

AMJ/20-00678

5 April 2022

Caroline Ford
Development Management Division
Environment and Place Directorate
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
White Post Road
Bodicote
Banbury
OX15 4AA
UK

66 St James's Street
St James's
London
SW1A 1NE

0370 777 6292
info@rapleys.com
rapleys.com

LONDON
BIRMINGHAM
BRISTOL
CAMBRIDGE
EDINBURGH
HUNTINGDON
MANCHESTER

Dear Caroline,

Re: Land at North-West Bicester

We have carried out an initial review of Nigel's viability review and in this first instance, we are able to provide some clarifications with regard to the development mix and area assumptions as requested as well as the definition of FHS and TZC.

The proposed development mix and area assumptions have been formulated following detailed engagement with several major PLC housebuilders. The feedback from this process deemed that the mix and the size of units are appropriate and in line with market expectations. The mix and area assumptions are justified, and market tested and therefore should remain unchanged for the purposes of assessing viability. Ultimately this is an outline planning application, with the detailed design and mix to be determined at a later stage. We have made reasonable and justified assumptions regarding the mix and size of the units likely to be delivered on this site at this stage.

In terms of the gross to net ratio for the apartment dwellings, the Gross Internal Area (GIA) was assumed by Gardiner & Theobald based on the Net Internal Area (NIA) detailed by the scheme architects, Mosaic. During the cost plan review process, which included analysis of assumed areas, this gross to net ratio was accepted by RLF taking into consideration the scheme specific design requirements associated with delivering a TZC building. It is therefore justified and in line with market norms.

In terms of the nominal discrepancy between GIAs within our appraisals and the cost plans, Nigel is correct in assuming that this is due to rounding issue within Argus. We will update this in the next round of appraisals but due to the nominal difference, it does not impact on the overall position, and we agree that the GIA in RLF and Gardiner & Theobald's cost plans is correct.

The provision of garages within the scheme was again formulated following detailed engagement with several major PLC housebuilders. The feedback from this process deemed that most house builders prefer a garage for each 3-bed unit and upwards. The extent of garages is therefore justified, and market tested and should remain unchanged for the purposes of assessing viability. We have requested that Green and Co confirm that their residential sales values take account of garage provision.

The areas of visitor car parking assumed by the Applicant in the Cost Plan was informed following discussions with Oxford County Council (OCC) and the current car parking standards set out within Table A6.B1 of Appendix F of the CDC Residential Design Guide SPD (adopted on the 16th of July 2018). The areas for visitor car parking are therefore compliant and market driven.

The extent of provision of electric charging points for visitors within the scheme was informed by the Parking Standards set out within CDC's SPD – Residential Design Guide (Adopted July 2018). The SPD states that “every home should have access to at least one electric charging point” and the applicant has assumed a 50% provision for visitor parking as this development is being promoted as having high sustainability credentials on the assumption that a high level of provision for visitor spaces would be welcomed.

The Interpretation of FHS and TZC by the applicant has been informed with reference to the “Future Homes Standard: Changes to Part L and Part F of the Building Regulations for new dwellings” and Development Principle 2 of the SPD. We therefore assume our interpretations are policy compliant and hope that Bioregional's review will be forthcoming as soon as possible to confirm this. Please can you confirm when Bioregional's review will be received?

We would like to take the opportunity to thank Nigel Simkin for his response on the BLV providing the additional information requested. We are in the process of reviewing this and will respond in full next week.

We trust the above is clear and look forward to hearing that these assumptions are agreed so we can turn to the matter of s106 contributions and affordable housing.

Yours sincerely,

Archie Mackay-James

MRICS

Senior Associate

Archie.mackay-james@rapleys.com

07467941544