



# **Community Infrastructure Levy: Viability Study**

Prepared for  
Wiltshire Council

August 2012

## Contents

1	Executive Summary	3
2	Introduction	7
3	Methodology and appraisal inputs	12
4	Development appraisals	15
5	Appraisal outputs	25
6	Assessment of the results	30
7	Conclusions and recommendations	42

## Appendices

Appendix 1	Private residential sales values
Appendix 2	Residential appraisal results
Appendix 3	Commercial appraisal results

### **Contact details:**

Anthony Lee MRTPI MRICS  
Senior Director – Development Consulting  
BNP Paribas Real Estate  
5 Aldermanbury Square  
London EC2V 7BP

Tel: 020 7338 4061  
Fax: 020 7404 2028  
Email: [anthony.lee@bnpparibas.com](mailto:anthony.lee@bnpparibas.com)

# 1 Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report tests the ability of a range of development types throughout the County of Wiltshire to yield contributions to infrastructure requirements through the Community Infrastructure Levy ('CIL'). Levels of CIL have been tested in combination with the Council's other planning requirements, including the provision of affordable housing.

## Methodology

- 1.2 The study methodology compares the residual land values of a range of generic developments to a range of benchmark land values. If a development incorporating a given level of CIL generates a higher value than the benchmark land value, then it can be judged that the proposed level of CIL will be viable.
- 1.3 The study utilises the residual land value method of calculating the value of each development. This method is used by developers when determining how much to bid for land and involves calculating the value of the completed scheme and deducting development costs (construction, fees, finance and CIL) and Developer's profit. The residual amount is the sum left after these costs have been deducted from the value of the development, and guides a Developer in determining an appropriate offer price for the site.
- 1.4 The housing and commercial property markets are inherently cyclical and the Council is testing its proposed rates of CIL at a time when values have fallen below their peak but have subsequently recovered to some degree. Despite this recovery, there is some uncertainty as to the likely short term trajectory of house prices. We have allowed for this by running a sensitivity analysis which inflates sales values by 10% and build costs by 5%. This analysis is indicative only, but is intended to assist the Council in understanding the levels of CIL that are viable in today's terms but also the impact of changing markets on viability. We have also tested a fall in sales values of 5%, to enable the Council to take a view on the impact of any adverse movements in sales values in the short term. Our commercial appraisals incorporate sensitivity analyses on rent levels and yields.

## Key findings

- 1.5 The key findings of the study are as follows:
- The results of this study are reflective of current market conditions, which are likely to improve over the medium term. It is therefore important that the Council keeps the viability situation under review so that levels of CIL can be reviewed, if necessary, to reflect any future changes.
  - The ability of **residential schemes** to make CIL contributions varies depending on area, the current use of the site and the need to strike a balance between funding for infrastructure and the delivery of affordable housing. Having regard to these variations in sales values and existing use, and the impact of varying CIL rates on affordable housing delivery, residential schemes should be able to absorb a **maximum** CIL rate of between £100 to £200 per square metre, depending on the settlement. CLG guidance requires that charging authorities do not set their CIL at the margins of viability. Other authorities have set their rates at a discount to the maximum rate, with discounts ranging from circa 30% to 50%. The maximum rates shown in Table 1.5.1 below take a broad view across our appraisal results and are pitched at a level that optimises affordable

housing delivery. The full results are shown in tables 6.7.1 to 6.7.5 and we have exercised a degree of judgement in distilling these results into the maximum rates shown in Table 1.5.1. For example, we have arrived at a maximum rate of £160 per sqm for Settlement Category 2 because this would still allow at least 20% affordable on sites in former employment use (and 40% on greenfield sites). A maximum CIL rate of £120 per sqm would allow developments in Settlement Category 3 to provide between 20% and 30% affordable housing on greenfield sites. A maximum CIL rate of £100 per sqm would allow developments in Settlement Category 4 to provide at least 20% affordable housing on greenfield sites. The Council may, of course, decide that a different prioritisation between affordable housing and CIL is appropriate.

**Table 1.5.1: Maximum CIL rates – residential**

Settlement Categories	Maximum CIL indicated by appraisals (£s per sqm)
<b>Category 1</b> Marlborough & surrounding area, including Pewsey	£200
<b>Category 2</b> Bradford upon Avon, Salisbury, rural villages south of Salisbury, Wilton and Chippenham	£160
<b>Category 3</b> Corsham, Amesbury, Devizes and surrounding villages	£120
<b>Category 4</b> Melksham, Trowbridge, Westbury, Dilton Marsh, Calne and Warminster	£100

- Our understanding is that the bulk of development is expected to come forward in Settlement categories 2, 3 and 4. In light of this expectation, the Council may wish to consider adopting a single charge across the County at £70 per square metre, as the loss of potential income from Settlement Category 1 will be limited. This would also avoid the need to define a boundary for different charging zones for residential development and result in a simple structure which would be simple to implement. The settlement categories do not form continuous areas and defining appropriate boundaries would be complicated, not least by the variability of sales values on a localised basis. These factors would suggest that variable CIL rates would be difficult to implement and would, in any case, result in very little change in terms of overall CIL income.
- Inevitably, affordable housing delivery on individual schemes may need to be adjusted to accommodate CIL contributions (as is the case now with Section 106 obligations). On sites with lower sales values, the proportion of affordable housing is likely to be lower than on sites with higher sales values. However, as sales values increase, viability of developments on the lower value sites will improve; additional value generated can then be used to provide higher levels of affordable housing, in addition to CIL contributions.
- Whilst the maximum rates are higher than the proposed rates, the buffer will help to mitigate a number of risk factors (primarily the potentially adverse impact on land supply of setting the rates at a high level and 'shocking' the market). However, there is no prescribed percentage buffer and this is entirely a matter for the Charging Authority's judgement.

- Our appraisals indicate that, at the current time, **office, industrial and warehouse** developments are unlikely to be sufficiently viable to absorb CIL contributions. We would therefore suggest a nil rate on these types of development.
  - Residual values generated by **Retail developments in the main shopping centres (Trowbridge, Chippenham, Salisbury, Marlborough and Bradford upon Avon)** are higher than current use values. However, to a degree retail development will involve the re-use of existing retail space, so the difference in value between current and newly developed space is modest in areas where rents are low. Our appraisals indicate that the development of new retail space is sufficiently viable to absorb CIL. We recommend a rate of £175 per square metre, which will allow for a substantial buffer below the maximum rate. Outside these town centre areas, in district centres in these settlements and in town/district centres in other settlements across the county, our appraisals indicate that new retail development (excluding retail warehouses, supermarkets and similar developments) is unlikely to be sufficiently viable to be capable of absorbing a CIL contribution.
  - **Retail warehouse, supermarket** and similar developments are viable throughout the County and could also absorb a CIL contribution. Allowing a buffer below the maximum rates indicated by our appraisals, we would recommend a rate of £175 per square metre.
  - **Student housing** (C2) in the County generates sufficient surplus residual values to absorb a CIL of up to £142 per square metre. After allowing for a buffer for site-specific factors, we suggest a rate of £70 per square metre.
  - **Hotel developments** are able to absorb a maximum CIL of £253 per square metre when built on low values sites. After allowing a buffer for site-specific factors, we suggest a rate of £70 per square metre.
  - **D1 and D2** uses often do not generate sufficient income streams to cover their costs. Consequently, they require some form of subsidy to operate. This type of facility is very unlikely to be built by the private sector. We therefore suggest that a nil rate of CIL be set for D1 and D2 uses.
- 1.6 Tables 1.6.1 and 1.6.2 provide two options on CIL rates that the Council may wish to consider. These rates combine the benefits of a simple structure with optimisation of infrastructure funding.

**Table 1.6.1: Proposed CIL rates – Option 1**

Development type	CIL Charge £/sq m
Residential	£70
High street and covered shopping centre retail in Chippenham, Salisbury, Trowbridge, Marlborough and Bradford upon Avon;	£70
Retail warehouse and superstore development across the County;	£70
Student housing and hotels	£70
All other uses	£0

**Table 1.6.2: Proposed CIL rates – Option 2**

Development type	CIL Charge £/sq m
Residential	£70
High street and covered shopping centre retail in Chippenham, Salisbury, Trowbridge, Marlborough and Bradford upon Avon;	£70
Retail warehouse and superstore development across the County;	£175
Student housing and hotels	£70
All other uses	£0