.
- Policy layer 4 – This includes Policy layer 3 and the requirement for meeting sustainable construction standards as set out in the PDRC 2018 policy CC2 and CC3.
- Policy layer 5 – This includes Policy layer 4 and an allowance for Gypsy and Traveller pitches as set out in PDRC 2018 policy H5. This only applies to sites with 100 or more units.

Residential Testing Viability Results

6.5 The following tables present the cumulative policy viability findings for the site typologies (Table 6.1) and the tested strategic sites (Table 6.2). The tables use a 'traffic light' system, as follows:

- Green colour means that the development is viable with financial headroom that could be used for further planning gain;
- Amber is marginal in that they fall within a 20% range around (i.e., 10% above or below) the benchmark land value; and
- Red colour means it is unviable if required to be policy compliant.
6.6 In addition to identifying the viability outcome required to deliver the tested site typologies, the potential positive financial headroom per CIL liable square metre of development above this level is also shown. That is the headroom between value and all costs, including the cost of the land, associated with each typology, and is derived by dividing the total headroom by the CIL liable floorspace (i.e. for open market uses only because affordable housing floorspace is exempt).

6.7 Table 6.1 shows that there is viability across nearly all residential site typologies with the imposition of the key PPDRC policies (i.e. at cumulative policy layer 4 or 5). The exceptions are for the smaller site typologies (with 10, 8 or 7 units) outside of the City Centre, where the full cumulative burden gives marginal viability. However, this is marginal and therefore unlikely to put at serious risk the bulk of smaller sites coming forward since a minor change in market conditions or, for example, the tested average S106 policy requirements, will bring these sites forward with a positive headroom.

6.8 Table 6.1 also shows that Retirement homes sites achieve negative viability beyond the s106 requirements from Policy layer 3 onwards, while Extra-care dwelling sites has negative viability even before the imposition of PDRC 2018 policies. However, this does not suggest that such sites will not come forward because the value that can be achieved by retirement/Extra-care home developers who are also the providers, like McCarthy and Stone, is increased through on-going service charges for facilities and services that are typically charged on the occupiers of these developments. Also, each site’s planning obligations should be considered on an individual case basis.

6.9 The high-level viability impact of each cumulative policy layer scenario on the strategic sites is shown in Table 6.2. Based on the general assumptions that have been applied, Table 6.2 shows that it would be viable to require full policy compliance (at cumulative policy layer 5) on all the strategic sites. However, this finding is based on generic assumptions and therefore will be subject to further detail in relation to specific site costs and S106 requirements to make these larger sites acceptable in planning terms.

### Table 6.1 Viability and available CIL headroom (sqm) of typology sites under cumulative policy layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site typology</th>
<th>Cumulative policy layers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy layer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Large - 95 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium - 50 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small - 20 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Large - 45 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Medium - 25 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Small - 10 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Large - 140 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Medium - 38 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Small - 8 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Village - 122 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Large - 33 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site typology</th>
<th>Cumulative policy layers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy layer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Medium - 7 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Small - 1 dwellings - Greenfield</td>
<td>£217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Large - 95 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Medium - 50 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small - 20 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Large - 45 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Medium - 25 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban - Small - 10 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Large - 140 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Medium - 38 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban - Small - 8 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Village - 122 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Large - 33 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Medium - 7 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village - Small - 1 dwellings - Brownfield</td>
<td>£122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-care Brownfield</td>
<td>-£72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Home Brownfield</td>
<td>£97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-care Greenfield</td>
<td>-£43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Home Greenfield</td>
<td>£70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.2 Viability of typology sites under cumulative policy layers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site typology</th>
<th>Cumulative policy layers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy layer 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1 British Sugar</td>
<td>£565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2 Civil Service Sports Ground</td>
<td>£345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4 Land adj Hull Road</td>
<td>£352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5 York Central</td>
<td>£587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 Land East of Metcalfe Lane</td>
<td>£413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8 Land North of Monks Cross</td>
<td>£419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST9 Land North of Haxby</td>
<td>£417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST14 Land to West of Wigginton Road</td>
<td>£413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST15 Land to west of Elvington Lane</td>
<td>£406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST16 Terrys</td>
<td>£453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST17 Nestle South</td>
<td>£529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST31 Land South of Tadcaster Rd, Copmanthorpe</td>
<td>£432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST32 Hungate (Phases 5+)</td>
<td>£573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST33 Station Yard, Wheldrake</td>
<td>£412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST35 Queen Elizabeth Barracks</td>
<td>£467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST36 Imphal Barracks (MOD)</td>
<td>£522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential for Residential CIL rates

6.10 To assess the scope for charging a CIL rate within the City of York, the analysis in this section looks at the headroom, which is the difference between the benchmark land value and the residual land value, per CIL liable square metre of floorspace (i.e. for open market uses only because affordable housing floorspace is CIL exempt).

6.11 The headrooms shown in Tables 6.1 and Table 6.2 are the maximum amount after all costs, including policy costs, have been considered under current market conditions. As this effectively shows the maximum amount that could contribute to a CIL charge it is prudent that a financial buffer is adopted to avoid setting a CIL charge at the margins of viability.

6.12 A key finding from Table 6.1 is that the viability headrooms vary but not substantially. The main differences are summarised in Table 6.3, which shows the average headrooms for the typologies by area type and sizes. Most of the tested sites can support a CIL rate up to a maximum of almost £200. For this reason, we would recommend that a CIL rate of £130 per sqm, which is at most two-thirds of the average headroom, would be achievable without putting the bulk of sites within the City of York at risk of delivery.

6.13 The exception may be for small sites outside of the City Centre, where small urban and suburban sites, and medium and small sites in village areas, with around 10 or fewer units, and any sites identified for retirement homes and Extra-care, where there is limited or no headroom for CIL, and therefore these should be zero rated on viability grounds within the current market conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.3 Average headrooms by area type and site size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre/City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.14 Whether the recommended CIL rates based on the tested site typologies would undermine the delivery of the strategic sites is considered based on the headrooms in Table 6.2. In doing so, it is assumed that the sites will be prioritised to meet the full policy level, and therefore the potential headroom for charging CIL is considered at the cumulative policy layer 5. This shows that the suggested CIL rate of £130 per sqm would comfortably be able to be afforded by most of the strategic sites subject to any significant requirements sought through S106 or significant abnormal site costs.

PDRC 2018 Policies Testing on Non-Residential Development

6.15 Each non-residential typology site has been subjected to a detailed appraisal, complete with cashflow analysis. The only policy that is considered to have some impact on the viability of delivery is Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction, which requires a BREEAM ‘excellent’ rating in new non-residential buildings, as discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 5. This has been considered through as an added policy layer to judge the impact of this policy when setting a CIL charge by using the following policy layer testing:

- Policy layer 1 – This is a base layer, where no policies are applied; and
- Policy layer 2 – This layer includes the requirement for achieving a BREEAM ‘excellent’ delivery in line with Policy CC2: Sustainable Design and Construction.

6.16 The tests have not accounted for s106/s278 contributions to mitigate direct impacts of the development. This is because s106/s278 agreements are likely to vary more than they do for residential schemes owing to the specifics of individual developments which are not yet known. These payments will often centre on highways improvements but could also relate to design and access. This potential cost needs factoring in when considering the headroom to support a CIL charge.

6.17 The results of each policy layer’s impact on the tested non-residential ‘typology’ sites are displayed using a traffic-light system along with the estimate financial headroom. This headroom can be used to determine the scope for a contribution towards CIL or other planning gain through S106/S278. An example of a non-residential site appraisal is provided in Appendix 1.

**PDRC 2018 testing results**

6.18 As noted in Chapter 2, unlike housing sites, the viability of non-residential uses is not necessary for supporting non-residential allocations in the PDRC (2018). However, Local Plans must be realistic and not generate barriers to investment when identifying non-residential allocations and setting policies.

6.19 As shown in Table 6.4, based on current values and costs, retail uses are the only non-residential uses that can show viability with or without meeting the proposed policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction. Table 6.4 appraises the different uses, considering the costs for meeting this policy, which shows the impact is low at a cost of around £4 per sqm. This doesn’t change any viability conclusions, but it does reduce the positive financial headroom of retail slightly.

6.20 It is important to note that the results only tests development that might be built for subsequent sale or rent to a commercial tenant. But, in today’s market in York, most non-residential developments are undertaken through pre-lets or self-build for specific commercial operators that see greater benefit in the site than might be valued by the market for open sale. Given the small impact of policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction that is identified in Table 6.4, then we would not expect the application of Policy CC2 to affect the delivery of non-residential uses through self-build or pre-let conditions in any significant way.

**Potential for a Non-residential CIL rate**

6.21 As discussed above, the only non-residential developments within the City of York that can be considered viable at today’s costs and values is retail. Therefore, only retail uses should be liable for a positive CIL charge because the retail headrooms shown in Table 6.4 indicate that there is scope to introduce a CIL charge without undermining future delivery. For this we would recommend that at least a 50% buffer is used to suitably allow for other potential S106 contribution, before considering the headroom for identifying a potential CIL rate.
Table 6.4 Non-residential uses viability and financial headroom for CIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Policy layer 1 - no specific policy costs</th>
<th>Policy layer 1 - CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: City centre office</td>
<td>-£351</td>
<td>-£364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>-£199</td>
<td>-£211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>-£539</td>
<td>-£543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>£469</td>
<td>£466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>£348</td>
<td>£344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>£238</td>
<td>£234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>£614</td>
<td>£610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: City centre retail</td>
<td>£101</td>
<td>£93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>-£415</td>
<td>-£422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation</td>
<td>-£165</td>
<td>-£175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care home</td>
<td>-£307</td>
<td>-£315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.22 Since supermarkets, smaller supermarkets and retail warehouses are most likely to occur in out of town locations, the results of the commercial testing would therefore indicate that a city centre CIL rate and an out of city centre CIL rate would be appropriate for the City of York.

6.23 For retail outside the city centre, the testing shows that a substantial CIL charge could be afforded at the full policy level. But this does range from £234 for out of centre supermarkets to £466 for retail warehouses. After considering the need for s106/s278 contributions to be applied to such uses in addition to any CIL, then a potential CIL rate at about £200 per sqm should leave enough headroom for other site mitigations costs without putting at risk most retail developments outside the York city centre.

6.24 The £200 CIL rate might be difficult for the larger supermarkets in out of centre areas which have the lowest headroom. However, the market is preferring central locations in smaller formats stores and therefore not delivering out of centre large supermarkets. Also, the PDRC 2018 is not dependent on these schemes coming forward to support the aims of the emerging Plan. Therefore, a single rate set at £200 per sqm is not likely to undermine the bulk of retail delivery on out of centre sites, and would be appropriate for keeping CIL simple, which is its original purpose.

6.25 Conversely, the viability results show that retail warehouses potentially are able to afford much more than £200 per sqm in CIL, but recently there has been doubts over the covenants of national occupiers that tend to occupy such stores like Toys R Us and Mothercare, which have not kept abreast of changing consumer trends, and therefore it may be safer to apply a low CIL but keep this under close review. Again, this adds to the simplicity of implementing a CIL charge.

6.26 For retail within the city centre, the viability headroom is much lower at £93 per CIL liable sqm, which would suggest that a much lower CIL rate would need to be set.
Therefore, based on the typology viability testing, it is recommended that a CIL rate for all retail floorspace inside the city centre is charged at £45 per square metre.
7 Conclusions and Recommendations

Testing of the City of York PDRC 2018 Viability

7.1 The final stage of this viability assessment is to draw broad conclusions on whether the emerging Local Plan is deliverable in terms of viability. A key finding of this report is that the viability testing results imply that the cumulative impact of the policies in the PDRC 2018 document do not put implementation of the emerging plan at serious risk.

7.2 So, it is concluded that in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 173, the PDRC 2018 would not unduly burden the delivery of residential and non-residential development in the City of York.

Recommendation for CIL Charging in the City of York

7.3 The assessment can draw conclusions for introducing a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) that may be affordable in the City of York. It is considered that the recommended residential and non-residential CIL rates in Table 7.1 would be affordable without putting at risk the bulk of development sites in most parts of the unitary authority area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use/location</th>
<th>Rate per liable sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential sites in the City Centre</td>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential sites outside of the City Centre with 11 or more units</td>
<td>£130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential sites outside of the City Centre with 10 or fewer units</td>
<td>zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older person and specialist housing (supported/extra-care, etc)</td>
<td>zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All retail units inside the city centre / central area</td>
<td>£45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All retail units outside the city centre / central area</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other forms of non-residential floorspace</td>
<td>zero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1

Example Appraisals
# Development Viability Appraisal of a 20 unit Flatted Residential Scheme

## Centre/ City Centre Extension - Small - 20 dwellings - Greenfield

### Residual Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NR of units</th>
<th>UNIT 1</th>
<th>UNIT 2</th>
<th>UNIT 3</th>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats (NA)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>£1,650</td>
<td>£173,448</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social rent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NR of units</th>
<th>UNIT 1</th>
<th>UNIT 2</th>
<th>UNIT 3</th>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats (NA)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>£1,650</td>
<td>£173,448</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,325</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable rental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NR of units</th>
<th>UNIT 1</th>
<th>UNIT 2</th>
<th>UNIT 3</th>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats (NA)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,310</td>
<td>£151,767</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,855</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,855</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£1,855</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jul-19 to Feb-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Development Value

### Gross Development value

£3,071,475

## 2.0 Developer's Profit

### Private units

20.0% on OM GDV | £505,890 | Feb-21 to Mar-21

### Starter Home

10.0% on Starter Home value | £0 | Feb-21 to Mar-21

### Affordable units

8% on AH transfer values | £32,522 | Feb-21 to Mar-21

### Total Developer's Profit

£538,412

## 3.0 Development Costs

### Sales cost

3.00% on OM GDV | £75,884 | Jul-19 to Feb-21

### Build Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NR of units</th>
<th>UNIT 1</th>
<th>UNIT 2</th>
<th>UNIT 3</th>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats (GIA)</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>£1,124</td>
<td>£990,778</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Affordable units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>NR of units</th>
<th>UNIT 1</th>
<th>UNIT 2</th>
<th>UNIT 3</th>
<th>UNIT 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats (GIA)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>£1,124</td>
<td>£424,619</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ bed house</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>£958</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 to Aug-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Extra over construction costs

### Earmarked

15% extra-over on build cost | £141,539 | Jan-19 to Aug-20

### Total build costs

£1,415,397

### Extra over construction costs

£141,540

Cont’d
### 3.4 Professional fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1 Professional fees</td>
<td>8% on build costs (incl. externals)</td>
<td>£124,555</td>
<td>Jan-19 Aug-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total professional fees** £124,555

### 3.5 Contingency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1 Contingency</td>
<td>4% on build costs (incl. externals)</td>
<td>£67,260</td>
<td>Jan-19 Aug-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total contingency** £67,260

### 3.6 Developer contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6.1 AH Commuted Sum</td>
<td>£0 per unit</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 Oct-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.2 Policy X Sustainable construction and design</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21,480</td>
<td>Jan-19 Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.3 Gypsy &amp; Traveller</td>
<td>£150,000 per pitch</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>Jan-19 Aug-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.4 S106 contribution</td>
<td>£3,300 per unit</td>
<td>£66,000</td>
<td>Jan-19 Oct-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total developer contributions** £87,480

### 4.0 Site Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Net site value (residual land value)</td>
<td></td>
<td>£524,467</td>
<td>Jan-19 Oct-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Stamp Duty</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,723</td>
<td>Jan-19 Oct-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Purchaser costs</td>
<td>1.8% on land costs</td>
<td>£19,440</td>
<td>Jan-19 Oct-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total site costs** £549,631

**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (EXCLUDING INTEREST)** £3,000,157

**TOTAL INCOME - TOTAL COSTS (EXCLUDING INTEREST)** £71,318

### 5.0 Finance Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>PCM</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Finance</td>
<td>6.50% on net costs</td>
<td>0.526%</td>
<td>-£71,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (INCLUDING INTEREST)** £3,071,475

---

This appraisal has been prepared for the Council. The appraisal has been prepared in line with the RICS valuation guidance. The purpose of the appraisal is to inform the Council about the impact of planning policy has on viability at a strategic level. This appraisal is not a formal ‘Red Book’ (RICS Valuation – Professional Standards January 2014) valuation and should not be relied upon as such.
## Development Viability Appraisal of a Supermarket Scheme

### Development Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>Residual value</th>
<th>Net Site Area</th>
<th>0.63</th>
<th>£2,934,334.63 per ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1.0 Development Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Size sq.m</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>£7,464,286 per unit</th>
<th>Capital Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1.1 | 6: Supermarket | 1 | 2375 | 165 | 5.3% | £7,464,286 |

- **Rent free period**: 0 No. of months
- **Adjusted for rent free**: May-17

| Total development value | £7,464,286 |

### Development Cost

#### 2.0 Development Cost

#### 2.1 Site Acquisition

- **Site value (residual land value)**: £1,833,959
- **Purchaser costs**: £113,292

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser costs</td>
<td>Aug-16 Aug-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site value (residual land value)</td>
<td>Aug-16 Aug-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Development Cost | £7,250,686 |

### Build Costs

#### 2.2 Build Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>Size sq.m</th>
<th>Cost per sq.m</th>
<th>Total Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **2.2.1 6: Supermarket**: 1, 2,500, £1,317, £3,292,500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 6: Supermarket</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Build Costs | £3,300,402 |

### Externals

#### 2.3 Externals

- **external works as a percentage of build costs**: 15.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External works</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Externals | £495,060 |

### Professional Fees

#### 2.4 Professional Fees

- **as percentage of build costs & externals**: 10%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Professional Fees | £379,546 |

### Total Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total construction costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Construction Costs | £4,175,009 |

### Contingency

#### 3.0 Contingency

- **as a percentage of total construction costs**: 4%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Contingency | £167,000 |

### TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS (including land payment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Development Costs | £6,062,676 |

### Developers' Profit

#### 4.0 Developers' Profit

- **as percentage of total development costs**: 20%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developers' Profit</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Developers' Profit | £1,212,535 |

### TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (EXCLUDING INTEREST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Project Costs | £7,275,211 |

### TOTAL INCOME - TOTAL COSTS (EXCLUDING INTEREST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Income - Total Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Income - Total Costs | £189,075 |

### Finance Costs

#### 5.0 Finance Costs

- **APR**: 7.00%
- **PCM**: 0.35%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Finance Costs | £189,075 |

### TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (INCLUDING INTEREST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>Sep-16 May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Project Costs | £7,464,286 |

---

This appraisal has been prepared on behalf of the Council. The appraisal has been prepared in line with the RICS valuation guidance. The purpose of the appraisal is to inform Council as to the impact of planning policy has on viability at a strategic borough level. This appraisal is not a formal 'Red Book' (RICS Valuation – Professional Standards January 2014) valuation and should not be relied upon as such.
APPENDIX 2

Developer Workshop Note
Meeting Title: City of York Plan Viability Developer Workshop

Signed in attendees:  
- **PBA:** Russell Porter (RP) and Tom Marshall (TM);  
- **CYC:** Ian Stokes (IS), Martin Grainger, Derek Gauld, Ben Murphy;  
- **Barratt Homes:** Daniel Starkey;  
- **O’Neill Associates:** Eamonn Keogh;  
- **National Railway Museum:** Tom Devine;  
- **Taylor Wimpey:** Jennie Walker and Rob McLackland;  
- **Redrow Homes:** Lindsey Ramsden;  
- **Johnson Mowat:** Mark Johnson;  
- **PB Planning:** Paul Butler;  
- **Persimmon Homes:** John Kirkham;  
- **Planning Prospects:** Jason Tait;  
- **Rapleys:** Neil Jones.

Date of Meeting: 22nd September 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Introduction</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS introduced the workshop and explained how the study fitted with the preparation of the emerging York Local Plan and a potential CIL (if found to be feasible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. Purpose of the Workshop** | N/A |
| RP explained the background to PBA’s commission and its experience in this type of work. | |
| RP explained that PBA is assessing viability in terms of whole plan viability test including any potential Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). | |
| RP explained that the purpose of the workshop is to find out about local experience of development, including CIL, and approaches to testing viability in York. RP added that PBA is willing to follow-up today’s ‘interactive’ workshop with further dialogue with delegates as necessary | RP / TM / delegates (as necessary) |

| **3. Approach** | No comments were made, so it assumed that the approach is acceptable. |
| RP explained the approach to viability testing using the slide copied below, in particular noting that it followed a residual land value approach, as recommended in government, RTPI and RICS guidance notes, and that it would be applied with iterations (scenarios) in testing for an appropriate balance between plan policies and infrastructure funding. | |
| RP discussed the legislative background underpinning PBA’s approach to Viability involving the Harman Report, RICS Guidance and the PPG. | |
4. Sites for non-residential uses to be tested

TM explained that there is a need for identifying suitable and appropriate development typologies for testing the impact of Local Plan policies and CIL on the future land supply and development, which should be discussed and generally agreed by stakeholders at this workshop.

There was general agreement that those identified in the workshop slide (copied below) broadly reflected future development typologies in the city, but one consultee suggested the potential for A3 leisure uses such as out-of-town trampoline centres and gyms, and A4 uses such as Pubs and Restaurants should be considered.

---

### Viability modelling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>GIA (sqm)</th>
<th>Size (Ha)</th>
<th>Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Town centre office</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>150%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Business park</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Small local convenience</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supermarket</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Retail warehouse</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Town centre retail</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hotel (60 beds)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student Accommodation (100 bed)</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Care Home (40 bed)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An iterative approach...

**Note** Benchmark land value = current market value + uplift to encourage a willingness to bring land forward for development.

PBA to review the need to consider A3 and A4 uses in the appraisals.
5. Non-residential sales values - rents and yields assumptions

TM set out the recent average data on non-residential transactions in and around York (slide copied below).

TM explained that these were sought from recent transactions from sites such as COSTAR. Properties currently being advertised (on sites such as Right Move) and research documents from commercial agents such as Savills, Knight Frank etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(£ per sq m p.a.)</td>
<td>(£ per sq m p.a.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(£ per hectare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Town centre office</td>
<td>£160</td>
<td>£14.9</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Business park</td>
<td>£170</td>
<td>£15.8</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Industrial / warehouse</td>
<td>£75</td>
<td>£7.0</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>£850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Small local convenience</td>
<td>£180</td>
<td>£16.7</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Smaller supermarket</td>
<td>£180</td>
<td>£16.7</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Supermarket</td>
<td>£165</td>
<td>£15.3</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Retail warehouse</td>
<td>£160</td>
<td>£14.9</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Town centre retail</td>
<td>£195</td>
<td>£18.1</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
<td>£4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Hotel (60 bed)</td>
<td>£3,300 per bed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Student accommodation (100 bed)</td>
<td>£3,500 per bed</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Care Home (40 bed)</td>
<td>£8,000 per bed</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>£2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One response noted a belief that the yields were a little low. TM and RP have requested further information regarding this.

It was noted that many of the attendees had a greater understanding on the residential sector, as opposed to the non-residential, and that many attendees would like to circulate the slides around colleagues for more info.

Otherwise, no further comments.

6. Non-residential build costs

TM set out the build costs in the slide copied below and confirmed that these were based on BCIS median averages, rebased to York in Q3 2015.

No comments were made. PBA will await any further feedback following the workshop.
7. Non-residential other development assumptions

TM presented other development costs assumptions for non-residential development that are listed in the workshop slide copied below. It was commented that externals were set high at 15% because to include all site costs, including car parking and access.

Assumptions

Other key non-residential costs assumptions...

- Externals (including site costs): 15% of build costs
- Contingency: 4% of build costs
- Professional fees: 10% of build costs
- Sales Fees: 3% of Open market GDV
- Finance: 7% applied to the cashflow on a monthly basis
- Developer return: 20% of Gross Development Costs

No comments were given regarding this slide

8. Sites for Residential uses to be tested

TM presented the proposed residential typologies in the slide below to be tested, explaining that there are two sets of residential testing: one covering a typology of sites and the other being more specific to strategic sites.
TM explained PBA’s approach to testing the following ‘typology’ sites, and that they were formed by analysis of the housing allocations report. However, TM also requested feedback that the scale, ‘broad locations’ and the mix of greenfield and brownfield land match those likely to come forward within York.

One respondent asked if the strategic sites included the land required for public open space (POS) planning obligations. RP said he that this would be allowed for in converting the gross land to net land area plus contributions to POS will be identified in the S106 or through an appropriate allowance of headroom in the residual value testing.

A point was raised that the Suburban densities tend to be plotting out on 35-40 dph rather than at the levels presented in the slide below because the densities shown are ‘a little aspirational’.

It was also suggested that densities in York may be lower to allow for on-site water retention/attenuation owing to York’s flood risks, which was reflected in the reps to the site allocation consultations.

Assumptions

Identifying a suitable typology of sites...

- To test the suitability of the plan policies (incl. CIL) we are testing a number of ‘typology’ sites
- ‘Typologies’ designed to reflect hypothetical schemes representing sites likely to come forward
- Covering four ‘Broad Locations’
  - Based on City of York’s policy regarding density
  - Informed by previous viability evidence

TM introduced the second suite of typology sites, and that these were ‘strategic sites’ as set out in the preferred sites consultation document (July 2016).

TM stated that PBA would be issuing proformas to site representatives to collect information about site and scheme details to ensure that the appraisals are as accurate as possible.
9. Floorspace

TM presented two sources of floorspace data noting that the left hand column outlined data by house type from over 300 new build properties within York. The right hand column broadly outlined the minimum National Space Standards floorspaces by number of bedrooms.

TM explained that terraced properties appeared larger relative to other location in the UK.

Assumptions
Residential - saleable areas

Floorspace is important because this informs overall revenue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Nett Land (m²)</th>
<th>Nett Gross Buildable (m²)</th>
<th>National Space Standards (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached / 3 bed</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>197.5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached / 4 bed house</td>
<td>138.6</td>
<td>288.9</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed flat</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bed flat</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats (60%)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments were noted, and further evidence was asked for.

One respondent suggested that it would be better to obtain data from a wider timeframe and geography beyond York. Another expressed the view that using the NSS would be the best approach. RP asked stakeholders to provide any evidence to demonstrate why this might be the case for their schemes.
10. Residential sales values

TM presented a number of slides to set out PBA’s approach to residential values. The first ‘set the scene’ in terms of trend data of how York compares to neighbouring areas and the average sales price by type of dwelling for new and existing sales.

Secondly, TM presented sales values mapped across York using the slide below, explaining that PBA did this to establish higher and lower value areas.

TM noted that the four maps indicated a lack of consistency, and concluded that the heat maps did not show a distinct difference of value areas.

TM and RP sought feedback as to whether this was consistent with the views of the development industry. There were no comments to suggest value areas were significantly different across the city except one comment that values can be notably dissimilar at the local street level. It was also commented that values at street level would tend to be more homogenous in the suburbs and outside in places like Huntington.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM then presented the current average values per square metre values for York as a whole (shown below), which would inform the viability testing.</td>
<td>No comments were made. PBA will await any further feedback following the workshop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was no opposition to using these values.

### 11. Residential Build costs

TM presented build costs to be tested in the residential appraisals, explaining that these were from actual tender prices using median BCIS data rebased to Q32015.

**Assumptions**

**Residential build costs**

- Using BGIS latest actual tender prices
- Median data for Q3 2015

- Excludes externals, opening up costs and abnormal costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build Costs</th>
<th>Cost per sqm</th>
<th>Cost per sqft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flats / Apartments</td>
<td>£1.124</td>
<td>£1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (small house builder &lt;3 units)</td>
<td>£1.214</td>
<td>£1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (medium house builder 4 to 14 units)</td>
<td>£1.086</td>
<td>£1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses (large house builder 15+)</td>
<td>£1.058</td>
<td>£1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One stakeholder commented that the median BCIS values would be appropriate for York rather than the often seen lower quartile averages often used in these studies because of the high quality design standards expected and therefore achieved on new builds in York.

PBA will continue to use median data from BCIS as the most appropriate source of build cost data.
One respondent asked why Q3 2015 data was used as opposed to later data. RP explained that this is the latest data available that is based on an actual tender price sample as opposed to a forecast tender price. TM explained that because of various changes in the macroeconomic climate, particularly BREXIT, BCIS’s forecasts were open to a large degree of uncertainty. RP also explained that sales values are also sourced from the last few years and therefore the build costs and values are from similar periods.

12. Benchmark land values and site infrastructure costs

TM presented a slide setting out benchmark land values, abnormal costs and opening up costs.

### Assumptions

**Benchmark land values and site costs**

- Assumed as clean, ‘ready to go’ sites without planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of site</th>
<th>per net hectare</th>
<th>per net acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>£1,500,000</td>
<td>£697,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban, suburban or village / rural</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic site</td>
<td>£400,000</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Plus
  - Any abnormal costs per net ha:
    - Brownfield: £500,000
    - Part brownfield: £150,000
  - Opening up costs per unit for greenfield:
    - <200 units: £5,000
    - 200 to 500: £10,000
    - 500+: £17,000
    - Part greenfield sites = half the above

One stakeholder suggested the difference between Urban’ and ‘Strategic’ land values may be too large. TM reiterated that these were broad brush assumptions and that strategic site representatives would be encouraged to provide specific costs regarding infrastructure items in the forthcoming pro formas.

It was asked if viability assessment would include a cashflow. RP confirmed that the testing would be run on a monthly cashflow based on broad assumptions regarding all developments starting now but would be phased to appropriate build and sales rates. RP asked for any suggestions regarding build out rates and was pointed to review some of the reps submitted to the site allocation consultations which included phasing plans.

13. Other residential development cost assumptions

TM presented a slide setting out other key assumptions relating to externals, contingency, professional fees, sales fees, finance and developer return.
One respondent suggested that it was typical to apply 3 to 5% on build costs to provide a contingency.

An attendee from the council had suggested that 20% profit on cost and 17% on GDV was normally expected to be achieved rather than the 20% on GDV being assumed by the consultants.

14. Policy assumptions

For the final slide regarding assumptions TM presented a slide setting out various indicative policy costs including s106, affordable housing and sustainable design. IS added that policies and hence policy costs would be reviewed and assessed to set the policies in the Local plan Publications Draft.
IS also referred to two Supplementary Planning Guidance available on CYC’s website pertaining to developer contributions towards:

- Educational facilities
- Open Space

15. What happens next and conclusion

RP outlined the remainder of the work timetable. RP also ran through the strategic sites information proforma that is to be issued following the workshop for subsequent completion by delegates.

IS discussed the timetable for the preparation and adoption of the City of York Local plan and CIL as set out in the Local Development Scheme, 2016.

Finally, RP thanked the attendees for coming and provided email addresses for attendees to get in touch if further information is required.
APPENDIX 3

New Build Residential Property Transactions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Property type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Estimated £ per sqm</th>
<th>Price paid</th>
<th>Index at transactn date</th>
<th>Index at Nov/17</th>
<th>Indexed £ per sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Yard</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>£2,087</td>
<td>£265,000</td>
<td>101.68</td>
<td>114.87</td>
<td>£2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>£2,470</td>
<td>£414,995</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>£2,624</td>
<td>£474,995</td>
<td>107.15</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>£2,630</td>
<td>£475,995</td>
<td>107.15</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>£2,752</td>
<td>£255,995</td>
<td>108.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>£2,849</td>
<td>£264,995</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smary Lane</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>£2,260</td>
<td>£495,000</td>
<td>100.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry Gardens</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>£2,647</td>
<td>£540,000</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry Gardens</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>£2,875</td>
<td>£299,000</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>£3,310</td>
<td>£940,000</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>Jan-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>£3,346</td>
<td>£890,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>£3,446</td>
<td>£920,000</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£4,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>£3,585</td>
<td>£950,000</td>
<td>98.87</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£4,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£399,995</td>
<td>98.87</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£499,995</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>£2,513</td>
<td>£499,995</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
<td>£539,995</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Drive</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>£2,703</td>
<td>£399,995</td>
<td>98.87</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>£2,740</td>
<td>£427,495</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
<td>£549,995</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>£2,862</td>
<td>£446,500</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwicke Close</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
<td>£279,000</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>£2,475</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>97.41</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
<td>£249,999</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>105.4</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>105.16</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>108.78</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>£2,973</td>
<td>£330,000</td>
<td>105.16</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebohm Mews</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>£2,414</td>
<td>£279,995</td>
<td>101.68</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>£2,419</td>
<td>£224,995</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebohm Mews</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>£2,481</td>
<td>£468,995</td>
<td>107.15</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£2,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£2,857</td>
<td>£239,995</td>
<td>105.88</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>£2,841</td>
<td>£499,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>£2,896</td>
<td>£402,500</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>£3,009</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>£3,261</td>
<td>£449,950</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£3,571</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£4,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodsworth Avenue</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>108.78</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,563</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
<td>£204,950</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>93.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>£2,784</td>
<td>£514,950</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£2,846</td>
<td>£369,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£2,846</td>
<td>£369,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>£2,894</td>
<td>£384,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>98.87</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,925</td>
<td>£274,950</td>
<td>99.42</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>£2,954</td>
<td>£324,950</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>£3,644</td>
<td>£389,950</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£4,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>£3,846</td>
<td>£499,950</td>
<td>93.57</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£4,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Willows</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>£2,770</td>
<td>£589,950</td>
<td>102.64</td>
<td>116.32</td>
<td>£3,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,627</td>
<td>£246,950</td>
<td>101.76</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£2,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
<td>£204,950</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
<td>£204,950</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
<td>£209,950</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
<td>£209,950</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
<td>£266,000</td>
<td>108.33</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,967</td>
<td>£270,000</td>
<td>105.49</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toremill Close</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>£2,533</td>
<td>£304,000</td>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£2,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossvie Close</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>£2,198</td>
<td>£255,000</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£2,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossvie Close</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>£2,233</td>
<td>£258,995</td>
<td>99.31</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£2,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossvie Close</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£2,836</td>
<td>£189,995</td>
<td>100.57</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossvie Close</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,936</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>99.08</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>£2,922</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>105.49</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£2,987</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>107.36</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>£3,090</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>108.33</td>
<td>115.68</td>
<td>£3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>£1,907</td>
<td>£224,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>£2,132</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>£2,132</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ebor Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>£3,148</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>£2,381</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>95.97</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Square</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>£3,047</td>
<td>£585,000</td>
<td>99.46</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersyde Mews</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>£3,164</td>
<td>£193,000</td>
<td>93.46</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,499</td>
<td>£149,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,533</td>
<td>£152,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>99.46</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>100.88</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>£2,464</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>£2,536</td>
<td>£174,950</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>£2,536</td>
<td>£174,950</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>£2,536</td>
<td>£174,950</td>
<td>99.69</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transtcun date</td>
<td>Index at Nov/17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>Nov-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>£2,935</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Lane</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£1,975</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Tour Way</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>£2,151</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckfield Lane</td>
<td>May-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>£2,157</td>
<td>£192,000</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulley Mews</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>£3,993</td>
<td>£535,000</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£4,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>£2,073</td>
<td>£228,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>£2,136</td>
<td>£235,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£2,162</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>£2,331</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£2,333</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£2,353</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£2,367</td>
<td>£177,500</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>£2,381</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£2,388</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,637</td>
<td>£240,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,660</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>Apr-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>94.35</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£2,823</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>£1,991</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>101.99</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>99.46</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,057</td>
<td>£289,995</td>
<td>95.97</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,113</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,113</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,135</td>
<td>£300,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,163</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,163</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>101.99</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>£2,214</td>
<td>£309,995</td>
<td>99.32</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,220</td>
<td>£312,995</td>
<td>104.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,234</td>
<td>£314,995</td>
<td>104.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>£2,269</td>
<td>£319,995</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>£2,321</td>
<td>£324,995</td>
<td>105.94</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>£2,324</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
<td>£269,995</td>
<td>104.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>£2,356</td>
<td>£277,995</td>
<td>104.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>£2,394</td>
<td>£260,995</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>£2,435</td>
<td>£279,995</td>
<td>107.54</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£2,702</td>
<td>£226,995</td>
<td>104.45</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£2,786</td>
<td>£233,995</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson Street</td>
<td>May-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£2,810</td>
<td>£163,000</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£3,571</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>104.12</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>£2,261</td>
<td>£241,950</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,284</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,393</td>
<td>£224,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>£2,443</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>104.69</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
<td>£229,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>£2,499</td>
<td>£234,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£195,000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Feb-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
<td>£197,950</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,583</td>
<td>£154,950</td>
<td>93.52</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,593</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,654</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,654</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>93.52</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,853</td>
<td>£222,500</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>£2,874</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>101.74</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£2,885</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>104.12</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>£2,911</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
<td>103.08</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>£2,999</td>
<td>£194,950</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>£3,645</td>
<td>£236,950</td>
<td>101.91</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£4,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£2,273</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
<td>£168,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>£2,282</td>
<td>£234,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>£2,349</td>
<td>£241,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£2,746</td>
<td>£183,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£2,761</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,857</td>
<td>£179,995</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>£2,342</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>92.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>£2,354</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>92.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£2,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>Jan-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,642</td>
<td>£158,500</td>
<td>92.37</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,720</td>
<td>£247,500</td>
<td>95.97</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,720</td>
<td>£247,500</td>
<td>99.46</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>£2,977</td>
<td>£264,995</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>£3,011</td>
<td>£267,995</td>
<td>104.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£3,013</td>
<td>£231,995</td>
<td>107.78</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£3,015</td>
<td>£204,995</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£3,039</td>
<td>£233,995</td>
<td>104.95</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£3,059</td>
<td>£207,995</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>107.14</td>
<td>114.49</td>
<td>£3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishophill Senior</td>
<td>Jun-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£2,907</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>94.25</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micklegate</td>
<td>Jan-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Avenue</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>£4,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Avenue</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>£4,962</td>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>£4,091</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>£4,133</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>£4,326</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>£4,359</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>£4,771</td>
<td>£167,000</td>
<td>103.79</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>£4,773</td>
<td>£105,000</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>£4,957</td>
<td>£114,000</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>£5,345</td>
<td>£620,000</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>£5,639</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
<td>103.79</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£6,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>£5,768</td>
<td>£548,000</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£6,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>£5,800</td>
<td>£435,000</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£6,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>£5,838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£6,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>£6,436</td>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>103.79</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£7,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowntree Wharf</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,778</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowntree Wharf</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£2,778</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppergate</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>£3,049</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>£3,875</td>
<td>£248,000</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>£3,875</td>
<td>£310,000</td>
<td>99.14</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£4,031</td>
<td>£249,950</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£4,242</td>
<td>£263,000</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£4,254</td>
<td>£268,000</td>
<td>101.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Oct-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£4,323</td>
<td>£268,000</td>
<td>98.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£4,385</td>
<td>£342,000</td>
<td>103.79</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>£4,484</td>
<td>£286,950</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>£4,563</td>
<td>£365,000</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£4,779</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>102.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Mar-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>£4,844</td>
<td>£310,000</td>
<td>102.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>£5,769</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£6,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>May-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£2,941</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>106.58</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>£2,978</td>
<td>£202,500</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>£3,070</td>
<td>£187,250</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>£3,393</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>£3,523</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>£3,681</td>
<td>£132,500</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>£3,690</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>£4,545</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£3,103</td>
<td>£179,995</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£3,190</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>£3,402</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>£3,583</td>
<td>£171,995</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>£3,696</td>
<td>£169,995</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>£3,696</td>
<td>£169,995</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£3,704</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£3,766</td>
<td>£289,995</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£3,831</td>
<td>£294,995</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>£3,857</td>
<td>£269,995</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£3,878</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>£3,886</td>
<td>£271,995</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£3,896</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£4,086</td>
<td>£302,383</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£4,122</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£4,246</td>
<td>£284,496</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>£4,321</td>
<td>£349,995</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£4,325</td>
<td>£332,995</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>£4,493</td>
<td>£309,995</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>£4,545</td>
<td>£349,995</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£4,616</td>
<td>£309,246</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>£4,757</td>
<td>£332,995</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£2,973</td>
<td>£219,999</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>£3,705</td>
<td>£270,499</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Sep-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£3,758</td>
<td>£232,999</td>
<td>103.79</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>£3,767</td>
<td>£274,999</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>£3,921</td>
<td>£297,999</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£3,922</td>
<td>£199,999</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£3,922</td>
<td>£199,999</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov'17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£4,020</td>
<td>£205,000</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£4,257</td>
<td>£314,999</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£4,286</td>
<td>£209,999</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£4,392</td>
<td>£324,999</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£4,449</td>
<td>£217,999</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£4,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Aug-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£4,718</td>
<td>£292,499</td>
<td>102.89</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>£4,758</td>
<td>£294,999</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£5,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Jun-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>£2,014</td>
<td>£287,995</td>
<td>94.25</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,114</td>
<td>£139,495</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,182</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>May-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>93.72</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>£2,418</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>£2,491</td>
<td>£132,000</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,623</td>
<td>£138,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,651</td>
<td>£166,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,683</td>
<td>£139,495</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>£2,773</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>£2,773</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>Mar-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,827</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>93.65</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield Street</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>£2,300</td>
<td>£138,000</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holgate Road</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>£2,675</td>
<td>£214,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acomb Road</td>
<td>Aug-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>£2,895</td>
<td>£110,000</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holgate Road</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>£2,968</td>
<td>£187,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Court</td>
<td>Jul-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>£1,678</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>£2,336</td>
<td>£142,500</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Property type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Estimated £ per sqm</td>
<td>Price paid</td>
<td>Index at transactn date</td>
<td>Index at Nov’17</td>
<td>Indexed £ per sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Mar-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>£2,394</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>107.07</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>£2,397</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£2,402</td>
<td>£122,500</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>£2,438</td>
<td>£99,950</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>£2,447</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>£2,452</td>
<td>£127,500</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£2,549</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>£2,563</td>
<td>£99,950</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>£2,591</td>
<td>£142,500</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Jan-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>£2,598</td>
<td>£132,500</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>£2,604</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>104.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Feb-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>£2,613</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>106.48</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>106.99</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>£3,125</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.38</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>£2,509</td>
<td>£143,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.39</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>Nov-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Feb-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>£2,117</td>
<td>£135,500</td>
<td>100.94</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Close</td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>£2,188</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
<td>99.14</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Dec-15</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>£2,653</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>103.77</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>Sep-14</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>£2,660</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>114.53</td>
<td>£3,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Land Registry and EPC data
APPENDIX 4

Non-residential Property Transactions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Price per Sqm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakery Yard</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£265,000</td>
<td>£2,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£414,995</td>
<td>£2,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£474,995</td>
<td>£2,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£475,995</td>
<td>£2,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£255,955</td>
<td>£2,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£264,995</td>
<td>£2,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smay Lane</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£495,000</td>
<td>£2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry Gardens</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£540,000</td>
<td>£2,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackberry Gardens</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>£2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£940,000</td>
<td>£3,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£890,000</td>
<td>£3,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lane</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£920,000</td>
<td>£3,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardgraves Mews</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£950,000</td>
<td>£3,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£399,995</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£499,995</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£499,995</td>
<td>£2,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£539,995</td>
<td>£2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Drive</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£399,995</td>
<td>£2,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£427,495</td>
<td>£2,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£549,995</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursary Court</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£446,500</td>
<td>£2,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwicke Close</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£279,000</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£249,999</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£2,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbeam Close</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£330,000</td>
<td>£2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£279,995</td>
<td>£2,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£224,995</td>
<td>£2,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£468,995</td>
<td>£2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£239,995</td>
<td>£2,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£499,950</td>
<td>£2,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£402,500</td>
<td>£2,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£3,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£449,950</td>
<td>£3,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dales Court</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodsworth Avenue</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£199,950</td>
<td>£2,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£204,950</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£514,950</td>
<td>£2,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£369,950</td>
<td>£2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£369,950</td>
<td>£2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£384,950</td>
<td>£2,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£379,950</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£274,950</td>
<td>£2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£324,950</td>
<td>£2,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£389,950</td>
<td>£3,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£499,950</td>
<td>£3,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Willows</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£589,950</td>
<td>£2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£246,950</td>
<td>£2,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£204,950</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£204,995</td>
<td>£2,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£209,950</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£266,000</td>
<td>£2,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£270,000</td>
<td>£2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toremill Close</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£304,000</td>
<td>£2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£255,000</td>
<td>£2,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£258,995</td>
<td>£2,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£189,995</td>
<td>£2,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>£2,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>£2,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>£2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Semi</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>£3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£224,995</td>
<td>£1,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>£2,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>£2,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£306,995</td>
<td>£2,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£308,995</td>
<td>£2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£308,995</td>
<td>£2,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£314,995</td>
<td>£2,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£312,995</td>
<td>£2,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£292,995</td>
<td>£2,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£321,995</td>
<td>£2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>£2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>£2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£327,995</td>
<td>£2,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>£2,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>£2,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£256,995</td>
<td>£2,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£204,995</td>
<td>£2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£204,995</td>
<td>£2,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£274,995</td>
<td>£2,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Mews</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£242,995</td>
<td>£2,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£246,995</td>
<td>£2,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotherington Avenue</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£226,995</td>
<td>£2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£228,000</td>
<td>£2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,000</td>
<td>£2,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Benedict Road</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£219,000</td>
<td>£2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Ebor Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>£3,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>£2,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Square</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£585,000</td>
<td>£3,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldersyde Mews</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£193,000</td>
<td>£3,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£149,950</td>
<td>£2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£152,000</td>
<td>£2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervis Road</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>£2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£174,950</td>
<td>£2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£174,950</td>
<td>£2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton Street</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£135,000</td>
<td>£2,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr Lane</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>£1,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Tour Way</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>£2,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckfield Lane</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£192,000</td>
<td>£2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulleywn Mews</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£535,000</td>
<td>£3,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£228,000</td>
<td>£2,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£235,000</td>
<td>£2,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>£2,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>£2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£120,000</td>
<td>£2,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£177,500</td>
<td>£2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£160,000</td>
<td>£2,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£240,000</td>
<td>£2,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newborough Street</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>£2,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootham Green</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£1,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,995</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£289,995</td>
<td>£2,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>£2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£297,995</td>
<td>£2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£300,995</td>
<td>£2,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>£2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>£2,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£309,995</td>
<td>£2,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£312,995</td>
<td>£2,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£314,995</td>
<td>£2,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£319,995</td>
<td>£2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£324,995</td>
<td>£2,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>£2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£269,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£277,995</td>
<td>£2,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aelreds Mews</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£260,995</td>
<td>£2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derwent Way</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£279,995</td>
<td>£2,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£226,995</td>
<td>£2,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£233,995</td>
<td>£2,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson Street</td>
<td>May 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£163,000</td>
<td>£2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seebohm Mews</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>£3,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£395,000</td>
<td>£3,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£241,950</td>
<td>£2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>£2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£224,950</td>
<td>£2,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£2,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,950</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£229,950</td>
<td>£2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Walk</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£234,950</td>
<td>£2,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£195,000</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£197,950</td>
<td>£2,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£154,950</td>
<td>£2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
<td>£2,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£215,000</td>
<td>£2,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£159,950</td>
<td>£2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£164,950</td>
<td>£2,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£222,500</td>
<td>£2,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>£2,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperdale Park</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£230,000</td>
<td>£2,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£194,950</td>
<td>£2,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£236,950</td>
<td>£3,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£168,000</td>
<td>£2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lane</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£234,995</td>
<td>£2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£241,995</td>
<td>£2,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£183,995</td>
<td>£2,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>£2,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossview Close</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£179,995</td>
<td>£2,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
<td>£2,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>£2,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntsmans Court</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£158,500</td>
<td>£2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£247,500</td>
<td>£2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£247,500</td>
<td>£2,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Lane</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£2,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£264,995</td>
<td>£2,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£267,995</td>
<td>£3,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£231,995</td>
<td>£3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£204,995</td>
<td>£3,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£233,995</td>
<td>£3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£207,995</td>
<td>£3,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathside</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£209,995</td>
<td>£3,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishophill Senior</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£2,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micklegate</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Avenue</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
<td>£4,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Avenue</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>£4,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£180,000</td>
<td>£4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>£4,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£186,000</td>
<td>£4,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>£4,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£167,000</td>
<td>£4,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£105,000</td>
<td>£4,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£114,000</td>
<td>£4,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£620,000</td>
<td>£5,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
<td>£5,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£548,000</td>
<td>£5,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£435,000</td>
<td>£5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£1,080,000</td>
<td>£5,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Saviours Place</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>£6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowntree Wharf</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>£2,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowntree Wharf</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£225,000</td>
<td>£2,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppergate</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£3,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£248,000</td>
<td>£3,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£310,000</td>
<td>£3,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£249,950</td>
<td>£4,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£263,000</td>
<td>£4,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£268,000</td>
<td>£4,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£268,000</td>
<td>£4,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£342,000</td>
<td>£4,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£286,950</td>
<td>£4,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£365,000</td>
<td>£4,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£325,000</td>
<td>£4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£310,000</td>
<td>£4,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Gate</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piccadilly</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£450,000</td>
<td>£5,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£202,500</td>
<td>£2,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£187,250</td>
<td>£3,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>£3,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>£3,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£132,500</td>
<td>£3,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>£3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishergate</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>£4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£179,995</td>
<td>£3,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£184,995</td>
<td>£3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£329,995</td>
<td>£3,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£171,995</td>
<td>£3,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£169,995</td>
<td>£3,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£169,995</td>
<td>£3,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>£3,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£289,995</td>
<td>£3,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£294,995</td>
<td>£3,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£269,995</td>
<td>£3,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£190,000</td>
<td>£3,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£271,995</td>
<td>£3,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£299,995</td>
<td>£3,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£302,383</td>
<td>£4,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£304,995</td>
<td>£4,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£284,496</td>
<td>£4,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£349,995</td>
<td>£4,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£332,995</td>
<td>£4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£309,995</td>
<td>£4,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£349,995</td>
<td>£4,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£309,246</td>
<td>£4,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Terry Grove</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£332,995</td>
<td>£4,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£219,999</td>
<td>£2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£270,499</td>
<td>£3,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£232,999</td>
<td>£3,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£274,999</td>
<td>£3,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£297,999</td>
<td>£3,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£199,999</td>
<td>£3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£199,999</td>
<td>£3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£205,000</td>
<td>£4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£314,999</td>
<td>£4,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£292,499</td>
<td>£4,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Lane</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£294,999</td>
<td>£4,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£287,999</td>
<td>£2,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£139,495</td>
<td>£2,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£154,995</td>
<td>£2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£132,000</td>
<td>£2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£161,995</td>
<td>£2,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£138,995</td>
<td>£2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£166,995</td>
<td>£2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£139,495</td>
<td>£2,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,995</td>
<td>£2,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>£2,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>£2,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>£2,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Mews</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£146,995</td>
<td>£2,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield Street</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£138,000</td>
<td>£2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holgate Road</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£214,000</td>
<td>£2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acomb Road</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£110,000</td>
<td>£2,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holgate Road</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£187,000</td>
<td>£2,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westfield Court</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£245,000</td>
<td>£1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£142,500</td>
<td>£2,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£170,000</td>
<td>£2,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£175,000</td>
<td>£2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£122,500</td>
<td>£2,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£99,950</td>
<td>£2,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£2,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£127,500</td>
<td>£2,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>£2,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£127,500</td>
<td>£2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£99,950</td>
<td>£2,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£142,500</td>
<td>£2,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£132,500</td>
<td>£2,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£132,500</td>
<td>£2,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£2,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£155,000</td>
<td>£2,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>£2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>£2,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>April 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>£2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£137,500</td>
<td>£2,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£115,000</td>
<td>£2,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>Price per Sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Johnson Way</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£3,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerby Court</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£143,000</td>
<td>£2,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layerthorpe</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£150,000</td>
<td>£2,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£135,500</td>
<td>£2,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Close</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£140,000</td>
<td>£2,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£130,000</td>
<td>£2,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Road</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£125,000</td>
<td>£2,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Committed Sum Analysis on Sites with Fewer than 15 units

Introduction

Under the emerging Policy H10 of the City of York Local Plan, would be required to provide a contribution to affordable housing. The policy states that this would be equivalent to 10% on rural sites between 2 and 4 units, 15% on rural sites with between 5 and 10 units, and 20% on rural sites of between 11 and 14. Where there is an off-site financial contribution (OSFC), this is calculated in Table 5.4 of the emerging Policy H10 as per the below.

Average York Property price – Average York Fixed RP Price x % Target = OSFC per dwelling

This note shows sensitivity testing of varying the level of off-site committed sum payment that would be applicable to typologies under 15 units. This includes urban and suburban sites, which although have no requirement for delivering AH, they appear to have a headroom level which might make it justifiable for securing some affordable housing contribution.

Using the above formula, PPE have carried out sensitivity testing by re-appraising typologies under 15 units at the per unit committed sum payments equivalent to different affordable housing in the table below.

Table 1: Commuted sum payments for sites with fewer than 15 units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average York Price (March 2017)</th>
<th>Average York RSL</th>
<th>% Target</th>
<th>Commuted Payment (per unit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>£1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>£3,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>£4,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>£6,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>£8,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>£9,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>£11,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>£13,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>£14,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>£16,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£18,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>£19,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£23,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£24,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>£26,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>£28,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£29,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>£31,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£241,042</td>
<td>£75,000</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£33,208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The testing is based on the assumptions and methodology described in PBA’s “City of York Local Plan & CIL Viability Report”, published in September 2017. The document sets out ‘policy layers’ to show
the cumulative cost of the City of York Local Plan policies. For this assessment, the testing is based on the following policy layers:

- **Policy layer 3** – This layer includes s106 cost assumptions, and the analysis in this note shows the headroom at the commuted sum amounts in the above table.
- **Policy layer 4** – This layer is identical to Policy Layer 3, but also includes the requirement for meeting sustainable construction standards as set out in the draft PPDRC (2017) Policy CC2.

**Discussion: Policy Layer 3**

At this policy layer, the results in Table 2 show that with Policy H10:

- Most rural typologies are viable or marginal at a commuted sum payment equivalent to 5% AH
- Rural brownfield sites with 3 units (appear to struggle at commuted sum payments equivalent to between 6% and 10% AH
- Typologies of 9 & 10 units on rural sites appear to generally be able to accommodate payments up to 14% AH.
- Viability is weak for nearly all rural site typologies (except for a couple of greenfield typologies) at payments of 16% and higher.
- The results for suburban and rural sites suggest that contributions towards AH may also be viable in line with the above findings for rural sites.

**Discussion: Policy Layer 4**

With the additional policy layer including meeting sustainable construction standards, the analysis indicates that viability overall worsens marginally. At this policy layer, the results in Table 3 show that:

- Most rural typologies are viable or marginal at a commuted sum payment equivalent to 3% AH
- Rural brownfield sites with 3 units appear to struggle at commuted sum payments equivalent of higher than 5% AH
- Typologies of 9 & 10 units on rural sites appear to generally be able to accommodate payments up to 11% AH
- Viability is weak for nearly all rural typologies (exception for a couple of greenfield typologies) at payments of 14% AH and higher.
- The results for suburban and rural sites suggest that contributions towards AH may also be viable in line with the above findings for rural sites.
Table 2: Impact of a range of commuted sum payments at Policy Layer 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site typology</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 0% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 1% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 2% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 3% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 4% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 5% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 6% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 7% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 8% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 9% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 10% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 11% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 12% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 13% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 14% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 15% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 16% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 17% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 18% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 19% Commuted sum</th>
<th>Policy layer 3 – s106 and 20% Commuted sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 units village/rural (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£182</td>
<td>£164</td>
<td>£145</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£108</td>
<td>£91</td>
<td>£73</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units village/rural (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£182</td>
<td>£164</td>
<td>£145</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£108</td>
<td>£91</td>
<td>£73</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units village/rural (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£211</td>
<td>£193</td>
<td>£175</td>
<td>£157</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£121</td>
<td>£103</td>
<td>£85</td>
<td>£67</td>
<td>£49</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units village/rural (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£211</td>
<td>£193</td>
<td>£175</td>
<td>£157</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£121</td>
<td>£103</td>
<td>£85</td>
<td>£67</td>
<td>£49</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units village/rural (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£211</td>
<td>£193</td>
<td>£175</td>
<td>£157</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£121</td>
<td>£103</td>
<td>£85</td>
<td>£67</td>
<td>£49</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units village/rural (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£211</td>
<td>£193</td>
<td>£175</td>
<td>£157</td>
<td>£139</td>
<td>£121</td>
<td>£103</td>
<td>£85</td>
<td>£67</td>
<td>£49</td>
<td>£31</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units Suburban (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£109</td>
<td>£91</td>
<td>£73</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units Suburban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£127</td>
<td>£109</td>
<td>£91</td>
<td>£73</td>
<td>£55</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£5</td>
<td>£3</td>
<td>£1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units Suburban (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units Suburban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units Suburban (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units Suburban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units Urban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£142</td>
<td>£124</td>
<td>£106</td>
<td>£88</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£34</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 units Urban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£142</td>
<td>£124</td>
<td>£106</td>
<td>£88</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£52</td>
<td>£34</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£1</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
<td>£17</td>
<td>£15</td>
<td>£13</td>
<td>£11</td>
<td>£9</td>
<td>£7</td>
<td>£5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units Urban (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£318</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>£282</td>
<td>£264</td>
<td>£246</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 units Urban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£318</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>£282</td>
<td>£264</td>
<td>£246</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units Urban (Greenfield)</td>
<td>£318</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>£282</td>
<td>£264</td>
<td>£246</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 units Urban (Brownfield)</td>
<td>£318</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>£282</td>
<td>£264</td>
<td>£246</td>
<td>£228</td>
<td>£210</td>
<td>£192</td>
<td>£174</td>
<td>£156</td>
<td>£138</td>
<td>£120</td>
<td>£102</td>
<td>£84</td>
<td>£66</td>
<td>£48</td>
<td>£30</td>
<td>£12</td>
<td>£53</td>
<td>£37</td>
<td>£19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Impact of a range of commuted sum payments at Policy Layer 4

| Site typology | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 0% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 1% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 2% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 3% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 4% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 5% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 6% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 7% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 8% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 9% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 10% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 11% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 12% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 13% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 14% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 15% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 16% Commuted sum | 4 – s106, Policy CC2 and 17% Commuted sum |
|---------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 3 units village/rural (Greenfield) | £145 | £127 | £109 | £98 | £77 | £64 | £54 | £44 | £32 | £24 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £17 | £16 | £15 | £14 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 9 units village/rural (Greenfield) | £168 | £158 | £141 | £131 | £114 | £104 | £96 | £87 | £78 | £68 | £55 | £47 | £36 | £27 | £19 | £12 | £7 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 10 units village/rural (Greenfield) | £169 | £151 | £134 | £116 | £101 | £88 | £76 | £65 | £55 | £47 | £40 | £34 | £27 | £21 | £16 | £12 | £7 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 3 units Suburban (Greenfield) | £105 | £92 | £74 | £62 | £49 | £36 | £24 | £14 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 9 units Suburban (Greenfield) | £123 | £109 | £95 | £82 | £67 | £52 | £38 | £24 | £14 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 10 units Suburban (Greenfield) | £128 | £112 | £99 | £86 | £71 | £55 | £40 | £26 | £16 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 3 units Urban (Brownfield) | £113 | £99 | £85 | £72 | £57 | £43 | £29 | £15 | £7 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 9 units Urban (Brownfield) | £125 | £110 | £95 | £82 | £67 | £52 | £38 | £24 | £14 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 10 units Urban (Brownfield) | £130 | £115 | £100 | £85 | £70 | £55 | £40 | £26 | £16 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 3 units Urban (Greenfield) | £109 | £95 | £81 | £67 | £53 | £38 | £24 | £14 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 9 units Urban (Greenfield) | £123 | £109 | £95 | £82 | £67 | £52 | £38 | £24 | £14 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| 10 units Urban (Greenfield) | £128 | £112 | £99 | £86 | £71 | £55 | £40 | £26 | £16 | £8 | £0 | £19 | £18 | £16 | £14 | £12 | £10 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |