

**CRANBROOK PLAN DEVELOPMENT
2013-2031: February 2019**

**ANSWERS: Issues and Questions
For Examination
29 November 2019**

P. Boekman (367)

Matter 15 Viability

Issue 21 Are the Assumptions Made Regarding Land Values Fully Justified in Respect of the Viability / Infrastructure Delivery Plan?

- Q168 The upgrading of the London Road is critical before any developments should be envisaged.
- Q169 The section 106 allowance of £16,828 per plot is not substantiated.
- Q170 The actual breakdown of disaggregated assumed abnormal costs is required and it is unclear whether this has been featured in the costs per dwelling figure.
- Q171 There is no justification for deviation from the benchmark rate across the development (SANGS).
- Q172 There is an extremely high risk associated with the blended benchmarking rate regarding the delivery of infrastructure.
- Q173 The evidence to support the land value should be as market value. We have seen no assessment.
- Q175 No evidence that the GDV used by Three Dragons is as market value.
- Q176 Have not seen any sensitivity testing in respect of the figures used in the Housing trajectory.
- Q177 The assessment of valued residential development land lost to infrastructure is incorporated within the developers' feasibility project to ensure that Cranbrook is profitable. This has not been evaluated.
- Q178 There is no justification for the trajectory of housing delivery in comparison to the actual delivery of units since 2011. The delivery of units since 2011 has been wholly reliant on market values and has been reduced and non performing.
- AQ21 The assumptions included within Matter 15 should be finalised as a new feasibility to ensure correct values and figures are used to support the Cranbrook Plan.