

**Cherwell District Council  
Place and Growth Directorate**

**Partial Review of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1):**

**Oxford's Unmet Housing Needs**

**DELIVERY TOPIC PAPER  
JANUARY 2019**

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 This Topic Paper summarises the Council's overall position on delivery of the Partial Review of the Local Plan. In preparing the Plan and working with key partners, the Council has been acutely aware of the necessity for Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs to be delivered by 2031. The deliverability of the Plan and the specific developments proposed has been considered through evidence, through policy formation, through the Council's involvement in the securing and implementation of the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal and through continued cooperative working since the Plan was submitted in March 2018.
- 1.2 Consultation and engagement (CD PR90 and CD PR93) during plan preparation and beyond have assisted consideration of deliverability and delivery issues including the preparation of the Infrastructure Schedule and Housing Trajectory.
- 1.3 The Topic Paper explains how the Plan can be considered to be deliverable and viable by describing three key areas:
- Managing housing supply
  - Infrastructure delivery
  - Viability
- 1.4 In doing this, it takes account of the Submission Plan with Focused Changes and Minor Modifications (February 2018), the latter being subject to acceptance by the Inspector.

## **2 Managing housing supply**

### **Housing Trajectory**

- 2.1 A housing trajectory has been prepared for the Partial Review. The Council relies on the trajectory included in the Council's Focused Changes and Minor Modifications (February 2018) which are subject to the Inspector's acceptance.
- 2.2 The housing trajectory takes into account the following:
- a separate housing trajectory for Cherwell's needs exists in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan which is monitored and updated through the Annual Monitoring Report process
  - Cherwell district can presently demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites
  - the Oxfordshire SHMA 2014 identifies housing needs to 2031
  - the purpose of the Partial Review is specifically to contribute to Oxford housing needs for the period to 2031 and not the wider needs of the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area
  - realistic expectations for housing delivery for the proposed housing sites
  - in accordance with the agreement of the Oxfordshire Growth Board, a proposed date of 1 April 2021 for starting to measure/monitor/maintain a five year supply within Cherwell for Oxford's needs

- the Plan is time limited. There are no proposals for a subsequent plan to specifically address Oxford's needs beyond 2031. Work has now started on Joint Statutory Spatial Plan which will consider future housing needs to 2050
  - the need to have a stepped and managed trajectory to ensure that a five year supply is maintained until there are less than five years remaining in the housing trajectory
  - the need to measure/monitor/maintain the five year supply separately from the five year supply for Cherwell's needs for the following reasons:
    - the Plan's specific purpose of meeting Oxford's need
    - the Plan sets out a distinct vision, objectives and a strategy
    - proposed development falling outside of the strategy would not sustainably meet Oxford's needs and undermine the purpose of the Plan
    - seven specific sites are identified for specifically meeting Oxford's distinct unmet housing need
    - appropriate policies are proposed for managing supply
- 2.3 The Plan Partial Review updated housing trajectory applied a 5% buffer due to the starting five year period not commencing until 2021 (1785 dwellings) and indicates 5.1 years of housing supply. This has taken into account a deliverable supply of 1,810 homes within the first five years against the annual requirement over the first five years of the supply period (2021/22-2025/26) of 357 homes per annum.
- 2.4 The updated Housing Trajectory of the Plan shows that the Council is expected to demonstrate a 5.1 year housing supply for the period 2021-2026. On 12 September 2018, the Secretary of State for Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued a written statement (see Appendix 1 of this Statement) containing a 'temporary change to housing land supply policies as they apply in Oxfordshire'. It states that the Oxfordshire authorities only need to demonstrate a 3 year housing land supply and not 5 years to enable the authorities to focus efforts on the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan.
- 2.5 Policy PR12a and the Housing Trajectory phase the delivery of sites PR7a Land to the South East of Kidlington and PR10 Land South East of Woodstock to the 2026-2031 housing supply plan period. This would enable land to be brought forward should there be an unanticipated delay in housing delivery. The Council is mindful that there is other planned growth at Woodstock (see Council statement on Matter 8) and that the proposed Plan includes other provision to the south of Killington.

### **Site delivery**

- 2.6 CDC's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) (CD PR54 & PR79) informed the selection of the Submission Plan strategic residential allocations and an allocation for a potential golf course replacement in association with Policy PR6b. The HELAA identifies the sites proposed as residential allocations to be deliverable and developable.
- 2.7 The Submission Plan site proposals comprise a range of site sizes along the main transport corridor connecting southern Cherwell to Oxford City:
- 100 dwellings (PR7b) and 230 dwellings (PR7a) in the Kidlington area as small scale urban extensions closely related to existing development in the Kidlington area in a

strategic transport corridor to Oxford City and closely related to the Oxford Parkway Railway Station and Water Eaton Park & Ride

- 650 dwellings (PR6a) and 530 dwellings (PR6b) as urban extensions to north Oxford in a strategic transport corridor closely related to the Oxford Parkway Railway Station and Water Eaton Park & Ride
- 1950 dwellings (PR8) in the Begbroke/Yarnton area in a strategic transport corridor to Oxford City and benefiting from the proposed location of a Park & Ride serving the corridor. Closely related to the Begbroke Science Park located in the central area of the PR8 site and associated to the science park's potential extension through adopted Policy Kidlington 1
- 440 dwellings (PR9) in the Yarnton area in a strategic transport corridor to Oxford and benefiting from the proposed location of a Park & Ride serving the corridor
- 500 dwellings (PR10) as an extension to recently permitted extension to Woodstock in a strategic transport corridor to Oxford City, closely linked to the Oxford-London Airport and proposals for a corridor Park & Ride at the airport.

- 2.8 The Council considers that a large scale development at site PR8 can contribute to the supply of housing while delivering wider place making opportunities as highlighted in Submission Plan para. 5.17 (7):

“...

*7. the unique place shaping potential for the area of land next to the University of Oxford's Begbroke Science Park; land situated next to Yarnton and Begbroke village and close to Kidlington. The Begbroke Science Park is a facility of international significance and is of great importance to the local and Oxfordshire economy. Its location close to Oxford and Kidlington and next to the Oxford Canal and railway provide for an exceptional opportunity to meet Oxford's needs in parallel with the expansion of the Science Park.”*

- 2.9 The Plan sets out measures to ensure the comprehensive development of the proposed sites and address early and effectively any issues that may arise from multiple ownership of larger sites.

- 2.10 All site policies require the preparation of Development Briefs in consultation with key stakeholders and their submission alongside development proposals at planning application stage. Work on development briefs commenced in summer 2018 with the first set of workshops including infrastructure and service providers such as Thames Water and Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group, main landowners and promoters of proposed sites and parish councils taken place in October 2018. Development Briefs are scheduled to be finalised, after public consultation, upon adoption of the Plan and approved for development management purposes by CDC Planning Committee shortly after.

- 2.11 Collaborative work in the preparation of Development Briefs is linked to a programme of work and timeframes in Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) most of which have already been signed between CDC and the main landowners and promoters for five of the seven sites proposed for residential development.

- 2.12 All the sites expected to commence development in the first five years of the Submission Plan supply period (2021/22-2025/26) have a PPA in place except site PR8, currently in the process of signing one.

- 2.13 All the sites have willing landowners and are being actively promoted.

- 2.14 The policies in the Plan are supported by plan-wide and site specific viability assessment (CD PR 49) and the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (CD PR54 & 79) indicates that the sites are deliverable and developable.

2.15 *Table 1 – Promoter and landowner interest*

Proposed site	Submission Plan representation	Housing Trajectory Supply commences
PR6a	Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter and Merton Colleges and Oxford University (PR-C-0775) support the allocation of PR6a A development and concept document has been submitted for the combined site demonstrating how 1,480 dwellings can be delivered on the sites.	2021
PR6b	Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter and Merton Colleges and Oxford University (PR-C-0775) support the allocation of PR6b' A development and concept document has been submitted for the combined site demonstrating how 1,480 dwellings can be delivered on the sites.	2023
PR7a	Turley for Hill and the landowner of the northern parcel of the site (Oxford Charity Trustees) (PR-C-1405) support the allocation of PR7a WYG for Barwood Development Securities Ltd (PR-C-1449) support the allocation.	2026
PR7b	Carter Jonas for Manor Oak Homes (PR-C-0777) support the allocation of PR7b. A vision document has been submitted which demonstrates how at least 175 homes might be constructed on the site together with the provision of retirement living accommodation within the retained Stratfield Farmhouse.	2021
PR8	David Lock Associates on behalf of the University of Oxford, Merton College and Local Landowner (The Tripartite) (PR-C-0842) control 86% of site PR8 and support the allocation of PR8. A design concept document has been submitted which demonstrates how at least 1950 homes can be constructed on the site.  Carter Jonas on behalf of New Core Solutions (PR-C-0304), landowners of Yarnton Nurseries and Messrs Smith and Smith (PR-C-1455), landowners of the southern edge of the site also support the allocation of PR8.	2021
PR9	Gerald Eve on behalf of Merton College (PR-C-1397) support the allocation of PR9	2021
PR10	Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of Vanburgh Unit Trust and Pye Homes Ltd (PR-C-1445) support the allocation of PR10.	2026

- 2.16 The Plan's updated trajectory indicates a consistent supply from 2021 and demonstrates an excess of supply for the first five year housing land supply period.
- 2.17 The Council's proposed housing trajectory shows 4,400 homes can be delivered by 2031. The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) will help support the delivery of this housing trajectory and wider Oxfordshire's housing commitments within that period. Council Officers and site promoters are in discussions regarding the development brief process and site delivery. The proposed housing trajectory takes account of sufficient lead-in times for planning and delivery.
- 2.18 The Council is in the process of preparing Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with main site promoters and will be submitted to assist the Inspector as soon as possible.
- 2.19 The trajectory proposes a phased approach with a scheme preparation phase (2018-2021), five sites delivering dwellings simultaneously in 2021-2026 and six sites delivering dwellings in 2026-2031.
- 2.20 The preparation phase has commenced. Good progress has been made on infrastructure schemes to deliver this growth completing feasibility by March 2019 and capital funding committed to deliver them by 2023 (see section 3).
- 2.21 The Council has taken into account that the sites are deliverable and developable and has been informed by developers intentions. The Council has work closely with all site promoters and landowners in setting out challenging but achievable assumptions on the time needed for development to commence and anticipated build out rates.

### **Managing housing delivery**

- 2.22 All draft site policies require a single comprehensive outline scheme to be approved for the entire site and all development schemes to be supported by:
- draft Heads of Terms for developer contributions
  - a Delivery Plan demonstrating implementation of a comprehensive scheme and its phasing as well as the delivery of individual development parcels and supporting infrastructure.
- 2.23 In addition to the requirements in the draft site policies and progress on enabling timely delivery through development briefs and PPAs, the Submission Plan includes reasonable safeguards to manage the supply of housing to 2031.
- 2.24 Submission Plan Policies PR12a, PR12b and PR13 contain a number of measures to ensure housing supply is maintained:
- deliverable requirement of 1700 homes for the first five years of the supply period (2021/22-2025/26) (Policy PR12a)
  - a phasing strategy built into the housing trajectory with two allocations (PR7a and PR10) planned to be delivered later in the plan period. These two sites could commence earlier if the estimated delivery rates fall below the five year period. (Policy PR12a)

- requiring developers to show they can maintain a five year supply for their own sites (all site policies)
- if there is a continuing under delivery then additional sites will be considered under (Policy PR12b)
- yearly monitoring and assessment of site delivery and housing supply (Policy PR13)

### 3 Infrastructure delivery

- 3.1 The Plan vision sets out that alongside meeting housing needs and supporting the economy it seeks ‘...convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities...’. Development will be provided so that it is ‘...well connected to Oxford’, ‘...supported by necessary infrastructure’ and ‘...contributes to health and well-being’. These are taken forward under strategic objective SO19:

*“To provide Cherwell’s contribution to meeting Oxford’s unmet housing needs in such a way that it complements the County Council’s Local Transport Plan, including where applicable, its Oxford Transport Strategy and so it facilitates demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to Oxford.”*

- 3.2 Underpinning the Submission Plan are strategies and planned investment programmes such as the Oxford Transport Strategy (CD PR18), the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy to 2040 (CD PR82) and the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal 2018 (CD PR85).
- 3.3 Relevant policies in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) such as Policy INF1 on infrastructure and SLE4 on transport and draft Policies in the Plan such as PR4a and PR4b on sustainable transport, PR5 on Green Infrastructure and PR11 on infrastructure provision will guide the planning and delivery of infrastructure requirements supporting the Plan’s proposed growth.
- 3.4 The Plan’s strategic infrastructure schemes and those in the adopted Local Plan’s IDP are collated in the Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (OxIS) November 2017 (CD PR82). This provides up to date and coordinated county wide and district evidence to inform and influence local, county and national infrastructure investment programs including Local Growth funding bids, Housing Infrastructure Fund bids and Highways England/ Department for Transport Road Investment Strategies.
- 3.5 The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal signed by the Secretary of State for MHCLG in March 2018, secures a 5-year (2018-2023) funding package of £150m to deliver strategic transport and associated infrastructure to unlock committed and emerging housing growth in Oxfordshire.

- 3.6 In preparing the Plan, the Council has addressed NPPF requirements to plan for strategic priorities including infrastructure (para. 156). The Plan's site specific policies set out requirements for different types and levels of infrastructure appropriate to the proposals in the policy. Policy PR11 supported by the Plan's Infrastructure Schedule (incorporating Focused Changes) addresses the types of infrastructure and schemes identified by infrastructure and service providers to support the plan's growth in the southern Cherwell area and the required infrastructure to address site specific mitigation.
- 3.7 The Council has planned positively for the development and infrastructure required (NPPF para. 157). The Infrastructure Schedule has been informed by continuing dialogue (CD PR90 and CD PR93) with infrastructure and service providers following the identification of areas of growth and sites progressing to the Proposed Submission Plan stage. The 2017 Proposed Submission consultation allowed for the refinement of infrastructure schemes and identification of costs as submitted in March 2018 as part of the Focused Changes and Modifications (February 2018) (Focused Change FC98).
- 3.8 The Infrastructure schedule provides relevant information including: project/scheme description, priority, known costs, funding, delivery partners, the sites the infrastructure relates to, phasing in relation to housing trajectory periods and delivery mechanisms or progress at the time of preparation.
- 3.9 The Submission Infrastructure schedule is a 'live' document that will be adjusted and added to following examination and adoption of the local plan it supports. Upon adoption the infrastructure schedule will be monitored and reviewed on a yearly basis as part of Cherwell's Annual Monitoring Report.
- 3.10 In preparing the Plan, the Council has addressed NPPF requirements to plan for strategic priorities including infrastructure (para. 156) and plan positively for the development and infrastructure required (para. 157). The Council worked with infrastructure and service providers as well as main site promoters to ensure there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion (Para. 177).

### **Site specific infrastructure**

- 3.11 The Infrastructure schedule identifies site specific requirements which arise as a result of mitigating the impact of development proposals. In this instance specifications and costs will be determined by design considerations (e.g provision of open space to policy standards such as play areas). The phasing and cost of these schemes are dependent on detailed development proposals and are expected to be delivered via site specific developer contributions from the development proposal. This is made clear in the Infrastructure Schedule under the 'funding' section.



- 3.12 Most of the site specific infrastructure for the Submission Plan is at this stage identified to be delivered in the period 2018-2021 with the exception of sites PR7a and PR10 for which the housing supply period starts in 2026. Refinement of phasing will be informed by the sites development brief process. Housing delivery is not planned until 2021 and this allows the development briefs and the refinement of infrastructure phasing to inform development proposals.
- 3.13 Infrastructure which is dependent upon developer contributions has been considered through the Submission Plan's viability assessment (CD PR49). The assessment indicates the Plan's requirements do not preclude site delivery (refer to Section 4).

### **Key strategic infrastructure**

- 3.14 In addition to infrastructure required to address site specific mitigation, the infrastructure schedule details the types of infrastructure and schemes identified by infrastructure and service providers to support the proposed level of growth in the southern Cherwell area for Oxford's unmet housing needs.
- 3.15 The sections below provide an account of how the Council's effective engagement with infrastructure and service providers is supporting the delivery of the Plan. They provide a position update on key strategic infrastructure from the Plan's infrastructure schedule and show its delivery alongside planned housing supply. Appendix 2 of this Statement provides more detailed delivery position information for strategic transport, education and community infrastructure.

### **Transport and connectivity**

- 3.16 Draft Policies PR4a and PR4b on sustainable transport alongside the Submission Plan Infrastructure Schedule, the adopted Plan Policy SLE4 and the Oxford Transport Strategy (CD PR18) and Oxfordshire Infrastructure Strategy (CD PR35 & PR82 provide a robust and deliverable approach to transport supporting 4,400 homes in southern Cherwell.
- 3.17 Oxfordshire County Council informed the transport infrastructure information in the Plan's infrastructure schedule.

*Table 2. Summary of Strategic Transport Infrastructure supporting the Plan  
(Nos. correlate to Infrastructure schedule reference)*

<b>Short to medium term 2018-2026</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2026</b>	<b>c.£33-36 m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>
A4260/A4165 corridor	c.£15.5-£18.6 m	630 Homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026
<i>No. Scheme</i>		
4 Bus Lane and bus stop improvements along the A4260/A4165		
5 Signalised junctions along the A4260/A4165 corridor to improve bus movements (including Bus Gate near Kidlington centre).		

11 Kidlington Centre – public realm, transport related improvements 20mph zone in centre of Kidlington on A4260 between Lyne Road and Sterling Approach 9a Cycle super highway along the A4260/A4165 to Oxford Parkway 9b Cycle super highway along A4165 from Oxford Parkway to Oxford city centre 2a Expansion of Water Eaton P&R		
A44 corridor	c.£16.7m <sup>1</sup>	1180 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026
6 Bus Lane improvements along the A44/A4144 8 Junction improvements facilitating cross-corridor bus movements (A44 to/from A4260) 3a P&R at London Oxford Airport Phase 1 21 Cycle and pedestrian improvements along the A44 (between Bladon Roundabout and Pear Tree Roundabout)		
A44-A4260	c.£0.772m	Supports completion of homes on both corridors
22 Cycle and pedestrian improvements along Langford Lane including enhancement to formalise crossing, Shared Use Path (SUP) on the western end of Langford Lane and hybrid cycle lanes for the eastern end.		
<b>Long term period 2026-2031</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2026-2031</b>	<b>c.£15m</b>	<b>2590 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031</b>
A4260/A4165 corridor	c.£15m	880 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031
2b Expansion of Water Eaton P&R 18 Kidlington roundabout: provision of pedestrian/cycle crossing at the roundabout and exploring the potential for a pedestrian/cycle bridge over Frieze Way		
A44 corridor	TBC	1710 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026
3b P&R at London Oxford Airport <u>Phase 2</u>		
<b>LP1 PR all corridors 2018-2031</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2031</b>	<b>c.£48-51 m</b>	<b>4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031</b>

3.18 The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal (CD PR8) delivery plan includes the transport schemes for the North Oxford/South Cherwell Area. The Oxfordshire Growth Board agreed the schemes that could be developed during Year 1 of the deal (2018-19), with capital funding allocated to the delivery of the emerging schemes. This saw the allocation of the following towards the A44 / A4260 corridor package:

- 2018-19 - £1.5m of revenue funding for optioneering / feasibility design work on key sections of both corridors
- 2019-21 - £5m of capital funding to deliver a prioritised element of the package.

3.19 The Oxfordshire Growth Board has now agreed the Years 2-5 programme, which includes a further allocation of funding for the strategy:

- £20.1m for sustainable connections (bus and cycle) along the A44 corridor between Langford Lane and Peartree Roundabout
- £9.1m for improvements to the Woodstock Road Corridor (bus lanes and cycle improvements)
- £9.7m for improvements to the Banbury Road Corridor (bus lanes and cycle lanes).

- 3.20 The majority of the strategic transport infrastructure in the Submission Plan is scheduled to be delivered in the short to medium term part of the Submission Plan and within the first five years of the housing supply (2021-2026). Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal capital programme to 2023 will enable their delivery.
- 3.21 The A4260 corridor through Kidlington can currently accommodate the delivery of the Rapid Transit planned within the period.
- 3.22 Scheme 1 of the Infrastructure Schedule 'Explore potential for a new rail station/halt between Kidlington and Begbroke' is a long term aspiration being explored by the site promoter of Draft Policy PR8. The Submission Plan reserves land so that future opportunities for sustainable transport are not prevented. Delivery of LP1 PR does not depend on this scheme. The scheme is not included in the delivery infrastructure table.
- 3.23 The location of the site proposals enables sustainable transport to the Water Eaton Park and Ride and into Oxford City. The Submission Plan sites are not dependant on the P&R extension. However, given it is an important strategic facility enabling rail travel across and beyond the County, which is of benefit to the area including LP1PR sites, some proportionate contribution would be expected from LP1 PR sites on a site by site bases as part of supporting Countywide infrastructure.
- 3.24 The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, signed with Government in March 2018, provides assurance that the strategic transport infrastructure can be provided in the earlier phase of the plan and ensure that infrastructure needs and significant costs will not hold up housing delivery. The current funding has enabled the options and feasibility work to take place in the Year 2018-2019 and will provide capital funding for the delivery of infrastructure in the years 2019-2023.

### **Education**

- 3.25 Oxfordshire County Council informed the Submission Plan's education requirements. Primary school requirements are a site specific infrastructure expected to be funded by the developer proposals as indicated in the Infrastructure Schedule.

- 3.26 Since the submission of the Plan Oxfordshire County Council has published its Pupil Place Plan to 2018-2022 (November 2018)<sup>1</sup> which accounts for the needs emerging from the Submission Plan in the north Oxford and south Cherwell area which notes:

*"Examination is underway of a "Partial Review" of the Cherwell Local Plan, which contains specific development proposals to deliver 4,400 additional homes as its contribution towards addressing Oxford's Unmet Need. The proposed distribution is for 1,180 homes across 2 sites in North Oxford; 330 homes across 2 sites south of Kidlington; 2,390 across Begbroke and Yarnton and 500 south east of Woodstock. The current pupil forecasts include only the housing numbers in the adopted Local Plan, and permitted sites. The additional housing proposed in the Partial Review would generate significantly more pupils. The Partial Review includes policies requiring a new primary school north of Oxford; up to two new primary schools in Begbroke; a new primary school in Woodstock; land for the expansion of William Fletcher Primary School in Yarnton; and a new secondary school at Begbroke. However, the exact school solution in each case will be confirmed at the time when planning applications are submitted, informed by the latest data, and may include expansions at one or more other schools as well as, or instead of, new schools."* (p.10 Pupil Role Plan to 2018-2022

- 3.27 At page 29 the Pupil Role Plan indicates:

*"Further new schools are expected to be needed as a result of the higher levels of housing growth now proposed in Local Plans. These will be confirmed once Local Plans are finalised, but proposals so far consulted on would require the following additional new schools:"*

Location	Type of school	Comment
Woodstock	1 primary school with nursery classes	Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review/Part 2, subject to approval/adoption. Potential need, depending on scale of housing growth eventually agreed for Woodstock
Cherwell's Oxford Unmet Need sites	2-3 primary schools with nursery classes and possible secondary school	Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review/Part 2, subject to approval/adoption.

*(Pupil Place Plan 2018 - Partial Review relevant table extract p. 29)*

- 3.28 Table 3 reflects the estimated cost of education infrastructure if all those requirements were needed:

*Table3. Summary of Education Infrastructure  
(Nos. correlate to Infrastructure schedule reference)*

Short to medium term 2018-2026		
Infrastructure 2018-2026	c.£74.3m	1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026
Secondary schools	c.£30.3m	1810 homes to be completed in the

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/schools/our-work-schools/pupil-place-plan>

		period 2021-2026
41 Secondary school (1100-place) at Land East of the A44 with playing pitches located to help maintain a gap between the development and Begbroke village		
Primary schools	c.£44m	1180 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026
37 Primary School 2FE at Land East of Oxford Road 38a Primary School 3FE at Land East of the A44 38b Primary School 2FE at Land East of the A44 if required- in consultation with the LEA and unless otherwise agreed with CDC 39 Additional playing field land (c.1.6ha) at Land West of Yarnton to facilitate the expansion of William Fletcher Primary School by a 0.5 FE on the school site (to a 2 FE) If required 40 Safeguarding of 3.1 hectares of land north of Shipton Road for the potential development of a new primary school (2 forms of entry), or sports pitches, serving the wider community.		
<b>All provision expected in the period to 2026</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2031</b>	<b>c.£74.3 m</b>	<b>4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031</b>

- 3.29 Oxfordshire County Council requires Special education needs (SEN) and early years school provision to meet projected needs either on site (including land) or adequate contributions to enable existing facilities to expand. There has been no on-site provision request for SEN provision and early years provision is accounted for in the primary school specifications.
- 3.30 Section 3 of the Pupil Place Plan provides the County Councils approach to funding school growth. Developer contributions will be sought towards education provision.
- 3.31 The Education and Skills Funding Agency (PR-C-0806) supported the education requirements proposed in the Submission Plan and invited discussions with the Council regarding forward funding ESF proposals for forward funding schools.
- 3.32 School provision requirements are informed by pupil generated by specific development proposals taking into account matters including housing mix, rate of delivery and capacity of schools in the area to accommodate the emerging need. The Submission Plan and Infrastructure schedule provide a precautionary approach to ensure land is available when detail proposals come forward. The infrastructure schedule requires early engagement with the Local Education Authority to inform the development brief for sites PR8 and PR10.
- 3.33 Work on development briefs has commenced and specific discussions on the options to deliver schools in the A44 corridor and Woodstock are taken place between main site promoters and the County Council.
- 3.34 The Plan enables the provision of infrastructure with required flexibility to refine requirements as proposals come forward. Table 2 represents a precautionary approach to safeguard delivery options at the more detailed stages of the planning system and will be reviewed alongside development briefs and development proposals.

### **Flood Risk, Water and Waste Water**

- 3.35 Thames Water informed the requirements in the Submission Plan's Infrastructure Schedule. At the time of Plan preparation Thames Water were preparing their Asset Management Plan (AMP7) 2020-2025 which will provide further information on infrastructure upgrades.
- 3.36 The Council worked with Thames Water, Environment Agency and Natural England in the preparation of the Submission Plan's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) Level 1 (CD PR31), SFRA Level 2 (CD PR32 & CD PR94) and a Water Cycle Study (CD PR71 & CD PR81). Evidence and on-going engagement informed policy and infrastructure requirements.
- 3.37 No strategic flood infrastructure requirements resulted from this engagement.
- 3.38 All development proposals will be expected to engage with Thames Water to secure Water supply links and sewerage links. Developers will also be expected to engage with TW to draw up water and drainage strategies outlining the developments water and waste water infrastructure to address water conservation. Planning applications will be required an agreement in principle from TW that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into their network.
- 3.39 The following network and treatment works upgrades have been identified:

**Requirements in the short to medium term (2018-2026)**

- 44a Wastewater Infrastructure upgrades required to serve Site Policy PR6a
- 44b Wastewater Infrastructure upgrades maybe required to serve Site Policy PR8
- 45 Oxford WwTW upgrade will be required to serve PR6a, PR6b and PR9
- 46b Cassington WwTW upgrade will be required to serve PR7a, PR7b and PR8

**Requirements in the medium to long term (2021-2031)**

- 46a Woodstock WwTW treatment process upgrade will be required for PR10

- 3.40 These will delivered by Thames Water with contributions by development proposals. Costs to be determined as detailed proposals come forward. Early engagement will be needed with Thames Water (TW) and the Environment Agency (EA) and Natural England (NE) when necessary.

**Energy infrastructure**

- 3.41 Southern Electric Power Distribution (SEPD) is the Distribution Network Operator (DNO) for the Submission Plan area. SEPD informed the requirements in the Submission Plan's Infrastructure Schedule and advised that developers will need to secure agreement in in principle with SEPD for any modification to overhead lines or development beneath

overhead lines/undergrounding of overhead lines in relation to sites PR6a, PR6b, PR6c, PR7a, PR8 and PR9.

- 3.42 No strategic Energy infrastructure requirement resulted from this engagement.

#### **Waste facilities**

- 3.43 At the time of Plan preparation Oxfordshire County Council were at early stages in the progression of Part 2 of the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan will consider the need of new facilities resulting from existing and emerging growth including in southern Cherwell. It is expected that any increase in demand for waste management infrastructure from the Plan's proposed growth will be addressed through developer contributions.

#### **Emergency and rescue services**

- 3.44 Thames Valley Policy informed the preparation of the Submission Plan and infrastructure schedule and continues engaging with the Council through the development brief process.
- 3.45 The Plan Infrastructure Schedule identifies:

#### **Requirements in the medium term (2021-2026)**

- 52 Provision of Neighbourhood Policing facilities to serve the additional growth identified in the area. This could be through the provision of new touchdown offices as part of planned community Facilities/Centres on the identified new housing sites or through the adaptation/alteration and/or extension of existing TVP facilities in the local area.
- 3.46 The Plan proposes two local centres (at PR6b and PR8) providing opportunity for facilities such as emergency services infrastructure. Delivery will be progressed as part of the development brief process.

#### **Health infrastructure**

- 3.47 Although a number of measures in the Plan address health and well-being principles in place making particularly through Green Infrastructure and community facilities. This section relates to those facilities needed to provide health care services to the community. Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG) informed the preparation of the Plan, infrastructure schedule. The Submission Plan area is covered by the OCCG North East Locality (Bicester, Kidlington, Woodstock and surrounding villages)
- 3.48 At the time of Plan preparation the OCCG were also preparing their North East Locality Plan. The Locality Plan was published in January 2018 and accounts for emerging growth in the

southern Cherwell. A key priority for the OCCG is establishing a new model of care for the area and are currently appraising model of care options in the locality.

3.49 The Plan Infrastructure Schedule identifies:

**Requirements in the medium to long term (2021-2031)**

- 53. Provision of GP health facilities: either through redevelopment of Exeter Hall to accommodate existing practices in larger premises as a preferred approach or through Local Centre space allocated as part of PR6a and PR8.

3.50 Ongoing engagement with the OCCG will provide further information on infrastructure requirements as they progress model of care options to serve identified needs in their Locality Plan. For site PR10 the OCCG will seek developer contributions towards GP facilities in the Woodstock area.

**Strategic community infrastructure**

3.51 Engagement with Cherwell's Community Services department informed community infrastructure requirements in the Submission Plan and Infrastructure Schedule. At the time of Plan preparation a number of studies were being progress to assess existing and future built sport and recreation facilities in Cherwell to 2031 as reflected in the Council's Open Space and Recreation Position Statement August 2017 (CD PR72).

*Table 4. Summary of key strategic community Infrastructure  
(Nos. correlate to Infrastructure schedule reference)*

<b>Short to medium term 2018-2026</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2026</b>	<b>c.£2.74m m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>
55 Sports hall at PR8 Secondary School for shared community use –one additional 4 court sports hall to Sport England specification 34.5 x 20 x 7.5 (690 sqm) 72 Converting existing Hockey AGP at Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre to 3G, and increasing its size.		
<b>Long term period 2026-2031</b>		
<b>Infrastructure 2026-2031</b>	<b>c.£9</b>	<b>2590 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031</b>
56 Additional swimming pool space by replacement pool of 25m x 6 lane pool plus teaching pool at Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre 59 Extension to Kidlington Cemetery 73 Formal sport pitches provision at Land South East Kidlington (PR7a) including: 2 3G football pitches and 1 cricket ground		
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2031</b>	<b>c.£11.7 m</b>	<b>4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031</b>



- 3.52 In 2018 the Council completed its Playing Pitch Strategy (November 2018)<sup>2</sup> and Sports Facilities Strategy (October 2018)<sup>3</sup>. The development brief process will guide the delivery of some onsite strategic infrastructure including the provision of sports hall at site PR8 proposed secondary school as a shared use facility with the community, formal sport pitches provision at site PR7a and extension of existing cemetery at PR7a.
- 3.53 The schemes are expected to be delivered through developer contributions.

## **4. Viability**

- 4.1 The Local Plan Viability Study (CD PR49) informed the Council on the overall robustness of the Submission Plan on the basis of delivering the plan's proposed growth. The study considered relevant Cherwell's Local Plan policies and all Submission Plan draft policies (CD PR49 p.15 ). The Council has paid due attention to the viability and costs in plan-making as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF and has worked with other local authorities and infrastructure providers on the preparation of the Submission Plan's infrastructure schedule and cross boundary spatial planning matters (NPPF paragraphs 162 and 182).
- 4.2 Viability testing was undertaken within the context of the plan being delivered over the 2021 to 2031 period and in the knowledge that variations in the property market and scheme proposals will occur over the plan period.

### **Cumulative effect of policies**

- 4.3 The study assessed the cumulative effect of Local Plan policies on development viability, by reviewing all Plan policies (including Local Plan 2015) and considered those which could have costs implications. The policies table (p.14 CD PR49) indicates the potential cumulative effect of Local Plan policies and shows that the cumulative impact of these policies does not put the delivery of the local plan at serious risk (NPPF paragraph 174).

### **Green Belt**

- 4.4 The study factored an allowance for improvements to Green Belt land as a cost and also on its approach to benchmark values (p.17 CD PR49) to account for those areas within the site boundaries outside the developable area which are retained in the Green Belt.

### **Affordable Housing**

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://modgov.cherwell.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=115&MId=3015&Ver=4>

<sup>3</sup> <http://modgov.cherwell.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=115&MId=3014&Ver=4>

- 4.5 The study tested a specific affordable housing requirement for each proposed development. The impact of affordable housing was assessed at 35% (base position –adopted Local Plan 2015) and at 5% increments from the base position: 40%, 45%: and 50% (Oxford City adopted requirement).
- 4.6 The assessment concluded:  
*“While this analysis is not intended to be a full affordable housing study, the outputs of this exercise for these sites point toward:  
The sites being capable of accommodating higher levels of affordable housing, all other assumptions being equal, and based on the benchmark land value of £500,000 per hectare.”*  
(p.22 CD PR49)
- 4.7 Given viable results of testing 50% affordable housing provision and compensatory improvements to the Green Belt (p.24 CD PR49), the Council took forward the 50% affordable housing requirement to all site policies alongside compensatory GB improvements to all.

#### **Proposed site allocations**

- 4.8 The study’s analysis indicates the proposed residential sites can be viable and deliverable and have a reasonable prospect of coming forward for development. Key viability messages:
- “ ...
- *That all of the sites examined appear to have a good prospect of being viable, even allowing for variations to build cost and sales values.*
  - *That, generally, most housing development sites appear to remain viable when tested at higher S106 contribution levels.*
  - *Likewise, the sites tested may have capacity to accommodate increased levels of affordable housing.*
  - *The sites are also considered in the context of including Green Belt land retained for compensatory purposes as part of wider development packages. Factoring in this land into the viability assessment - and allowing for a reasonable cost to enhance this land - the sites continue to show that:*
    - *They have the ability to be viable*
    - *Could still accommodate increased affordable housing allocations or S106 contributions – or possibly some increased combination of both.*
  - *Considering wider deliverability matters, it is noted that:*
    - *They are principally being used for agricultural purposes*
    - *They have the capacity to be accessible and connect to the surrounding road network.*
    - *The sites tested are located in the south of the District and are therefore well located to address unmet need arising from Oxford City. “ (p. CD PR49)*
- 4.9 This is a focused Plan review to address Oxford’s unmet housing needs and its viability evidence reflects that focus. All allocations have been tested for residential development and ancillary uses when relevant.

## Viability position post submission

- 4.10 In response to representations received to the Proposed Submission document the Council tested further the different affordable housing tenure scenarios that could emerge for affordable housing and recommended focus changes pertinent to viability matters.

### ***June 2018 – Focused changes***

- 4.11 In June 2018 Montagu Evans prepared a Viability briefing note (Appendix 3 of this Statement) addressing Submission Plan Focus Changes and testing the sensitivity of development sites to accommodate increased developer contributions requirements alongside the provision of 50% affordable housing on site. The briefing note also provided advice relevant at the time on the emerging approach to development viability in the March 2018 Draft NPPF while acknowledging that the Plan would be examined under NPPF1.

- 4.12 Site changes tested:

- **Site Policy PR9** – Land West of Yarnton replace ‘530’ with ‘440’  
Construction of ~~530~~ 440 dwellings (net) on approximately 16 hectares of land (Recommended Focus Changes FC07 and FC64)
- **Site Policy PR10** - Land South East of Woodstock replace ‘410’ with ‘500’  
Construction of ~~410~~ 500 dwellings (net) on 16.3 hectares of land (the residential area as shown).  
(Recommended Focus Changes FC08 and FC73)
- **Site Policy PR6a** Land East of Oxford Road Reduce land allocation for primary school use from 3 hectares to 2.2 hectares (reduction of 3FE to 2FE). Allocate 0.8 hectares to residential use  
‘Construction of 650 dwellings net on approximately 25 ~~24~~ hectares...’  
(Recommended Focus Changes FC17, FC18 and FC19)
- Average net densities removed from all Policies  
(Recommended Focus Changes FC18, FC29, FC38 FC43, FC50, FC64 and FC73)

- 4.13 The June 2018 viability concluded that *“all of the sites continue to show positive viability outputs for the base position (50% affordable housing)” ( Montagu Evans Briefing Note, June 2018 – Section 5 Viability Results).*

- 4.14 This round of viability testing also indicated that the sites can sustain some “increases in costs, or reduction in sales values”.

- 4.15 Overall conclusions note:  
“

- *The review of policy and viability analysis points toward:*

- *That the approach taken by the Viability Assessment (June 2017) and this update continues to align with both current and emerging policy advice. There is however a stronger emerging policy direction of travel that, as part of the plan making process, more knowledge of development costs – especially infrastructure costs is needed. The approach is intending to reduce the need to review viability once the plan has been adopted. In draft NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, the push is toward promoters of sites being expected to contribute to a much greater degree to the plan making process in term of viability matters.*
- *The LP1 PR Viability Review (July 2017) is already well aligned with the technical viability method set out in draft NPPG and the Planning Practice Guidance*
- *That, with the LP1 PR firmed up policy position on affordable housing and changes to a few of the sites in terms of proposed dwelling and site areas, each continues to show good potential to be viable*
- *Sensitivity testing shows that the sites can sustain some increases in costs, or reduction in sales value.*
- *Infrastructure cost associated with LP1 PR are substantial. Even so, it can be demonstrated at a high level how any funding gap might be bridged. In particular, there is the potential for significant external funding to be secured via the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal package.”*

4.16 Viability testing undertaken to inform the June 2018 Briefing Note confirms the proposed sites in the Plan are viable propositions.

***January 2019 – affordable housing tenures***

4.17 Draft Policy PR2 ‘Housing Mix, Tenure and Size’ requires the provision of 80% of the affordable housing to be provided as affordable rent/social rented dwellings and 20% as other forms of intermediate affordable homes.

4.18 In November 2018 the Council commissioned Montagu Evans to assess the capability of development sites to support 50% affordable housing on site and compensatory improvements at a range of housing tenures either end of policy requirements. The Council commissioned the viability testing of:

- 80% affordable rent/ 20% intermediate housing
- 40% affordable rent/40% social rent/20% intermediate housing
- 80% social rent/20% intermediate housing

4.19 As part of this commission Montagu Evans were also asked to adjust some of the sites composition reflecting greater knowledge on site specifics as the Council progresses work on development briefs.

*Table 5 – adjustments to site composition*

Site	Core/ developable Site	Compensatory Land	Combined Site Area
------	---------------------------	----------------------	-----------------------

	Area		
<b>PR10 - Land South East of Woodstock</b>	19.4ha (22.4ha)	32.5ha (29.7ha)	51.9ha (52.1ha)
<b>PR8 - Land East of the A44</b>	112.8ha (112.2)	76.9ha (78ha)	189.7 ha (190.2)
<b>PR9 - Land West of Yarnton</b>	17.3ha	82.0 ha	99.3ha
<b>PR7b - Land at Stratfield Farm</b>	4.2ha	6.3ha	10.5ha
<b>PR7a - Land South East of Kidlington</b>	10.7ha	21.5ha	32.2ha
<b>PR6b - Land West of the Oxford Road</b>	31.6ha	29.9ha	61.5ha
<b>PR6a - Land East of the Oxford Road</b>	28.1ha	19.6ha	47.7ha

*Figures in brackets reflect June 2018 Viability testing adjusted in the November 2018 viability commission to reflect sites' composition*

- 4.20 Appendix 4 of this Statement contains the summary outputs of this viability testing.
- 4.21 Some minor changes to site areas were tested for two sites, with a more substantial change to one site (PR8). The assessment indicates the resultant site viability outcomes of these changes are either insignificant or very positive for the site where more substantive changes have been made.
- 4.22 The assessment confirms that all sites have the capacity to accommodate increased levels of the 'less economically valuable' affordable housing products.
- 4.23 All sites are shown capable of delivering 50% affordable housing on site with a 80% affordable rent/ 20% intermediate housing tenure split.
- 4.24 All sites are shown capable of delivering 50% affordable housing on site with a 40% affordable rent/40% social rent/20% intermediate housing tenure split.
- 4.25 All sites are shown capable of delivering 80% social rent/20% intermediate housing tenure split except PR6b - Land West of the Oxford Road which shows a negative outcome for this particular tenure split.
- 4.26 Policy PR2 is being tested under NPPF1. However, NPPF 2 provides a broader definition of affordable housing and this viability testing exercise shows Policy PR2 will be deliverable when applications come forward.

## 4. Conclusion

- 4.1 The Infrastructure needed to deliver the Plan's growth has been identified together with key delivery partners and funding mechanisms. Critical infrastructure for the earlier phases of the Local Plan is either in place or with some funding committed for its delivery. The Council has paid due attention to the viability and costs in plan-making as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF and has worked with other local authorities and infrastructure providers on the

preparation of its Infrastructure Schedule and cross boundary spatial planning matters (NPPF paragraphs 162 and 182).

- 4.1.1 Viability work undertaken in support of the Local Plan and information on availability of sites (CD PR49 CD PR79) indicates proposed sites are deliverable and there is an active interest from developers and landowners to bring sites forward (NPPF footnotes page 12). The cumulative effect of policies on the proposed sites has been tested and shown not to preclude development coming forward. Further viability work undertaken post Plan submission confirms the positive conclusions on Plan wide and site specific viability in the July 2017 Viability Assessment (CD PR49).
- 4.2 The plan as proposed is economically viable and practically achievable in the timescales envisaged and supported by a strong commitment to on-going infrastructure planning and funding.

## **APPENDICES**

**Appendix 1 - Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire HCWS955**

**Appendix 2 - Key Strategic Infrastructure Summary of Delivery Position at January 2019**

**Appendix 3 – Montagu Evans Viability Briefing Note June 2018**

**Appendix 4 – Montagu Evans viability testing of affordable housing tenures, January 2019**

## **Appendix 1 – Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire HCWS955**



## **Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire: Written statement - HCWS955**

WS

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Made on: 12 September 2018

Made by: James Brokenshire (Secretary of State for Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government)

Commons

HCWS955

### **Housing Land Supply in Oxfordshire**

In March this year the Government committed to the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, to support ambitious plans to deliver 100,000 homes by 2031. The Oxfordshire-wide Joint Statutory Spatial Plan to be adopted by 2021 will be supported by £215 million of funding to help deliver more affordable housing and infrastructure improvements to support sustainable development across the county.

Paragraph 217 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that the Government will explore potential planning freedoms and flexibilities, for example where this would facilitate an increase in the amount of housing that can be delivered. Such freedoms and flexibilities are to be considered by the Government on a case by case basis. In this instance the Government has worked closely with the authorities in Oxfordshire to agree planning freedoms and flexibilities that will support the ambitious plan-led approach through a Joint Spatial Strategy and the Housing Deal.

As part of the Housing Deal, Oxfordshire sought flexibility from the National Planning Policy Framework policy on maintaining a 5 year housing land supply. This policy supports the delivery of housing by ensuring sufficient land is coming forward to meet housing need. However, we recognise the ambitious plans in Oxford to deliver above their housing need in the long term. The Government wants to support this strategic approach to supporting housing delivery through joint working. We have therefore agreed to provide a short term flexibility which will support the delivery of the local plans for the area and ensure that the local authorities can focus their efforts on their Joint Spatial Strategy. The Government recognises that in the short term this will result in fewer permissions being granted under paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework but the Government believes that it is important to support these ambitious plans that will deliver more housing in the longer term.

Having considered the responses from a local consultation, which closed on the 12th July 2018, I am today implementing a temporary change to housing land supply policies as they apply in Oxfordshire.

For the purposes of decision-taking under paragraph 11(d), footnote 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework will apply where the authorities in Oxfordshire cannot demonstrate a three year supply of deliverable housing sites (with the appropriate buffer, as set out in paragraph 73). This policy flexibility does not apply to the Housing Delivery Test limb of footnote 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework nor plan making policy in paragraph 67. If a local authority intends to fix their land supply under paragraph 74 they will still be required to demonstrate a minimum of five year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the appropriate buffer.

This statement is a material consideration in planning decisions and applies to those local planning authorities in Oxfordshire with whom the Government has agreed the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal, namely Cherwell District Council, Oxford City Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council and West Oxfordshire District Council. This statement applies from today and remains in effect until the adoption of the Joint Statutory Spatial Plan in each area, provided the timescales agreed in the Housing and Growth Deal are adhered to. I will monitor progress against these timescales and keep the planning flexibility set out in this statement under review.

This statement has also been made in the House of Lords: HLWS924

## **Appendix 2 - Key Strategic Infrastructure Summary of Delivery Position at January 2019**

## Transport

No	Project	Priority	Cost	Sites	Delivery	Delivery partners
<b>Short to medium term 2018-2026</b>						
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2026</b>			<b>c.£33-36 m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
<b>A4260/A4165 corridor</b>			<b>c.£15.5-£18.6 m</b>	<b>630 Homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
4 (a, b, c)	Bus Lane and bus stop improvements along the A4260/A4165 (4a, 4b and 4c)	Critical	c. £3.87m c. £0.583m c. £0.539m	All LP1PR sites	Partially secured through Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) Delivery through 2018-2023. <u>Banbury Road improvement (Banbury Road Corridor)</u> <u>The scheme covers the northern end of St Giles up to the Kidlington roundabout; and</u> <u>LP1 PR sites contributions</u> <u>Deal spend: £9,700,000</u> <u>Full cost of scheme: £9,700,000</u> <u>Developer contributions</u>	OCC, bus service providers, private developers
5 (a, b, c)	Signalised junctions along the A4260/A4165 corridor to improve bus movements (including Bus Gate near Kidlington centre). (5a, 5b and 5c)	Critical	c.£0.313m c.£0.313m <u>c.£0.271m</u>	All LP1PR sites	<u>The A4260 can accommodate the provision of Rapid Transit down the A4260 through Kidlington. However, transport related public realm improvements will be required to increase the attractiveness and effectiveness of Rapid transit.</u> <u>An element of contribution is expected from all LP1 PR sites</u>	OCC, private developers
11 (a and b)	Kidlington Centre – public realm, transport related improvements 20mph zone in centre of Kidlington on A4260 between Lyne Road and Sterling Approach	Desirable	c.£0.5m TBC	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Partially secured through Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) Delivery through 2018-2023.</u> <u>Banbury Road improvement (Banbury Road Corridor)</u> <u>The scheme covers the northern end of St Giles up to the Kidlington roundabout; and</u> <u>LP1 PR sites contributions</u> <u>Deal spend: £9,700,000</u> <u>Full cost of scheme: £9,700,000</u> <u>Developer contributions</u>	OCC, private developers
9a	Cycle super highway along the A4260/A4165 to Oxford Parkway	Critical	c.£2.1m-5.25m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>This is an important strategic facility for Oxfordshire but LP1 PR sites are not depending on its delivery. However, this is an important strategic facility enabling rail travel across and beyond the County and some contribution would be expected from LP1 PR sites.</u>	OCC, private developers
9b	Cycle super highway along A4165 from Oxford Parkway to Oxford city centre	Critical	N/A	All LP1 PR sites		
2a	Expansion of Water Eaton P&R	Necessary	c. £7m	All LP1 PR sites		
<b>A44 corridor</b>			<b>c.£16.7m<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1180 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		

6	Bus Lane improvements along the A44/A4144 (6a, 6b, 6c and 6d)	Critical	c.£0.521m c.£1.2m <u>c.£3.8m</u>	PR8 PR9 PR10	<u>Secured through Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) Delivery through 2018-2023.</u> <u>A44 corridor improvements from Langford Lane to Peartree roundabout (Woodstock Road Corridor)</u> Deal spend: £20,100,000 Full cost of scheme: £22,100,000	OCC, bus service providers, private developers
8	Junction improvements facilitating cross-corridor bus movements (A44 to/from A4260) (8a, 8b, 8c and 8d)	Critical	c.£1.04m c.£1.04m c.£1.04m c.£0.31k	All LP1 PR sites		OCC, bus service providers, private developers
3a	P&R at London Oxford Airport <u>Phase 1</u>	Necessary	<u>c. £4m</u>	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Memorandum of Understanding between OCC and landowner indicates how the land will be secured and the P&amp;R delivered.</u> <u>Delivered by Housing and Growth Deal Blenheim Estates contribution Developer contributions</u> <u>Phase 1 – 400 spaces</u>	OCC, bus service providers, <u>London Oxford Airport, Blenheim Estates</u> , private developers
21	Cycle and pedestrian improvements along the A44 (between Bladon Roundabout and Pear Tree Roundabout) (21a and b)	Critical	Apportioned cost of A44 and Woodstock Road scheme c. £8.23m <sup>1</sup> <i>A split of costs will applied for the purpose of this paper's calculations only (£4.1m)</i>	PR8 PR9 PR10	<u>Secured through Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) Delivery through 2018-2023.</u> <u>A44 corridor improvements from Langford Lane to Peartree roundabout (Woodstock Road Corridor)</u> Deal spend: £20,100,000 Full cost of scheme: £22,100,000  <u>Contributions expected from sites PR8, PR9 and PR10.</u>	OCC, private developers
A44-A4260			c.£0.772m	Supports completion of homes on both corridors		
22	Cycle and pedestrian improvements along Langford Lane including enhancement to formalise crossing, Shared Use Path (SUP) on the western end of Langford Lane and hybrid cycle lanes for the eastern end.	Critical	c.£0.772m	PR8 PR9 PR10	<u>Secured through Housing and Growth Deal (March 2018) Delivery through 2018-2023.</u> <u>A44 corridor improvements from Langford Lane to Peartree roundabout (Woodstock Road Corridor)</u> Deal spend: £20,100,000 Full cost of scheme: £22,100,000	OCC , private developers
Long term period 2026-2031						
Infrastructure 2026-2031			c.£15m	2590 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031		
A4260/A4165 corridor			c.£15m	880 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031		
2b	Expansion of Water Eaton P&R	Necessary	c. £8m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>This is an important strategic facility for Oxfordshire but LP1 PR sites are not depending on its delivery.</u> <u>However, this is an important strategic facility</u>	OCC, bus service providers, <u>Chiltern Railways</u> , private

					<u>enabling rail travel across and beyond the County and some contribution would be expected from LP1 PR sites.</u>	developers
18	Kidlington roundabout: provision of pedestrian/cycle crossing at the roundabout and exploring the potential for a pedestrian/cycle bridge over Frieze Way	Critical	c.£7m	PR6a PR6b PR7a PR7b	<u>Developer contributions</u>	OCC, private developers
<b>A44 corridor</b>			<b>TBC</b>	<b>1710 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
3b	P&R at London Oxford Airport <u>Phase 2</u>	Necessary	<u>TBC</u>	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Memorandum of Understanding between OCC and landowner indicates how the land will be secured and the P&amp;R delivered.</u> <u>Delivered by Housing and Growth Deal Blenheim Estates contribution Developer contributions</u> <u>Long term 2026-2031 for Phase 2 – spaces 1100 spaces (including phase1) Feasibility work will indicate cost for phase 2 as explained in the MoU</u>	OCC, bus service providers, <u>London Oxford Airport, Blenheim Estates</u> , private developers
<b>LP1 PR all corridors 2018-2031</b>						
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2031</b>			<b>c.£48-51 m</b>	<b>4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031</b>		

## Education

No	Project	Priority	Cost	Sites	Delivery	Delivery partners
<b>Short to medium term 2018-2026</b>						
<b>Infrastructure 2018-2026</b>			<b>c.£74.3m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
<b>Secondary schools</b>			<b>c.30.3m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
41	Secondary school (1100-place) at Land East of the A44 with playing pitches located to help maintain a gap between the development and Begbroke village	Critical	c.30.3m		Potential funding sources include: Developer contributions and Education and Skills Funding Agency funding streams for capital investment in school provision	
<b>Primary schools</b>			<b>£44m</b>	<b>1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026</b>		
37	Primary School 2FE at Land East of Oxford Road	Critical	c.£10m	PR6a PR6b PR7a PR7b	Potential funding sources include: Developer contributions and Education and Skills Funding Agency funding streams for capital investment in school provision <u>A partial contribution will be required by PR7a and PR7b which would also be served by the recently</u>	OCC Education and Skills Funding Agency Private sector developers

					<u>agreed permanent expansion of Edward Field Primary School.</u>	
38a	Primary School 3FE at Land East of the A44	Critical	c.£13.7m	PR8 PR9	Early engagement with LEA needed to inform a site development brief and development proposals and allow consideration of wider needs and provision.	OCC Education and Skills Funding Agency Private sector developers
38b	Primary School 2FE at Land East of the A44 if required- in consultation with the LEA and unless otherwise agreed with CDC	Critical	c.£10m	PR8 PR9	Potential funding sources include: Developer contributions and Education and Skills Funding Agency funding streams for capital investment in school provision	
39	Additional playing field land (c.1.6ha) at Land West of Yarnton to facilitate the expansion of William Fletcher Primary School by a 0.5 FE on the school site (to a 2 FE)If required	Critical	c.£326.4K*	PR9	*Costs relate to playing pitches provision on c.1.6 ha at PR9	
40	Safeguarding of 3.1 hectares of land north of Shipton Road for the potential development of a new primary school (2 forms of entry), or sports pitches, serving the wider community.	Critical	c.£10m*	PR10	Early engagement with LEA needed to inform a site development brief and development proposals and allow consideration of wider needs and provision.  Potential funding sources include: Developer contributions and Education and Skills Funding Agency funding streams for capital investment in school provision	OCC Education and Skills Funding Agency Private sector developers * The policy requirement for Policy PR10 relates to safeguarding of land and financial contributions,. For indicative purposes, the cost noted covers the provision of a new 2FE school
All provision expected in the period to 2026						
Infrastructure 2018-2031			c.£74.3m	4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031		

## Community Infrastructure

No	Project	Priority	Cost	Sites	Delivery	Delivery partners
Short to medium term 2018-2026						
Infrastructure 2018-2026			c.£2.74m	1810 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2026		
55	Sports hall at PR8 Secondary School for shared community use –one additional 4 court sports hall to Sport England specification 34.5 x 20 x 7.5 (690 sqm)	Necessary	c.£2.34m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>To be delivered in association with the provision of a secondary school at site PR8 with shared use with the community.</u>  <u>Delivery to be informed by the development brief process</u> <u>To be delivered by developer contributions</u>	OCC CDC Private Developers
72	Converting existing Hockey AGP at Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre to 3G, and increasing its size.	Necessary	c.0.4m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy completed in 2018</u> <u>To be delivered by developer contributions</u>	
Long term period 2026-2031						
Infrastructure 2026-2031			c.£9m	2590 homes to be completed in the period 2026-2031		
56	Additional swimming pool space by replacement pool of 25m x 6 lane pool plus teaching pool at Kidlington and Gosford Leisure Centre	Necessary	c.5.7m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy completed in 2018</u> <u>To be delivered by developer contributions</u>	CDC Private Developers
59	Extension to Kidlington Cemetery	Necessary	c.0.14m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Delivery to be informed by the development brief process</u> <u>Provision of land at PR7a</u>	Kidlington PC CDC Private developer
73	Formal sport pitches provision at Land South East Kidlington (PR7a) including: 2 3G football pitches and 1 cricket ground	Necessary	c.3.17m	All LP1 PR sites	<u>Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy completed in 2018</u> <u>Delivery to be informed by the development brief process</u>	Provision of land at PR7a  To be delivered by development proposals
LP1 PR all corridors 2018-2031						
Infrastructure 2018-2031			c.£11.7 m	4400 homes to be completed in the period 2021-2031		



### **Appendix 3 – Montagu Evans Viability Briefing Note (June 2018)**

# BRIEFING NOTE

**Site or property:****Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review****Completed by:****Malcolm Hewines****Job number:****PS12106****Date:****Tuesday, 26 June 2018****Client:****Cherwell District Council****Subject:****Cherwell Local Plan Partial Review**

This briefing note has been prepared for Cherwell District Council on Local Plan viability matters, with specific regard to proposed 'focussed' changes to the Local Plan Partial Review, Submission Plan (June 2017). It also captures other additional information, guidance and publications that have arisen since Montagu Evans' Viability Assessment of the Local Plan was undertaken. This advice note covers:

- Context: LP1 PR Viability Assessment (June 2017).
- Emerging changes to the Policy Background: Draft NPPF and Draft Planning Practice Guidance
- Cherwell's Submission Local Plan Partial Review (LP1 PR) and the focussed changes to it.
- Representations received on the Consultation LP1 PR
- The Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal and site infrastructure costs
- Site Viability Update

A number of conclusions and recommendations are then set out.

## 1. CONTEXT

In June 2017 Montagu Evans' prepared for Cherwell Council a LP1 PR Viability Assessment. The report covered matters of the Local Plan and national planning policy, cumulative policy impact, Cherwell's property market, wider delivery issues and site specific viability testing for those sites proposed to be allocated in the LP1 PR.

The Viability Assessment showed that all of the sites tested have the potential to be viable, with sensitivities undertaken on affordable housing, S106 contributions, house prices and build costs as well as compensatory measures for affected green belt land.

## 2. CHANGES TO THE POLICY BACKGROUND SINCE THE LP1 PR VIABILITY ASSESSMENT

Two key draft policy documents have been published since Montagu Evans' issued its Viability Report. These are:

- I. **Draft NPPF**
- II. **Draft Planning Practice Guidance**

# BRIEFING NOTE

Although these are not yet final versions, and therefore the weight attributed to them is much less, they are important markers for the direction of travel for plan making policy and associated viability issues. First, we reflect briefly on the current NPPF, the National Planning Practice Guidance as well as the Housing White Paper of 2017 before considering the recent draft NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance.

## A. THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. The NPPF sets out the government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

At the heart of NPPF is that the purpose of planning is to help to achieve sustainable development. The NPPF must be taken into account in the preparation of Local Plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. In delivering sustainable development the NPPF is clear that investment in business should not be over burdened by the combined requirements of planning policy expectations. Planning policies should however recognise, seek and address potential barriers to investment through the preparation of Local Plans. This should be to set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the area. In doing so, authorities should set criteria or identify strategic sites to match their strategy and meet needs over the plan period.

### ***NPPF and Housing***

The delivery of housing is given significant prominence in NPPF. Local planning authorities need to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites of enough quantity to provide five years' worth of housing requirements. Local Plans should also meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. Beyond the first five years, local authorities also need to identify a supply of specific and deliverable sites in broad locations for growth for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15.

### ***NPPF: Viability and Delivery***

NPPF places considerable weight on plans being viable and deliverable, and notes that careful attention needs to be made to viability and costs in plan making and decision taking. Plans should be deliverable. Viability is determined, in broad terms, through:

*"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 landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable." (Paragraph 173, Page 41)*

The footnotes of NPPF (page 12) clarify the definition of a deliverable and developable site:

*"To be considered 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 site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years..." (Footnote 11, Page 12)*

*"To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged." (Footnote 12, Page 12)*

NPPF also requires local planning authorities to consider the likely cumulative impacts on development in the area of existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support their development plans. Crucially, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put delivery of the local plan at serious risk.

# BRIEFING NOTE

## B. NATIONAL PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) clearly states that understanding Local Plan viability is critical to the overall assessment of deliverability. Local Plans should present visions for an area. This should be in the context of understanding of local economic conditions and market realities. It not should not however undermine ambition for high quality design and wider social and environmental benefit, and such ambition should be tested against likelihood of delivery.

NPPG also states:

*"The National Planning Policy Framework policy on viability applies also to decision-taking. Decision taking on individual schemes does not normally require an assessment of viability. However viability can be important where planning obligations or other costs are being introduced. In these cases decisions must be underpinned by an understanding of viability, ensuring realistic decisions are made to support development and promote economic growth. Where the viability of a development is in question, local planning authorities should look to be flexible in applying policy requirements wherever possible". (Para: 001 ID: 10-001-20140306)*

NPPG is also clear that there is "no standard answer to questions of viability, nor is there a single approach for assessing viability". (Para: 002 ID: 10-002-20140306).

## C. HOUSING WHITE PAPER (2017): DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT

In February 2017 the Government issued a Housing White Paper. It is designed to address the market's failure to deliver the numbers of affordable homes needed. There are a number of key messages within the White Paper, including:

- The need for more land for homes where people want to live.
- Authorities to have up-to-date plans in place.
- Ensuring that homes are built quickly once planning permissions are granted.
- Diversify the housing market, opening it up to smaller builders and those who embrace innovative and efficient methods.
- Encourage housing associations and local authorities to build more.
- Work to attract new investors into residential.

Considerable reference in the White Paper is also made to the Green Belt. The White Paper reaffirms the Government's intention to maintain existing strong protections for the Green Belt, and that Green Belt boundaries should be amended only in exceptional circumstances. The White Paper suggests that local authorities would need to demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements before releasing land from the Green Belt. (Page 18, Step 1 bullet point 6 and Page 21 bullet point 6)

The White Paper suggests a potential new requirement: "Where land is removed from the Green Belt, local policies should require the impact to be offset by compensatory improvements to the environmental quality or accessibility of remaining Green Belt land". The White Paper also states that the Government will "...explore whether higher contributions can be collected from development as a consequence of land being released from the Green Belt"(Page 28, bullet point 2 and Page 85, A.63 – noting that on page 85 it is preceded by the statement that "on improving arrangements for capturing uplifts in land value for community benefit, we will also explore....."). All (save one) of the proposed LP1 PR sites which are the focus of this report are within the Green Belt.

## D. DRAFT NPPF MARCH 2018

The draft NPPF incorporates policy proposals previously consulted on in the Housing White Paper and the Planning for the right homes in the right places consultation. Key text from the draft NPPF is flagged below, with particular regard to matters of viability. It is noted that this document is at draft stage: it will be subject to change. Nor is there any prescribed timetable for its adoption and it is likely that Cherwell's LP1 PR will be examined before the draft NPPF is adopted.

# BRIEFING NOTE

## ***Transitional arrangements***

*The Government published transitional arrangements alongside the Draft Review NPPF. Under these arrangements, the current NPPF (2012) will apply to local plans submitted on or before the date which is six months from the publication of the new NPPF.*

**Comment:** *Cherwell's LP1 Partial was submitted for Examination on 5 March 2018 and according to the draft revised NPPF transitional arrangements, the Plan would be tested against the existing NPPF. However, it is most likely that applications for planning permission submitted in relation to the PR will be assessed in the context of the new NPPF.*

## ***Development contributions***

*"Plans should set out the contributions expected in association with particular sites and types of development. This should include setting out the levels and types of affordable housing provision required, along with other infrastructure (such as that needed for education, health, transport, green and digital infrastructure). Such policies should not make development unviable, and should be supported by evidence to demonstrate this. Plans should also set out any circumstances in which further viability assessment may be required in determining individual applications." (Paragraph 34)*

**Comment:** *Cherwell's Local Plan and the Partial Review already does this. The Viability Assessment provides the evidence base for confirming that the sites are viable. However, the draft NPPF text points toward the need for a greater level of understanding and knowledge of these matters being required; and perhaps especially on infrastructure items.*

*"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. Where a viability assessment is needed, it should reflect the recommended approach in national planning guidance, including standardised inputs, and should be made publicly available". (Paragraph 58).*

**Comment:** *Although the above statement suggests that viability would essentially be 'fixed' when the local plan is adopted, there still remains some degree of flexibility to test viability at a later stage.*

*"Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for developments that are not on major sites, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). To support the re-use of brownfield land, where vacant buildings are being reused or redeveloped, any affordable housing contribution due should be reduced by a proportionate amount"<sup>22</sup>. (Paragraph 64).*

**Comment:** *This does not specifically impact on the strategic sites within LP1 PR, as they are green belt or underdeveloped land. The retention and renovation of Stratfield Farmhouse (a farmhouse and outbuildings) may increase development costs, though only very marginally – and well within the realms of the contingency applied. This is referred to below in Section 4.*

*Where major housing development is proposed, planning policies and decisions should expect at least 10% of the homes to be available for affordable home ownership, unless this would exceed the level of affordable housing required in the area, or significantly prejudice the ability to meet the identified affordable housing needs of specific groups. Exemptions should also be made where the site or proposed development:*

- a) provides solely for Build to Rent homes;*
- b) provides specialist accommodation for a group of people with specific needs (such as purpose-built accommodation for the elderly or students);*
- c) is proposed to be developed by people who wish to build or commission their own homes; or*
- d) is exclusively for affordable housing, an entry level exception site or a rural exception site (para 65).*

# BRIEFING NOTE

**Comment:** Based on the viability testing undertaken for LP1 PR, all sites are capable of accommodating at least 10% of units as affordable homes, and indeed the policy position in LP1 PR is set at 50%.

*"Small sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area, and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites local planning authorities should:*

- a) ensure that at least 20% of the sites identified for housing in their plans are of half a hectare or less;*
- b) use tools such as area-wide design assessments and Local Development Orders to bring development sites forward;*
- c) support the development of windfall sites through their policies and decisions – giving great weight to the benefits of using suitable sites within existing settlements for homes; and*
- d) work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites where this could help to speed up the delivery of homes"*

(Paragraph 69).

**Comment:** LP1 PR focuses on the partial review of the adopted Local Plan to meet that part of Oxford's unmet housing need apportioned to Cherwell and proposes the allocation of seven large sites to be delivered by 2031. A crucial element of the LP1 PR is that development meets Oxford's housing needs and does not cause harm to the delivery of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. Planning for a mixture of large and small sites should be seen in combination with sites proposed in the emerging Oxford City Local Plan and adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1.

## Protecting Green Belt Land

They should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land (para 37).

**Comment:** The prospect of compensatory improvements to remaining Green Belt land is factored into the LP1 PR Viability Assessment (June 2017), which makes both an allowance for the cost of this land plus its environmental quality and accessibility.

## E. DRAFT PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE MARCH 2018

This document – issued at the same time as the draft NPPF – has significant focus on viability matters. Again, key paragraphs are cited below, together with comments relevant to the circumstances of Cherwell's LP1 PR.

*'Plans should set out policy requirements for the contributions expected from different types of development and, where necessary, from different sites. In particular this should set out policy requirements for the level and types of affordable housing, and for supporting infrastructure including (but not limited to) education, transport, health, green infrastructure, and digital infrastructure.'* (Draft PPG: page, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph)

**Comment:** this guidance points toward authorities would need to have much greater levels of information on specific sites, particularly for infrastructure provision.

*'The National Planning Policy Framework says that plans should be prepared positively in a way that is aspirational but deliverable. This means that policies should be realistic and the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies should not be of a scale that will make development unviable.'* (Draft PPG: page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph)

**Comment:** the cumulative impact of Local Plan policies for LP1 PR has been tested as part of the Viability Assessment. LP1PR provides a considerable level of detail on required infrastructure.

# BRIEFING NOTE

*'Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that allows for sites allocated in the plan to be delivered without the use of further viability assessment at the decision making stage. The use of viability assessment at the decision making stage should not be necessary. 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. Plans should however set out circumstances in which viability assessment at the decision making stage may be required.'* (Draft PPG: page 4, 5th paragraph)

**Comment:** *This statement places greater emphasis on knowledge of the site, scheme and associated development costs and values in order to create certainty on the site's viability at the plan making stage. It is not clear whether the guidance is seeking policy to be formulated on a site by site basis. If so, this would place a much greater onus on the authority preparing its Local Plan – although inevitably, there will be variations in market conditions through the lifetime of a plan which will mean viability too will be subject to variation.*

## **How should viability be assessed in plan making?**

*'The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Drafting of plan policies should be iterative and informed by engagement with landowners, developers, infrastructure and affordable housing providers. Plans should be informed by evidence of infrastructure and affordable housing need and an assessment of viability that takes into account all relevant policies, local, and national standards including for developer contributions. Viability assessment should not compromise the quality of development but should ensure that policies are realistic and the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies is not of a scale that that will make development unviable.'* (Draft PPG: page 5, 2nd paragraph)

## **Should every site be assessed for viability in plan making?**

*'To assess the viability of proposed site allocations site typologies may be used to assess viability in plan making. A typology approach is where sites are grouped by shared characteristics such as the location, current and proposed use (including whether brownfield or greenfield), or size of site. The characteristics used to group sites should reflect the nature of sites proposed for allocation in the plan.'* (Draft PPG: page 5, 3rd paragraph)

*'Average costs and values can be used to make assumptions about how the viability of each type of site would be affected by all relevant policies. Comparing data from comparable case study sites will help ensure that the assumptions of costs and values are realistic and broadly accurate. In using comparable data having regard to outliers (very high or very low values that skew the average) is important to provide an accurate base from which to apply typologies.'* (Draft PPG: page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph)

*'A masterplan approach can be helpful in creating sustainable locations, identifying cumulative infrastructure requirements of development across the area and assessing the impact on scheme viability.'* (Draft PPG: page 5, 5th paragraph)

**Comment:** *this is broadly the approach taken to LP1 PR Viability Assessment, as well as testing each major site separately arguably adding substantial weight to the assessment.*

## **How should strategic sites be assessed for viability in plan making?**

*'It is important to consider the specific circumstances of strategic sites. Plan makers can undertake individual site specific viability assessment for sites that are critical to delivering the strategic priorities of the plan, which could include, for example, large sites, sites that provide a significant proportion of planned supply, sites that enable or unlock other development sites or sites within priority regeneration areas.'* (Draft PPG: page 5, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph)

**Comment:** *the LP1 PR takes this approach – a site by site viability assessment for strategic sites.*



# BRIEFING NOTE

## **How should site promoters engage in viability assessment in plan making?**

*'Plan makers should engage with landowners, developers, infrastructure and affordable housing providers to secure evidence on costs and values to inform viability assessment at the plan making stage. In the absence of this evidence the site should not be allocated. Plan makers should indicate in plans where further evidence and viability assessment may be required.'* (Draft PPG: page 6, 1st paragraph)

**Comment:** *This places far greater requirements on the promoters of sites in the local plan process to provide information which feeds into the authorities Plan Wide Viability Assessment. To a degree this has taken place through the Cherwell Viability Assessment undertaken (the document was consulted on), though much of the information used to inform the viability assessment has come from Council and advisor sources – not the site promoters.*

## **What should plans say about viability assessment at the decision making stage?**

*'Plans should set out defined circumstances in which viability assessment at the decision making stage and when the use of review mechanisms may be required. This could include, for example, where development is proposed on unallocated sites; where further information on infrastructure costs is required; where particular types of development are proposed which may significantly vary from standard models of development for sale (for example build to rent); or where a significant change in economic conditions since plan adoption results in a significant difference in costs and values.'* (Draft PPG: page 6, 3rd paragraph)

**Comment:** *This is a 'catch all' statement which on the face of it allows an authority to describe circumstances when a review of viability might be acceptable – for example, due changes to the property market.*

## **Should viability be assessed in decision making?**

*'As set out in the [draft revised] National Planning Policy Framework the use of viability assessment at the decision making stage should not be necessary. Proposals for development should accord with the relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan and where they do no viability assessment should be required to accompany the application.'* (Draft PPG: page 6, 4th paragraph)

*'Plans should identify circumstances where further viability assessment may be required at the decision making stage. Where viability assessment is submitted to accompany a planning application this should be based upon and refer back to the viability assessment that informed the plan; and the applicant should provide evidence of what has changed since then. Any viability assessment should reflect the Government's recommended approach to defining key inputs as set out in National Planning Guidance.'* (Draft PPG: page 6, 5th paragraph)

**Comment:** *again, this seems to place much greater emphasis on the promoter to provide their evidence of site viability to avoid later viability reviews.*

## **Technical guidance**

In addition, there is a number of technical guidance provided on matters such as profit levels and benchmark land values. The Cherwell LP1 PR Viability Assessment is consistent with this guidance. Again, the draft guidance indicates that where a viability assessment is submitted to accompany a planning application this should be based upon and refer back to the viability assessment that informed the local plan; and the applicant should provide evidence of what has changed since then.

In essence, the Government guidance is proposing a more standardised approach is undertaken for development viability with a number of guidelines set out which arguably may capture more of the Land Value Uplift, particularly in relation to the use of benchmark Existing Use Values. Key changes include:



# BRIEFING NOTE

- Taking into account costs when defining benchmark land values and for schemes specific assessments reference to project contingency relative to project risk and developer return.
- Benchmark land value calculated as existing use value (EUV) plus a premium for the land owner (EUV+). EUV should disregard hope value and be determined by plan makers in consultation with developers and landowners.
- Benchmark land value to reflect all policy requirement costs including planning obligations and CIL, abnormal costs, use of comparable market evidence of current uses (these should demonstrate that prices were based on policy compliant developments) and a premium to landowner (a minimum price a rational landowner would be willing to sell rather than the competitive returns in existing NPPF and NPPG).
- Developer's return set at 20% of gross development value (a lower figure of 6% GDV for affordable housing where there is guarantee of sale)

**Comment:** *the LP1 PR Viability Review (June 2017) already follows this guidance. Benchmark EUVs are used, with allowances made for a premium above this which is reflective of how land transaction deals for large sites are structured – a base minimum price. The modelling assumes a GDV approach with a blended rate of 17.5% applied to account for a lower profit being accepted for affordable housing.*

# BRIEFING NOTE

## 3. REPRESENTATIONS ON CHERWELL'S CONSULTATION VERSION LP1 PR

A number of representations were received in relation to the LP1 PR Consultation in 2017. Whilst many of these were related to wider Local Plan proposals, a number might have a potential bearing on site viability. The main issues of relevance are set out below with comments provided specifically on matters of viability:

Main issue	Comment:
Site PR6a Land East of Oxford Road – has the capacity to accommodate about 700 dwellings	<i>The viability assessment tests the Plan's proposals (PR6a - 650 dwellings) for the provision of 700 units has would be expected to improve scheme viability.</i>
Site PR6c Land at Frieze Farm– proposal for a golf course not justified	<i>The reasons to reserve Land at Frieze Farm for the potential golf course in connection to PR6b Land to the West of Oxford Road is a policy matter dealt within the evidence supporting the Plan. The Viability Assessment examined the cost for acquiring the golf course land and determined that the benchmark land value used was likely to be higher than the existing use value of the golf course. Thus, the Viability Assessment specifically examined the financial circumstances of factoring in the Golf Course (though does not explicitly examine the costs of reprovision).</i>
Site PR8 Land West of the A44, request the school site area (3.2ha) to be reduced to 2 ha to retain the garden centre use on site. Would be prepared to consider alternative location of the garden centre elsewhere in PR8.	<i>A cost of acquiring the Garden Centre has been factored into the LP1PR Viability Assessment. Were this not to be affected by development then the scheme viability would improve.</i>
Site PR10 Land South East of Woodstock - request amendment to 'at least 410 dwellings' without setting a minimum requirement	<i>PR10 housing figure is not set as a maximum threshold. The viability assessment tests the proposals in the Plan. It is to be expected that an increase on housing figures would improve viability. For Policy PR10, the viability assessment tested 410 dwellings as part of the Proposed Submission Plan evidence. This information note tested PR10's Submission Plan figure of 500 dwellings. Whether an increase in dwellings will improve viability will ultimately depend on scheme design, and the types of homes delivered – for example houses or flats, which each have different development costs associated with them – although the expectation is that it would have a positive overall financial benefit given the high sales values in the area.</i>
Policy PR2 Housing mix, tenure and size- Evidence not supporting the 50% AH approach -Policy should reflect Oxford City's emerging approach. Policy should address development viability through open book evidence triggering cascade approach if evidenced	<i>The LP1 PR Viability Assessment supports a 50% Affordable Housing, based on the assumptions used. Oxford City's adopted policy on Affordable housing has been followed. Local Plan Part 1 PR policies should be read alongside adopted Local Plan (2015) policies. Adopted Policy BSC3: affordable housing allows for a viability case to be made.</i>  <i>It is worth noting, Section E of this paper on proposed changes in the Daft Revised NPPF and NPG (March 2018) favours the frontloading of viability as part of development plans.</i>
Policy PR2 Housing mix, tenure and size- Policy should reflect Oxford City's emerging approach. Within the definition of affordable housing specific allowance is made for the key workers employed	<i>Cherwell District Council reflected Oxford City Council's adopted policy approach at the time of LP1PR preparation and submission. At the time of writing this note (June 2018) Oxford City Council were considering the responses to the Preferred</i>

# BRIEFING NOTE

Main issue	Comment:
<p>by the University and Colleges. Need to reflect the most up-to-date position and that is the one that is emerging within Oxford.</p>	<p><i>Options consultation (June-August 2017).</i></p> <p><i>Oxford City Council's preferred approach (June-August 2017) is to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Prioritise delivery of social rented housing (continue with 80/20 split of affordable housing) although, in certain circumstances when delivering employment sector needs, may readdress the social rent/ intermediate balance;</i></li> <li><i>• Continue with the approach to prioritise affordable housing through a robust target yet to be based on viability testing.</i></li> <li><i>• Continue to require on-site affordable housing for developments of 10 units or more, or on sites of 0.25ha or greater. This approach is yet to be supported by viability testing to confirm the threshold.</i></li> <li><i>• Meeting intermediate housing or employment sector specific needs based on local affordability by: allowing 100% intermediate housing on specific sites (could apply to University and Hospital Trust sites to support key staff; school campus sites or other staff accommodation schemes), prioritising homes for rent and have a specific local affordability policy linked to local incomes and house prices.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>LP1 PR sets out the affordable housing requirement for each proposed site allocation informed by a viability assessment that tested increments of affordable housing ranging from Cherwell's adopted policy in the area (35%) to Oxford City Council adopted 50% affordable housing requirement.</i></p> <p><i>The 80/20 affordable housing split in LP1 PR Policy PR2 follows Oxford City Council adopted and preferred approach to deliver social rented housing and the LP1 PR 50% affordable housing requirement has been subject to viability testing alongside the 80/20 tenure split.</i></p> <p><i>LP1 PR Policy PR2 indicates provision for key workers as part of the affordable and market housing mix and for the provision to be made in accordance to Oxford City Council's key workers' definition. How key workers are defined is crucial to assessing the impact on scheme viability. If, for example, some market housing is allocated for key workers – but then is regarded as contributing to the affordable housing quota – then this could generate a more viable scheme. Interestingly too, Oxford City Council's emerging policy suggests that a 100% affordable housing scheme may be acceptable and viable, suggesting therefore that lower levels of affordable housing should also be viable given that they would be cross funded by more valuable private housing.</i></p>
<p>Policy PR2 Housing mix, tenure and size- Need to demonstrate that the proposed application of the</p>	<p><i>The Viability Assessment supports a 50% Affordable Housing allocation based on the assumptions used. It is not possible to</i></p>

# BRIEFING NOTE

Main issue	Comment:
City's affordable housing policies is supported by evidence. City experience at Barton is that 50% is not achievable –the site was owned by the City Council and the consent was granted on the basis of 40% AH.	<i>comment on the site specific outcome at Barton. Each and every scheme is different in terms of infrastructure and design requirements and the costs associated with these items such as for utilities, highways improvements, housing mix, public realm and other amenities. The level of developer's profit agreed will also have a bearing. These factors will then impact on the level of affordable housing that can be secured for each scheme.</i>
Policy PR2 Housing mix, tenure and size - request application of CDC 35% AH requirement for consistency across the district	<i>The affordable housing allocation is reflective of Oxford City's adopted position – and LP1PR is being driven by unmet need from Oxford City. If however a lower affordable housing allocation were proposed, this would improve scheme viability.</i>
Policy PR5 Green Infrastructure -Supportive of the delivery of GI but notwithstanding 'exceptional circumstances' there are limits as to the extent to which the planning applications that are submitted for each of the development sites are able to deliver GI measures, based on environmental suitability, long- term viability and the extent of land control	<i>Many schemes require works to be undertaken on land not immediately within the developer's control. The longer term sustainability of GI will ultimately be dependent on the management agreement, who undertakes this and how it is paid for.</i>
PR11 Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the delivery of infrastructure items must be the subject to an upper limit that, if necessary, can be determined by a viability appraisal.</li> <li>The Council should explore the availability of funding in the event that the allocated sites on their own are unable to fully fund the range of infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>	<i>The assumption would be that the proposed infrastructure is necessary to make the scheme acceptable, and in such instances setting an upper limit would not be appropriate. It is acknowledged however that there may be other funding avenues that become available: see the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth deal in Section 5 below.</i>

**Comment:** *in our view the comments made in the above representations do not, in the main, affect the Viability Assessment undertaken – or that there is insufficient information or definition to determine if they would or the extent of the impact it might have on viability – for example, the impact of key worker housing were this to be part of the affordable housing definition. Increases in the overall number of units without an increase in the land take to deliver that increase is likely to have a positive impact – this is tested in the updated viability assessment below.*

## 4. FOCUSED CHANGES TO THE SUBMISSION LOCAL PLAN

From a review of the Submission Plan and the Focussed Changes, the table below highlights changes which could impact on scheme / site viability.

Reference	Change
FC07 FC64	<b>Site Policy PR9</b> – Land West of Yarnton replace '530' with ' <u>440</u> ' Construction of <del>530</del> <u>440</u> dwellings (net ) on approximately 16 hectares of land
FC08 FC73	<b>Site Policy PR10</b> - Land South East of Woodstock replace '410' with ' <u>500</u> ' Construction of <del>410</del> <u>500</u> dwellings (net) on 16.3 hectares of land (the residential area as shown).

# BRIEFING NOTE

Reference	Change
FC17	<b>Site Policy PR6a</b> Land East of Oxford Road Reduce land allocation for primary school use from 3 hectares to 2.2 hectares (reduction of 3FE to 2FE). Allocate 0.8 hectares to residential use
FC18	
FC19	
FC18 FC29	Site policies PR6a, PR6b, PR7a, PR7b, PR8, PR9 and PR10 Average net densities removed from all Policies
FC38 FC43	
FC50 FC64	
FC73	

The deletion of average net densities for sites is also noted. The impact of this on viability issues is somewhat more challenging, as it potentially relates back to the mix of houses and flats. Matters of changes to infrastructure costs are also considered further below, although many of these are not site specific but area-wide proposals need to support a number of sites. The retention and renovation of Stratfield Farmhouse is likely to increase development costs, though only very marginally – and well within the realms of the contingency applied. Where land take increases or decreases, then this too has a bearing on the viability Assessment (though the land changes proposed are only minor in nature).

## INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING AND THE OXFORDSHIRE HOUSING AND GROWTH DEAL

This section reflects on the changes made to the Infrastructure Schedule following consultation. The Viability Assessment already factored in broad infrastructure costs. The current viability modelling assumes that the following total funds for infrastructure plus a considerable contingency budget.

Site	Site Infrastructure	S106	Abnormals	Contingency	Compensatory & Improvements
Land North West of Oxford Airport, near Woodstock	£7,500,000	£7,500,000	£2,967,114	£3,839,516	£560,000
Land East of the A44	£29,250,000	£29,250,000	£23,388,082	£15,758,540	£2,805,000
Land West of Yarnton	£6,600,000	£6,600,000	£2,611,060	£3,378,774	£432,500
Land at Stratfield Farm	£1,500,000	£1,500,000	£593,423	£767,903	£105,000
Land South East of Kidlington	£3,450,000	£3,450,000	£1,364,872	£1,766,177	£267,500
Land West of the Oxford Road	£7,950,000	£7,950,000	£3,145,140	£4,069,887	£790,000
Land East of the Oxford Road	£9,750,000	£9,750,000	£3,979,546	£151,254	£792,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£66,000,000</b>	<b>£66,000,000</b>	<b>£38,049,236</b>	<b>£29,732,051</b>	<b>£5,752,500</b>
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>					<b>£205,533,787</b>

The costs set out above are broadly similar to those contained in the initial Viability Assessment (2017). It is not possible to allocate these more recent cost estimates to individual sites, and indeed some sites may be capable of accommodating increased costs compared to others.

In March 2018 the 'Oxfordshire Authorities' (the District and County Council and OxLEP) entered into an 'Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal – Outline Agreement' alongside a 'Growth Delivery Plan'. This Agreement commits Central Government to provide Oxfordshire with up to £215m of funding subject to achieving a number of delivery target milestones. The funding package is split as follows:

- Up to £60m for affordable housing
- Up to £150m funding for infrastructure to unlock key housing sites
- £5m resource funding to get a joint plan in place and support housing delivery

The proposed sums stated in the Growth Deal are substantial. If invested they will be expected to have a substantial positive impact on housing delivery and growth. How this funding is to be allocated is not yet determined, although

# BRIEFING NOTE

there might be some expectation that some of these monies will be directed toward Cherwell, given the substantial role it is playing in delivering housing in Oxfordshire.

The costs included in the Infrastructure Schedule accompanying the Submission Plan (Appendix 4) point toward an identified sum of c.£215m associated with delivering LP1 PR. Of this sum, the vast majority will be expected to be delivered as part of the sites' proposals. Whilst the costs assumed within the Viability Assessment work and the Local Plan must be considered as high level at this stage, there is perhaps potential for a shortfall – Adding all of the allowances made for site infrastructure, abnormals, S106 and contingency amounts to just over £200m.

Although a funding gap is therefore possible, there is also some potential additional funding surplus available from the sites, based on a benchmark value of £500,000 per hectare. This is a generous benchmark, especially in light of the direction of travel set out in Draft NPPF (see above) and the advocacy to use EUV plus a premium for benchmark land values. If all the developable land is paid for at the £500,000 per hectare benchmark level, then this could yield up around another £100m of surplus value from the sites. Conceivably some – or all – of this surplus value could be directed toward infrastructure costs (see viability testing outputs below). And, were the benchmark to be set at £250,000 per hectare then that would yield yet another £50 - £60m.

On top of this, there could also be funds drawn from the New Homes Bonus or other ad hoc funding pots which arise through the course of the Local Plan delivery – such as via the LEP, Homes England or Housing Infrastructure Funds, for example.

Thus, although the costs of infrastructure for LP1 PR are considerable at around £215m a case can be made that over time these could be met through a combination of avenues.

## 5. VIABILITY TESTING UPDATE

In light of a number of changes to the sites themselves – plus the LP1PR now fixes the affordable housing policy position - updated viability testing has been undertaken for the same sites as previously tested:

Site	Housing Units	Housing Units
	(Proposed Submission Plan, July 2017)	(Submission Plan, March 2018)
Land East of Oxford Road	650	650
Land West of Oxford Road	530	530
Land South East of Kidlington	230	230
Land at Stratfield Farm	100	100
Land East of the A44	1950	1950
Land West of Yarnton	530	<b>440</b>
Land South East of Woodstock	410	<b>500</b>

The viability assessment assumes that the sites will come forward with compensatory measures. It is also assumed that the base position is a 50% affordable housing allocation with an 80/20 tenure split. All other assumptions are those used in the Viability Assessment (June 2017). Changes to the modelling work are:

- Land West of Yarnton: now 440 units; previously 530 units on approximately 16 hectares of land
- Land South East of Woodstock: now 500 units; previously 410 units on 16.3 hectares of land
- Minor changes to site areas, reflecting the focussed changes

The key site information which informs the viability testing is contained in the table below, with changes to the original assumptions shown in red (with previous figures shown in brackets below). The key appraisal assumptions are attached at Appendix 3.

# BRIEFING NOTE

Site	Uses	Core Site Area	Compensatory Land	Combined Site Area	Base Position Benchmark (per Ha)	Base Position plus Compensatory Land Benchmark (per Ha)
1. Land South East of Woodstock	Resi - increased from 410 to 500 units	22.4ha (19.4 ha)	29.7ha (23.9ha)	52.1ha (48.7ha)	£500,000	<b>£229,223</b> <b>(£210,729)</b>
2. Land East of the A44	Resi - 1,950 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	112.2ha	78.0ha	190.2 ha	£500,000	<b>£305,205</b>
3. Land West of Yarnton	Resi – reduced from 530 to 440 units	17.3ha	82.0 ha	99.3ha	£500,000	<b>£106,244</b>
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	Resi – 100 units	4.2ha	6.3ha	10.5ha	£500,000	<b>£215,000</b>
5. Land South East of Kidlington	Resi – 230 units	10.7ha	21.5ha	32.2ha	£500,000	<b>£182,842</b>
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	Resi – 530 units	31.6ha	29.9ha	61.5ha	£500,000	<b>£269,065</b>
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	Resi – 650 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	31.7ha	16.1ha	47.8ha	£500,000	<b>£340,010</b>

NB: The benchmark land values are as previous - Greenfield land: £500,000 per hectare / Compensatory land: £25,000 per hectare.

No changes have been made to build costs nor house prices. House prices have increased modestly over the last 12 months in Oxfordshire (see for example Zoopla which shows a 1.5% house price increase in the last 12 months for Oxfordshire) and build costs for residential have increased by 2.5% over the same period. It also provides a consistent basis for comparing and contrasting with the outputs provided in the original Viability Assessment (June 2017).

The results of the updated viability assessment, including sensitivity analyses are set out in Appendix A, and are colour coded as follows:

- Red** – Assumed to be less than 90% of the benchmark value. **Not likely to be viable.**
- Amber** – Not more than 10% lower than benchmark value. **Marginal viability.**
- Green** – Above benchmark value. **Likely to be viable.**

## Viability Results

The results attached at Appendix 1 & 2 show that:



# BRIEFING NOTE

- All of the sites continue to show positive viability outputs for the base position (50% affordable housing)
- The sensitivity testing shows that some sites become more marginal or unviable if (all other things remaining equal) but only when substantially more negative sensitivities are applied. That is:
  - Build costs increase by 10%
  - S106 increases to £30,000 per unit (though all sites are viable at £20,000 per unit)
  - House prices fall by 10%.

Therefore, the updated viability testing continues to support the view that the sites contained in Cherwell's LP1 PR are viable based on the assumptions used, allowing for the changes to the sites since the initial viability testing were prepared.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The review of policy and viability analysis points toward:

- That the approach taken by the Viability Assessment (June 2017) and this update continues to align with both current and emerging policy advice. There is however a stronger emerging policy direction of travel that, as part of the plan making process, more knowledge of development costs – especially infrastructure costs is needed. The approach is intending to reduce the need to review viability once the plan has been adopted. In draft NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, the push is toward promoters of sites being expected to contribute to a much greater degree to the plan making process in term of viability matters.
- The LP1 PR Viability Review (July 2017) is already well aligned with the technical viability method set out in draft NPPG and the Planning Practice Guidance
- That, with the LP1 PR firmed up policy position on affordable housing and changes to a few of the sites in terms of proposed dwelling and site areas, each continues to show good potential to be viable
- Sensitivity testing shows that the sites can sustain some increases in costs, or reduction in sales value.
- Infrastructure cost associated with LP1 PR are substantial. Even so, it can be demonstrated at a high level how any funding gap might be bridged. In particular, there is the potential for significant external funding to be secured via the Oxfordshire Housing and Growth Deal package.

We continue to remain comfortable that the sites contained within LP1 PR are viable propositions. In light of the emerging draft NPPF, the Council should continue to engage with promoters of sites in order that continued, increased knowledge of site infrastructure and costs can be shared and that greater certainty can be secured for delivering GI improvements.



# **BRIEFING NOTE**

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **BASE PLUS COMPENSATORY LAND ANALYSIS**

# BRIEFING NOTE

## **BASE PLUS COMPENSATORY LAND (50% Affordable)**

Base Position plus Compensatory Land	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£371,450
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£696,821
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£155,996
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£356,790
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£257,671
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£316,619
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£470,344

## **Affordable Housing Sensitivity Analysis**

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 35% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£569,227
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£922,238
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£247,480
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£553,545
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£397,699
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£482,755
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£708,347

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 40% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£503,301
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£847,099
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£217,228
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£487,960
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£350,937
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£427,368
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£629,008

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 45% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£437,375
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£771,960
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£186,612
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£422,375
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£304,176
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£372,272
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£549,990

# BRIEFING NOTE

## Build Costs Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 10% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£500,839
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£822,700
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£216,097
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£486,435
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£349,120
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£424,936
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£625,368

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 5% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£436,144
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£759,760
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£186,046
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£421,612
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£303,267
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£371,112
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£548,226

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +5% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£306,755
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£633,882
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£126,259
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£290,724
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£211,593
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£262,339
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£393,585

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +10% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£241,546
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£570,943
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£95,819
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£225,607
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£165,899
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£207,811
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£315,296

# BRIEFING NOTE

## S106 Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +£15,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£371,450
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£696,821
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£155,996
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£356,790
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£257,671
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£316,619
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£470,344

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +£20,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£326,502
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£655,081
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£135,510
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£311,754
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£225,658
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£279,063
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£417,482

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position plus Compensatory Land + £30,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£236,087
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£571,601
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£93,258
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£220,119
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£161,980
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£203,165
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£308,698

Base Position plus Compensatory Land + £40,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£145,857
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£488,121
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£51,170
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£129,638
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£97,074
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£126,896
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£199,915

# BRIEFING NOTE

## Sale Price Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 10% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£173,021
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£471,404
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£63,834
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£158,451
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£116,676
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£149,393
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£231,859

Base Position plus Compensatory Land 5% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£272,561
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£584,113
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£110,289
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£257,146
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£187,702
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£233,256
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£351,866



# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +5% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£470,338
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£809,530
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£201,920
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£455,168
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£327,557
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£400,099
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£589,814

Base Position plus Compensatory Land +10% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£569,227
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£922,238
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£247,480
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£553,545
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£397,699
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£482,755
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£708,347

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **BASE POSITION SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS**

# BRIEFING NOTE

## **BASE POSITION (50% affordable)**

Base Position	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£900,719
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,199,222
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,030,820
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£934,986
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£830,027
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£641,410
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£721,480

## **Affordable Housing Sensitivity Analysis**

Base Position 35% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,360,727
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,581,346
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,555,321
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,426,875
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£1,251,156
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£964,596
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£1,080,304

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position 40% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,207,391
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,453,971
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,380,243
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,262,912
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£1,110,433
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£856,802
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£960,670

Base Position 45% AH	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,054,055
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,326,596
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,206,554
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,098,949
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£969,710
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£749,723
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£841,578

# BRIEFING NOTE

## Build Costs Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position 10% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,201,664
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,412,609
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,373,511
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,259,099
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£1,104,964
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£852,068
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£955,181

Base Position 5% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,051,192
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,305,915
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,203,306
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,097,042
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£966,976
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£746,739
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£838,918

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position +5% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£750,246
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,092,528
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£859,773
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£772,929
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£691,364
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£535,908
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£605,800

Base Position +10% Build Costs	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£598,621
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£985,834
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£687,333
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£607,224
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£554,353
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£429,940
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£487,750

# BRIEFING NOTE

## S106 Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position +£15,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£900,719
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,199,222
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,030,820
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£934,986
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£830,027
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£641,410
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£721,480

Base Position +£20,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£796,177
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,128,465
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£910,984
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£822,396
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£733,689
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£568,457
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£641,833

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position + £30,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£585,925
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£986,950
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£672,672
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£593,504
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£542,560
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£420,898
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£477,800

Base Position + £40,000 S106 Payments	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£376,124
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£845,436
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£429,869
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£367,301
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£347,398
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£272,139
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£313,768



# BRIEFING NOTE

## Sale Price Sensitivity Analysis

Base Position 10% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£439,554
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£817,097
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£503,343
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£439,334
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£406,759
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£316,248
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£361,935

Base Position 5% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£670,715
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,008,160
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£769,625
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£686,071
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£618,063
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£479,306
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£542,893

# BRIEFING NOTE

Base Position +5% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,130,723
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,390,284
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,294,421
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,180,930
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£1,040,072
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£802,905
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£901,626

Base Position +10% Sale Price	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	22 Ha	£1,360,727
2. Land East of A44	112 Ha	£1,581,346
3. Land West of Yarnton	17 Ha	£1,555,321
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	4 Ha	£1,426,875
5. Land South East of Kidlington	11 Ha	£1,251,156
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£964,596
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	32 Ha	£1,080,304

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **KEY APPRAISAL ASSUMPTIONS**

# BRIEFING NOTE

## Appraisal Assumptions

The viability testing adopts the Residual Land Value approach. The appraisals are based on today's costs / today's values.

## Gross to Net Ratios

Use	Gross to Net Ratio
Unit retail	85%
Foodstore	100%
C3 Housing	100%
C3 Flats	85%

## Construction Costs

Use	BCIS Cost, (Q2, 2017, Cherwell District)
Unit retail / foodstore	£1,227 psm
C3 Housing	£1,166 psm
C3 Flats	£1,389 psm

## Other Costs

- **Sustainability allowance for Homes** - 4% increase on base unit build costs
- **Improvement to Compensatory Land:** £25,000 per hectare
- **Local Site Infrastructure:** £450,000 per net developable hectare. Site infrastructure is assumed to encapsulate immediate residential unit requirements: parking, gardens, local roads
- **Major Site Infrastructure Abnormals:** 5% -10% of build cost (including sustainability allowance and price of compensatory land improvements)
- **Professional fees:** 10% of build cost (including site infrastructure, sustainability allowance and abnormals)
- **Contingency:** 5% of total build costs (including site infrastructure, sustainability allowance, abnormals and professional fees)
- **Agent Sales Fee:** 2.5% (inc marketing for residential)
- **Agent Letting Fee:** 10% of 1<sup>st</sup> yrs. rent for commercial accommodation
- **Legal Letting Fee:** 5% of 1<sup>st</sup> yrs. rent for commercial accommodation
- **S106:** £15,000 per residential unit
- **Site Purchasers Costs:** 6.80% of the site acquisition cost
- **Finance Costs:** 7% of total construction costs
- **Profit:** 20% Profit on Gross Development Value

# BRIEFING NOTE

## Housing Mix and Sizes

Type	Area (sq m)	Mix
<b>1B Flat</b>	60 gross	15%
<b>2B Flat</b>	75 gross	15%
<b>2B House</b>	75	15%
<b>3B House</b>	100	40%
<b>4B+ house</b>	150	15%

All sites assume the above housing mix.

## Residential Sales Values and Sales Rates

- All sites at sales value of £4,305 (£400 per sq ft)
- All sites assume sales rate of 80 units per annum, save for Roundham Park (120 units p.a.), Stratfield Farm, (40 units p.a.) and Land East of Kidlington (40 units p.a.)

## Affordable Housing: Policy Compliant Levels

Affordable housing split is 80% affordable / 20% intermediate.

Blended affordable housing sales value of 50% of private sales market value. The affordable housing is based on the Affordable Rent model, with no grant assumed.

## Commercial Revenue

Use	Rent Psm (psf)	Yield
<b>A1 – A5 Unit Retail</b>	£161 (£15)	<b>8%</b>
<b>Foodstore</b>	£161 (£15)	<b>5%</b>

Rent free period is applied at 3 months for foodstore and 12 months for unit retail.

The table below describes the main land uses, and site areas for the site viability testing. It also sets out the benchmark land values used for Scenario 2: Base Position Plus Compensatory Land

Site	Uses	Core Site Area	Compensatory Land	Combined Site Area	Scenario 2: Benchmark (per Ha)
1.Land South East of Woodstock	Resi - 410 units	19.4ha	29.3ha	48.7 ha	£210,729
2. Land East of the A44	Resi - 1,950 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	112.2ha	78.0ha	190.2 ha	£305,205

# BRIEFING NOTE

Site	Uses	Core Site Area	Compensatory Land	Combined Site Area	Scenario 2: Benchmark (per Ha)
3. Land West of Yarnton	Resi – 530 units	17.3ha	82.0 ha	99.3ha	£106,244
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	Resi – 100 units	4.2ha	6.3ha	10.5ha	£215,000
5. Land South East of Kidlington	Resi – 230 units	10.7ha	21.5ha	32.2ha	£182,842
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	Resi – 530 units	31.6ha	29.9ha	61.5ha	£269,065
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	Resi – 650 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	31.7ha	16.1ha	47.8ha	£340,010

**Appendix 4 – Montagu Evans viability testing of affordable housing  
tenures, January 2019**

## SUMMARY OUTPUTS – CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN PARTIAL REVIEW (Jan 2019)

The table below sets out agreed changes to site areas. The changes to site areas affect PR10, PR8, and PR6a. They are generally modest / minor changes to site areas, save for PR8.

Site	Uses	Core/ developable Site Area	Compensatory Land	Combined Site Area	Updated Average Benchmark (per Ha)
<b>PR10 - Land South East of Woodstock</b>	Resi - 500 units	19.4ha	32.5ha	51.9ha	<b>£202,552</b>
<b>PR8 - Land East of the A44</b>	Resi - 1,950 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	82.59	76.9ha	159.49	<b>£270,973</b>
<b>PR9 - Land West of Yarnton</b>	Resi –440 units	17.3ha	82.0 ha	99.3ha	<b>£107,754</b>
<b>PR7b - Land at Stratfield Farm</b>	Resi – 100 units	4.2ha	6.3ha	10.5ha	<b>£215,000</b>
<b>PR7a - Land South East of Kidlington</b>	Resi – 230 units	10.7ha	21.5ha	32.2ha	<b>£182,842</b>
<b>PR6b - Land West of the Oxford Road</b>	Resi – 530 units	31.6ha	29.9ha	61.5ha	<b>£269,065</b>
<b>PR6a - Land East of the Oxford Road</b>	Resi – 650 units Commercial – retail 1,000 sq m Commercial – foodstore 1,000 sq m	28.1ha	19.6ha	47.7ha	<b>£304,821</b>

The benchmark land value for the core development site is retained at £500,000 per hectare gross, with the additional compensatory land at £25,000 per hectare gross. This approach provides an average benchmark land value for each site.



## Summary Viability Outputs

The below tables provide an update to the key outputs of the viability testing exercise carried out previously. We have focused on the viability of the **Base Position Plus Compensatory Land** – The core development land plus the safeguarded compensatory greenbelt land.

### Viability Assumptions

The majority of the assumptions used in our modelling remain unchanged. However, as instructed we have altered the affordable housing tenure mix to further test viability.

As previously, the outputs are colour coded as follows:

- **Red** – Assumed to be less than 90% of the benchmark value. **Not likely to be viable.**
- **Amber** – Not more than 10% lower than benchmark value. **Marginal viability.**
- **Green** – Above benchmark value. **Likely to be viable**

Four tables are provided below. These are:

1: Original base viability outputs from June 2018 Briefing note (50% AH, split 80% AR / 20% intermediate)

2. As above with amends to site areas (50% AH, split 80% AR / 20% intermediate)

3. As (2) above with 50% AH (split 40% AR / 40% SR / 20% intermediate)

4. As (2) above with 50% AH (split 80% SR / 20% intermediate)

**Table 1: Original base viability outputs from June 2018 Briefing note (50% AH, split 80% AR / 20% intermediate).**

Base Position plus Compensatory Land	Gross Area	Gross Ha RLV
1. Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£371,450
2. Land East of A44	190 Ha	£696,821
3. Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£155,996
4. Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£356,790
5. Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£257,671
6. Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£316,619
7. Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£470,344

**Table 2: Core Site Area Plus Compensatory Land (amended site areas): Affordable Housing – 80% affordable rent: 20% intermediate**

Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£371,450
Land East of the A44	159 Ha	£833,556
Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£155,996
Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£356,790
Land South East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£257,671
Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£316,619
Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£470,344

**Table 3: Core Site Area Plus Compensatory Land (amended site areas): Affordable Housing – 40% affordable rent: 40% social rent: 20% intermediate**

Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£319,937
Land East of the A44	159 Ha	£759,309
Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£131,885
Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£304,322
Land East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£220,105
Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£272,397
Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£407,869

**Table 4: Core Site Area Plus Compensatory Land (amended site areas): Affordable Housing – 80% social rent: 20% intermediate**

Land South East of Woodstock	52 Ha	£266,993
Land East of the A44	159 Ha	£687,623
Land West of Yarnton	99 Ha	£107,204
Land at Stratfield Farm	11 Ha	£250,566
Land East of Kidlington	32 Ha	£183,141
Land West of the Oxford Road	62 Ha	£227,664
Land East of the Oxford Road	48 Ha	£343,866