

Developer Forum
held on: 26 November 2019 at 1p.m.
Location: Waltham Abbey Town Hall, Waltham Abbey

Introduction and housekeeping given by Lydia Grainger (LG)

Note taking Amanda Apcar, EFDC (AJA)

Presentation given by Simon Drummond-Hay (S D-H)

Introduction and background

There have been huge changes in framework for setting the plan. Inputs, to take forward as there is a huge scope for viability testing for Local plan but we need to look at viability differently based on and viability Assessments to support the local plan.

The days of using appraisals have now gone and the new guidance says we shouldn't be doing viability like anymore.

Epping Forest DC has two viability assessments prepared to support the local Plan prepared by Dixon Searle - 2017 DS (version 1: 2015) and 2019 HGGT viability prepared with ARUP.

Viability is now a different language and current assumptions don't fit with the new guidance. Therefore work is needed to update costs and value, methodology and approach already used to reflect future DM concerning how we do this - NPPF/PPG/RICs Guidance.

We have prepared a rough and ready report. If anyone disagrees with figures included then please take us to evidence. We won't refer to anyone by name, will use generic terms.

S D-H sought any questions or comment so far? None received.

Changes have been unremarkable, there has been a general upward drift with no strong movement in values.

Look at new build/existing

Harlow of a type – old

Epping - better quality and larger, typically new.

S D-H have drawn on all different sources of information, however none are perfect.

We have used asking prices (not prices achieved) to establish the tone of market and how value are in different areas.

We have looked at Zoopla which show 2019 values right now at end October that are the asking prices of property on market now.

S D-H ask for View on build to rent?

Don't need to comment on everything. We want to push towards evidence and towards the correct assumptions & not analysis of NPPF/PPG - they are what they are.

RSLs do not appear to be seeking social rent, they want affordable rent up to 8% of market rent £15.00 per m². Assumptions used – no more than local - £2,352 m² – S D-H asking if this make sense?

A third housing on someone's scheme – if wrong come back and point us to where you think it should be.

Shared ownership £80,000 London, £70,000 outside.

Older people housing - PPG updated with better understanding for need & delivery
Institutional housing/extra care - when does this become a care home?.

New changes are being introduced and must also be included and cost considered on Employment sites - Biodiversity net gain – as LPA do not ask for this much at present.

This work will update Dixon Searle work.

Harlow different to wider market as there is very little and it is of a particular type and format that is bigger.

S D-H pointed out that the Appendix maybe wrong – and suggested that people please tell us if £2.1m per hectare, £1.3 mean per hectare policy compliance £9.65/£8.98

Most land is subject to an option agreement to purchase so don't know prices therefore have to use minimum prices. Would be useful to know what paid for min/or landowner if is the max

Not interested in land

How much is enough? Just enough.

VAT payable show as note in appendix.

EUV: Industrial = £1m more than Residential.

Agricultural = £22,500

Paddock = £50,000

Productive Agriculture = £20,000 per acre

Biodiversity – very new

DEFRA calculator as require biodiversity at end of scheme to be more than at start

On constraint sites there will be more costs - £20,000 per hectare Government figures

S D-H asked if there were any views?

mentioned calculator – Warwick Uni used?

S106 - £31,000 per unit

Draft figure that includes all infrastructure required.

Breakdown is not included in report as test range of impact in report.

Original assessment £3,000 per unit.

Report will consider impact of these figures and the maximum likely Section 106 contributions ask. see if sites have capacity to bear CIL contributions, If introducing CIL. CIL contributions could be less or more dependent on type of CIL use. Not how paid, what total amount paid.

Legal costs etc. - 0.5%

Promoters – will be taking a return for promoting sites and what take from landowner.

Need to know thinking? Where, use, size

S D-H ask that anyone could highlight if typology not in amongst those shown?

Trying to test as per PPG compliance.

Noted that the Inspector had no concerns about viability.

AJA dealing with technology issues but noted:

S D-H spoke about small 'site' & DS work

Produce early results that will change.

Gross area/net area for whole site

EUV with BLV = Residential value

Brownfield/greenfield - higher

Private rent/build to rent - update build costs and show why changed?

S D-H Suggested actions following this session:

EFDC: Report to be circulated – no analysis of all circumstances. We need to get costs, values right, when feedback will do scenario testing.

S D-H: Concentrate on bits that were of concern.

We must remember that at this stage it is a rough and ready draft and doesn't draw policy conclusions. We want to make sure numbers are applied properly.

Decide - Comments by Friday 6th December through Email can be bullet points – sale site etc.

Comments from Boyer Planning – No further hearings on this at examination so how will Council use this - PPG clear on requirements at development management stage
Looked at viability Assessment at plan stage & the Insp report on paragraph 57, what is the purpose regardless of this.

S D-H reply - Process to consider viability at DM stage

Compare and contrast evidence informing the plan and bring 2 studies into one place so can be used. The plan has been examined independently and this work won't be part of Local Plan process. Consolidate IDP and Viability so people know where to go.

There are a number of changes that must be picked up

- zero carbon
- bio diversity

S D-H questioned, £31,000 is it deliverable? need to understand the economics

Further comments from Boyer Planning – What further work precisely used for? Would be helpful to know to inform responses that will be made

Want assumptions to be right.

Surprised by work – what is its status? Weight? How is it to be used? How will the results be used?

S D-H reply at this stage – we need to get figures right!

S D-H said that they are happy to share blended raw data.

Email S D-H if want spreadsheet.

When it is to be published? Prepare a covering note.

Link on website.

Actions:

- Report by email to agents etc.
- make available to Town & Parish Councils

- Consultation on our website.

Why: committed to do this as part of Local Plan examination (matter 14), so it's easy to use and transparent. It will be Consolidated and Updated Viability evidence.

How use: for DM purposes

SPD: may want to use work for this purpose so need to consult to be a material planning consideration and give required weight.

Concern what it is: Guidance? DPD?

Want to update the work bearing in mind that build costs gone up/prices have not!

HRH to Tweak report Appendix

EFDC – explain purpose etc. and put on website with separate cover sheet – S D-H will review draft wording

- Arup figures different for HGGT. Unpick, why?

Response to ECC Developer contributions Guidance – S D-H happy to review.

Agreed that close of consultation will now be 6th January 2020