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## 1. Introduction

## Scope

1.1 King's Lynn and West Norfolk Council is working towards implementing Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as a mechanism to fund, at least in part, the infrastructure required to support the development set out in the Plan. In January 2015, the Council published and consulted on a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS). This update has been prepared to consider, and where appropriate address, the points raised by stakeholders and to consider the various changes in national policy.
1.2 The PDCS included the following rates of CIL:

| Table 1.1 PDCS proposed rates of CIL |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Development Type | Rate of CIL |
| Residential - All areas excluding the un-parished area of King's Lynn | $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Residential - For the un-parished area of King's Lynn only | $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Sheltered / Retirement Housing (C3) - All areas excluding the un-parished <br> area of King's Lynn | $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Supermarkets, Retail Warehouse and Hotels | $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| All other chargeable development | $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |

Source: Document A - Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation - Schedule of rates (January 2015)
1.3 This update will address:
a) The comments of stakeholders.
b) The various policy changes to national policy.
c) The updated strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs in relation to the larger sites that are included in the Council's Local Plan.
1.4 HDH Planning and Development Ltd completed the November 2013 Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD and Community Infrastructure Levy Viability Study (the 2013 Viability Study). The 2013 Viability Study forms the 'root' document which sets out the detailed methodology and assumptions used. Due to the passage of time and for ease of reference, this current report has been written to be read as a standalone document, but is an update to the earlier documents. In an effort ensure that the report is easy to follow, the chapter numbers in this update relate to those in the earlier report
1.5 Like the earlier work, this update will draw on the existing available evidence. CIL is set having regard to a range of factors, one of which is viability. This update only considers viability. Outside this report, the Council is considering, amongst other things, the need for infrastructure and other sources of funding.
1.6 As when considering the viability aspects of setting CIL, it is important to note at the start of a study of this type, that not all sites will be viable, even without any policy requirements or CIL imposed by the Council. It is inevitable that the Council's requirements will render some sites unviable. The question for this report is not whether some development site or other would be rendered unviable, it is whether the delivery of the overall Development Plan is threatened.
1.7 The 2013 Viability Study was prepared following a consultation process. An event was held on the 22nd January 2013, to which the representatives of the main developers, development site landowners, their agents and housing providers were invited. The meeting was used to set out the methodology, to test the assumptions used in the report and to put the report in context.

## Consultation Responses

1.8 A range of consultation responses were received in response to the PDCS. The principle points addressed in this update are as follows (including informal comments made following the formal consultation period):
a) The impact of changes to the regulations needs to be considered.
b) The viability evidence was completed late in 2013, but the work was carried out in late 2012 and early 2013. Costs have increased since then, as have values.
c) Neighbourhood plans need to be considered.
d) Clarity around the assumptions in relation future s106 payments, in the context of the emerging Norfolk County Council Planning Obligations Standards need to be considered.
e) A finer grain approach to residential values should be used due to significant variance in prices across the Borough - particularly in the west. In some areas the prices are too high.
f) Non-residential yields may be too low (resulting in inflated values).
g) The land value assumptions are too low.
h) Older people's housing should be given further attentions due to concerns about several assumptions.
i) The $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ rate should apply to all areas where a higher rate does not apply / the $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ rate should be better evidenced.
j) The retail rates do not reflect the smaller formats (such as Aldi, Lidl, Waitrose, Farmfoods, Spar, M\&S etc)
k) The mitigation of the potential impact of development on Curlew habitat should be recognised. This is anticipated to be $£ 50$ per new dwelling and at this stage is expected to affect all new homes in the Borough. This will be collected through a s106 Unilateral Undertaking.
1.9 A number of points were also raised on the allocation of CIL money. These are not viability matters so are not considered here.

## Report Structure

1.10 Due to the passage of time from the first iteration of this 2013 Viability Study we have taken a step back and presented this update as a standalone document - albeit using the same chapter numbers. This report follows the following format:

Chapter 2 The reasons for, and approach to, viability testing, including a short review of the requirements of the CIL Regulations, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Chapter 3 The methodology used.
Chapter 4 An assessment of the housing market, including market and affordable housing, with the purpose of establishing the worth of different types of housing in different areas.

Chapter 5 An assessment of the non-residential markets with the purpose of establishing the worth of different types of commercial uses.

Chapter 6 An assessment of the costs of land to be used when assessing viability.
Chapter 7 The cost and general development assumptions to be used in the development appraisals.

Chapter 8 A summary of the various policy requirements and constraints that influence the type of development that come forward.

Chapter 9 We have set out the range of modelled sites used for the financial development appraisals.

Chapter 10 The results of the appraisals and consideration of residential development.
Chapter 11 The appraisals and consideration of non-residential development.
Chapter 12 The CIL setting process.
Chapter 13 Summary.

## Metric or imperial

1.11 The property industry uses both imperial and metric data - often working out costings in metric ( $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) and values in imperial ( $£ /$ acre and $£ / \mathrm{sqft}$ ). This is confusing so we have used metric measurements throughout this report. The following conversion rates may assist readers.

| $1 \mathrm{~m}=$ | $3.28 \mathrm{ft}\left(3^{\prime}\right.$ and $\left.3.377^{\prime}\right)$ | 1 ft | $=0.30 \mathrm{~m}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \mathrm{~m}^{2}=$ | 10.76 sqft | 1 sqft | $=0.093 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ |

1.12 A useful broad rule of thumb to convert $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ to sqft is simply to add a final zero.

## 2. Viability Testing

2.1 Viability testing is an important part of the plan-making process. There have been a number of changes since the 2013 Viability Study, although the general principles remain unchanged. The requirement to assess viability forms part of the National Planning Policy Framework ${ }^{1}$ (NPPF), the Planning Practice Guidance ${ }^{2}$ (PPG) which replaced a wide range of existing planning guidance in March 2014, and is a requirement of the CIL Regulations ${ }^{3}$. In each case the requirement is slightly different but all have much in common.
2.2 The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. The NPPF's content has not been changed by the PPG. The PPG provides detail and clarity as to the meaning, application and implementation of the NPPF. In June 2014 the CIL Regulations were assimilated into the PPG.

## NPPF Viability Testing

2.3 The NPPF introduced a requirement to assess the viability of the delivery of Local Plans and the impact on development of policies contained within it. The NPPF includes the following requirements (with our emphasis):

## Ensuring viability and deliverability

173. Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in planmaking and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. 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 land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

[^0]174. Local planning authorities should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing. They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards. In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence.
2.4 The duty to test in the NPPF is a 'broad brush' one saying 'plans should be deliverable'. It is not a requirement that every site should be able to bear all of the local authority's requirements - indeed, there will be some sites that are unviable even with no requirements imposed on them by the local authority. The typical site in the local authority area should be able to bear whatever target or requirement is set and the Council should be able to show, with a reasonable degree of confidence, that the Development Plan is deliverable.
2.5 The enabling and delivery of development is a priority of the NPPF. In this regard it says:
47. To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

- use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period;
- identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable11 sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5\% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20\% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;
- identify a supply of specific, developable12 sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15;
- for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target; and
- set out their own approach to housing density to reflect local circumstances.
2.6 Footnotes 11 and 12 of the NPPF are important in providing detail stating:

[^1]2.7 Some sites within the area will not be viable. In these cases developers have scope to make specific submissions at the planning applications stage; similarly some sites will be able to
bear considerably more than the policy requirements. This study will consider the development viability of the site types that are most likely to come forward over the planperiod, building on the Council's existing viability evidence base.

## CIL Economic Viability Assessment

2.8 CIL, once introduced, is mandatory on all developments (with a very few exceptions) that fall within the categories and areas where the levy applies, unlike other policy requirements to provide affordable housing or to build to a particular environmental standard over which there can be negotiations. This means that CIL must not prejudice the viability of most sites.
2.9 In March 2010 Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance, Charge setting and charging schedule procedures were published to support the CIL Regulations. These were replaced by Community Infrastructure Levy, Guidance (December 2012 and then April 2013), which in turn was replaced by Community Infrastructure Levy, Guidance (February 2014). In June 2014 the CIL Guidance was further updated and assimilated into the PPG. The Guidance requires an authority that is pursuing CIL to publish a 'Charging Schedule'. The Charging Schedule will sit within the Local Development Framework; however, it will not form part of the statutory Development Plan.
2.10 Regulation 14 (as amended since the 2013 Viability Study) of the CIL Regulations now says ${ }^{4}$ :
'councils must strike an appropriate balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability'.
2.11 Viability testing in the context of CIL will assess the 'effects' on development viability of the imposition of CIL. It should be noted that whilst the financial impact of introducing CIL is an important factor, the provision of infrastructure (or lack of it) will also have an impact on the ability of the Council to meet its objectives through development and deliver its Development Plan. The Plan may not be deliverable in the absence of CIL. Further, the level at which CIL is set is not calculated through a predetermined formula. The assessment of the effect of CIL is a quantitative and a qualitative process.

[^2]'councils must aim to strike what appears to the charging authority to be an appropriate balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability'.
2.12 The test that will be applied to the proposed rates of CIL are set out in the updated CIL Guidance (within the PPG), putting greater emphasis on demonstrating how CIL will be used to deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.
'The levy is expected to have a positive economic effect on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.
This balance is at the centre of the charge-setting process. In meeting the regulatory requirements (see Regulation 14(1)), charging authorities should be able to show and explain how their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area.
As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in England (paragraphs 173-177), the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. The same principle applies in Wales.'

PPG ID: 25-009-20140612
2.13 The test is whether the sites and the scale of development identified in the Plan are subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens (when considered together) that their ability to be developed viably is threatened by CIL. This is somewhat more cautious than the approach set out in earlier guidance. In the March 2010 CIL Guidance, the test was whether the Plan was put at 'serious risk', and in the April 2013 CIL Guidance, the test was whether CIL 'threatened the development plan as a whole'.
2.14 On preparing the evidence base on economic viability, the Guidance says:
'A charging authority must use 'appropriate available evidence' (as defined in the Planning Act 2008 section 211(7A)) to inform their draft charging schedule. The Government recognises that the available data is unlikely to be fully comprehensive. Charging authorities need to demonstrate that their proposed levy rate or rates are informed by 'appropriate available' evidence and consistent with that evidence across their area as a whole.
In addition, a charging authority should directly sample an appropriate range of types of sites across its area, in order to supplement existing data. This will require support from local developers. The exercise should focus on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan (the Local Plan in England, Local Development Plan in Wales, and the London Plan in London )] relies, and those sites where the impact of the levy on economic viability is likely to be most significant (such as brownfield sites).
The sampling should reflect a selection of the different types of sites included in the relevant Plan, and should be consistent with viability assessment undertaken as part of plan-making.'

PPG ID: 25-019-20140612
2.15 This study has drawn on the existing available evidence where it is available. In due course this study will form one part of the evidence that the Council will use to set CIL. The Council will also consider other 'existing available evidence', the comments of stakeholders and
wider priorities. The NPPF, PPG and the Harman Guidance, (as referred to below), recommends that the development and consideration of a CIL rate should be undertaken as part of the same exercise. The starting point for this report is the existing evidence base as required by the CIL Regulations.
2.16 From April 2015, councils have been restricted in relation to pooling s106 contributions from five developments or more ${ }^{5}$ (where the obligation in the s106 is a reason for granting consent). This restriction will encourage councils to adopt CIL - particularly where there are large items of infrastructure to be delivered that will relate to multiple sites. This restriction on pooling may have the effect of bringing s106 tariff policies, for items like open space, to an end.
2.17 Councils that have adopted CIL will still be able to raise additional s106 funds for infrastructure, provided this infrastructure can be directly linked to the site-specific needs associated with the scheme in question, and that it is not for infrastructure specifically identified to be funded by CIL, through the Regulation 123 List $^{6}$. Payments requested under the s106 regime can only be (as set out in CIL Regulation 122):
a. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
b. directly related to the development; and
c. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
2.18 As mentioned above, under CIL Regulation 123, from April 2015, there are restrictions on pooling contributions from five or more sites where the obligation is a reason for granting planning permission. It is important to note that the counting of the 'five or more sites' relates to the 'provision of that project, or type of infrastructure' and is from the date of the CIL Regulations, being April 2010. The Council will need to consider whether the threshold has already been exceeded for some items of infrastructure.

## Differential Rates

2.19 CIL Regulation 13 (as amended) provides scope for CIL to be set at different levels by different area (zones) and type and size of developments:
'Differential rates
(1) A charging authority may set differential rates-

[^3](a) for different zones in which development would be situated;
(b) by reference to different intended uses of development,
(c) by reference to the intended gross internal area of development;
(d) by reference to the intended number of dwellings or units to be constructed or provided under a planning permission.
(2) In setting differential rates, a charging authority may set supplementary charges, nil rates, increased rates or reductions.'
2.20 The PPG expands on this saying:
'Charging authorities that decide to set differential rates may need to undertake more fine-grained sampling, on a higher proportion of total sites, to help them to estimate the boundaries for their differential rates. Fine-grained sampling is also likely to be necessary where they wish to differentiate between categories or scales of intended use.
The focus should be in particular on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan relies and those sites (such as brownfield sites) where the impact of the levy is likely to be most significant.

The outcome of the sampling exercise should be to provide a robust evidence base about the potential effects of the rates proposed, balanced against the need to avoid excessive detail.

A charging authority's proposed rate or rates should be reasonable, given the available evidence, but there is no requirement for a proposed rate to exactly mirror the evidence. For example, this might not be appropriate if the evidence pointed to setting a charge right at the margins of viability. There is room for some pragmatism. It would be appropriate to ensure that a 'buffer' or margin is included, so that the levy rate is able to support development when economic circumstances adjust. In all cases, the charging authority should be able to explain its approach clearly.

PPG ID: 25-019-20140612

The regulations allow charging authorities to apply differential rates in a flexible way, to help ensure the viability of development is not put at risk. Differences in rates need to be justified by reference to the economic viability of development. Differential rates should not be used as a means to deliver policy objectives.

Differential rates may be appropriate in relation to

- geographical zones within the charging authority's boundary
- types of development; and/or
- scales of development.

A charging authority that plans to set differential rates should seek to avoid undue complexity. Charging schedules with differential rates should not have a disproportionate impact on particular sectors or specialist forms of development. Charging authorities should consider the views of developers at an early stage.

If the evidence shows that the area includes a zone, which could be a strategic site, which has low, very low or zero viability, the charging authority should consider setting a low or zero levy rate in that area. The same principle should apply where the evidence shows similarly low viability for particular types and/or scales of development.

In all cases, differential rates must not be set in such a way that they constitute a notifiable state aid under European Commission regulations (see 'State aid’ section for further information). One element of state aid is the conferring of a selective advantage to any 'undertaking'. A charging authority which chooses to differentiate between classes of development, or by reference to different areas, should do so only where there is consistent economic viability evidence to justify this approach. It is the responsibility of each charging authority to ensure that their charging schedules are state aid compliant.'
2.21 Any differential rates must only be set with regard to viability. It would be contrary to the guidance, for example, to set a high rate to deter a particular type of development, or to set a low rate to encourage it - a consistent approach must be taken across all development types.

## Payments in kind

2.22 Under changes to CIL Regulation 73, a local authority (at its discretion and subject to strict rules) can accept CIL 'in kind'. The changes to this Regulation have extended this provision from the payment of CIL through the transfer of land, to the payment through the transfer of infrastructure as well as land. These changes give the increased flexibility to both the Charging Authority and the developer allowing CIL to be 'paid' through the provision of infrastructure.

## Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

2.23 The PPG has been published since the 2013 Viability Study and is relevant to setting CIL. Viability is a recurring theme through the PPG, and it includes specific sections on viability in both the plan making and the development management processes. As set out above, the NPPF says that plans should be deliverable and that the scale of development identified in the Plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. The PPG says:
'Understanding Local Plan viability is critical to the overall assessment of deliverability. Local Plans should present visions for an area in the context of an understanding of local economic conditions and market realities. This should not undermine ambition for high quality design and wider social and environmental benefit but such ambition should be tested against the realistic likelihood of delivery.
.... 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.'

PPG ID: 10-001-20140306
2.24 These requirements are not new and are simply stating best practice and are wholly consistent with the approach taken through the preparation of the Plan. An example is the inclusion of viability testing in relation to the Council's affordable housing policy.
2.25 In the section on considering land availability, the PPG says:
'A site is considered achievable for development where there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about the economic viability of a site, and the capacity of the developer to complete and sell the development over a certain period.'

PPG ID: 3-021-20140306
2.26 The PPG does not prescribe a single approach for assessing viability. The NPPF and the PPG both set out the policy principles relating to viability assessments. The PPG rightly
acknowledges that a 'range of sector led guidance on viability methodologies in plan making and decision taking is widely available'.
'There is no standard answer to questions of viability, nor is there a single approach for assessing viability. The National Planning Policy Framework, informed by this Guidance, sets out the policy principles relating to viability assessment. A range of sector led guidance on viability methodologies in plan making and decision taking is widely available.'

PPG 10-002-20140306.
2.27 As set out later in this chapter, this study is carried out under the Harman Guidance ${ }^{7}$ and is broadly in accordance with the RICS Guidance ${ }^{8}$. It also draws on the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) resources and has been informed by appeal decisions and CIL Examiner's reports.
2.28 The PPG does not require every site to be tested:
'Assessing the viability of plans does not require individual testing of every site or assurance that individual sites are viable; site typologies may be used to determine viability at policy level. Assessment of samples of sites may be helpful to support evidence and more detailed assessment may be necessary for particular areas or key sites on which the delivery of the plan relies.'

PPG ID: 10-006-20140306
2.29 This supports the approach that was taken where the analysis is based on a set of typologies that represent the expected development to come forward over the plan period, and builds on the analysis set out in the existing evidence base that considered the deliverability of the Plan.
2.30 Viability Thresholds are a controversial matter and it is clear that different landowners will take different approaches depending on their personal and corporate priorities. The assessment is based on an informed assumption being made about the 'uplift' being the margin above the 'Existing Use Value' which would be sufficient to incentivise the landowner to sell. Both the RICS Guidance and the PPG make it clear that when considering land value that this must be done in the context of current and emerging policies:
'Site Value definition Site Value either as an input into a scheme specific appraisal or as a benchmark is defined in the guidance note as follows: 'Site Value should equate to the market value subject to the following assumption: that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material planning considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan.'

[^4]Box 7, Page 12, RICS Guidance

'In all cases, estimated land or site value should: ...reflect emerging policy requirements and planning obligations and, where applicable, any Community Infrastructure Levy charge;...'

PPG ID 10-014-20140306
2.31 This supports the approach taken where the process is informed by past land transactions as well as considering an appropriate uplift.
2.32 The PPG stresses the importance of working from evidence and in collaboration with the development industry:
'Evidence based judgement: assessing viability requires judgements which are informed by the relevant available facts. It requires a realistic understanding of the costs and the value of development in the local area and an understanding of the operation of the market.
Understanding past performance, such as in relation to build rates and the scale of historic planning obligations can be a useful start. Direct engagement with the development sector may be helpful in accessing evidence.
Collaboration: a collaborative approach involving the local planning authority, business community, developers, landowners and other interested parties will improve understanding of deliverability and viability. Transparency of evidence is encouraged wherever possible. Where communities are preparing a neighbourhood plan (or Neighbourhood Development Order), local planning authorities are encouraged to share evidence to ensure that local viability assumptions are clearly understood.'

PPG ID: 10-004-20140306
2.33 The analysis in this report sets out and reflects the general comments of stakeholders as well as the more specific comments of site promoters.
2.34 The meaning of competitive returns is discussed in Chapter 6 below. The meaning of competitive return is at the core of a viability assessment. The RICS Guidance (see below) includes the following definition:
'Competitive returns - A term used in paragraph 173 of the NPPF and applied to 'a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable'. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of land and/or premises equates to the Site Value as defined by this guidance, i.e. the Market Value subject to the following assumption: that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material planning considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of a developer bringing forward development should be in accordance with a 'market risk adjusted return' to the developer, as defined in this guidance, in viably delivering a project.'

Page 43, Financial viability in planning, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN 94/2012), August 2012
2.35 The PPG now adds to this saying:

## 'Competitive return to developers and land owners

The National Planning Policy Framework states that viability should consider "competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable." This return will vary significantly between projects to reflect the size and risk profile of the development and the risks to the project. A rigid approach to assumed profit levels should be avoided and comparable schemes or data sources reflected wherever possible.

A competitive return for the land owner is the price at which a reasonable land owner would be willing to sell their land for the development. The price will need to provide an incentive for the land owner to
sell in comparison with the other options available. Those options may include the current use value of the land or its value for a realistic alternative use that complies with planning policy.'

PPG ID: 10-015-20140306.

## 'Recent' changes to the PPG

2.36 On the $28^{\text {th }}$ November 2014, in a written statement to Parliament, headed, Small-scale developers, by Brandon Lewis MP of Department for Communities and Local Government, thresholds for affordable housing and developer contributions were introduced:

Due to the disproportionate burden of developer contributions on small-scale developers, for sites of 10 -units or less, and which have a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. This will also apply to all residential annexes and extensions.

For designated rural areas under section 157 of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, authorities may choose to implement a lower threshold of 5-units or less, beneath which affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought. This will also apply to all residential annexes and extensions. Within these designated areas, if the 5unit threshold is implemented then payment of affordable housing and tariff style contributions on developments of between 6 to 10 units should also be sought as a cash payment only and be commuted until after completion of units within the development.

These changes in national planning policy will not apply to rural exception sites which, subject to the local area demonstrating sufficient need, remain available to support the delivery of affordable homes for local people. However, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should not be sought in relation to residential annexes and extensions.

A financial credit, equivalent to the existing gross floorspace of any vacant buildings brought back into any lawful use or demolished for re-development, should be deducted from the calculation of any affordable housing contributions sought from relevant development schemes.

This will not however apply to vacant buildings which have been abandoned.
2.37 Since then some further clarity was provided by The Rt Hon Eric Pickles of Department for Communities and Local Government on $25^{\text {th }}$ March 2015 headed Energy efficiency in buildings and Planning system which said:

We have previously revised national policy on Section 106 thresholds to help small builders and to encourage empty buildings to be brought back into use. Some councils have misinterpreted the written ministerial statement of 28 November 2014, official report, column 54WS as just a change in guidance - to clarify, this was a change in national policy and we will be updating the online planning guidance/policy website to make this crystal clear. We are also publishing guidance tomorrow on the vacant building credit to assist in the delivery of the new policy.

## Plan making

From the date the Deregulation Bill 2015 is given Royal Assent, local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not set in their emerging Local Plans, neighbourhood plans, or supplementary planning documents, any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings. This includes any policy requiring any level of the Code for Sustainable Homes to be achieved by new development; the government has now withdrawn the code, aside from the management of legacy cases. Particular standards or requirements for energy performance are considered later in this statement.

Local planning authorities and qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should consider their existing plan policies on technical housing standards or requirements and update them as appropriate, for example through a partial Local Plan review, or a full neighbourhood plan replacement in due course. Local planning authorities may also need to review their local information
requirements to ensure that technical detail that is no longer necessary is not requested to support planning applications.

The optional new national technical standards should only be required through any new Local Plan policies if they address a clearly evidenced need, and where their impact on viability has been considered, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Guidance. Neighbourhood plans should not be used to apply the new national technical standards.

For the specific issue of energy performance, local planning authorities will continue to be able to set and apply policies in their Local Plans which require compliance with energy performance standards that exceed the energy requirements of Building Regulations until commencement of amendments to the Planning and Energy Act 2008 in the Deregulation Bill 2015.

This is expected to happen alongside the introduction of zero carbon homes policy in late 2016. The government has stated that, from then, the energy performance requirements in Building Regulations will be set at a level equivalent to the (outgoing) Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Until the amendment is commenced, we would expect local planning authorities to take this statement of the government's intention into account in applying existing policies and not set conditions with requirements above a Code level 4 equivalent. This statement does not modify the National Planning Policy Framework policy allowing the connection of new housing development to low carbon infrastructure such as district heating networks.

Measures relating to flood resilience and resistance and external noise will remain a matter to be dealt with through the planning process, in line with the existing national policy and guidance. In cases of very specific and clearly evidenced housing accessibility needs, where individual household requirements are clearly outside the new national technical standards, local planning authorities may ask for specific requirements outside of the access standard, subject to overall viability considerations.
2.38 These changes were considered by KLWN Council, and a decision had been made to reflect these changes in development management.
2.39 Since then, on the 1st August 2015, the changes were reversed and the PPG was amended and a new paragraph (paragraph 30) was added as follows ${ }^{9}$ :

Please note that paragraphs 012-023 of the guidance on planning obligations will be removed following the judgment in $R$ (on the application of West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 2222 (Admin).
2.40 Since this announcement, in response to a question at the Conservative party conference in early October 2015, Mr Lewis, speaking as Minister of Planning and Housing said that it was the Government's intention to reintroduce the national threshold. It is not clear whether this change would be through bringing an appeal or through other changes to the NPPF or PPG.

[^5]2.41 Bearing in mind that the Council have an up to date and adopted Core Strategy we have assumed that the policy will apply as drafted, but due to the uncertainty we have also considered a scenario where the national affordable housing is reintroduced.

## Summer 2015 Budget

2.42 On the $8^{\text {th }}$ July 2015, the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave his post-election Summer Budget to Parliament. With the Budget a number of changes were announced that relate to planning.

## Affordable Housing

2.43 Prior to the budget Affordable Rents were set at up to $80 \%$ of open market rent and then generally went up by up to $1 \%$ over inflation (CPI) each year and Social Rents were set through a formula, again with an up to $1 \%$ over inflation uplift. These provisions were to prevail, under arrangements announced in 2013 until 2023 and have formed the basis of many housing associations' and other providers' business plans. The result was that housing associations knew their rents would go up and those people and organisations who invest in such properties (directly or indirectly) knew that the rents were going up year on year. This made them attractive as each year the rent would always be a little larger relative to inflation.
2.44 In the Budget it was announced that social and affordable rents would be reduced by $1 \%$ per year for 4 years - although we understand (although at the date of this update there remains some uncertainty) that the mechanism for setting new rents on new lets would not change. The objective of these changes was to reduce the cost to the Exchequer of the housing elements (such as Local Housing Allowance, Housing Benefit and the housing elements of Universal Credit) of the social security budget.
2.45 It is likely that this change will reduce the value of affordable housing. The impact on councils will depend largely on the amount and nature of affordable housing. Those with high affordable housing requirements will see a larger impact (as it makes up a larger proportion of a development). We have considered this further where we have reviewed residential values in Chapter 3 below.

## Starter Homes

2.46 The Budget included the following statement ${ }^{10}$ :

Starter Homes - 58,000 people have already signed up to show their interest in owning one of these new homes - exclusively for first time buyers under 40, at a $20 \%$ discount. 200,000 of these new homes will be built over the next 5 years. And to deliver this, the government is today announcing that every reasonable sized housing site must include starter homes - and a new duty will be placed on councils to make sure they include starter homes in their future housing plans for their area
2.47 It is not clear what 'every reasonable sized housing site' means, and it is expected that this will be clarified in due course.
2.48 The Planning and Housing Bill that is currently before Parliament does provide some further information. At the time of this update (so still subject to further iterations and changes) the Bill includes a definition:
(1) In this Chapter "starter home" means a building or part of a building that-
(a)is a new dwelling,
(b)10is available for purchase by qualifying first-time buyers only,
(c)is to be sold at a discount of at least $20 \%$ of the market value,
(d)is to be sold for less than the price cap, and
(e)is subject to any restrictions on sale or letting specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State.
(2) 15"New dwelling" means a building or part of a building that-
(a)has been constructed for use as a single dwelling and has not previously been occupied, or
(b)has been adapted for use as a single dwelling and has not been occupied since its adaptation.
(3) "Qualifying first-time buyer" means an individual who-
(a)is a first-time buyer,
(b)is under the age of 40 , and
(c) has any other characteristics specified in regulations made by the Secretary of State (for example, relating to nationality or minimum age).
2.49 The initial 'cap' is to be $£ 250,000$ outside London.

[^6]2.50 The PPG has not been updated since the Budget and, at the time of this update, the Starter Homes section of the PPG ${ }^{11}$ only relates to 'exception' sites.
2.51 On the 7th October 2015, in his speech to the Conservative party conference, the Prime Minister announced that new affordable housing that is provided by developers under the s106 regime would all be 'to buy' rather than affordable housing for rent (i.e. Affordable Rent or Social Rent). At the time it was not clear when this change may be implemented and whether or not this will apply to all affordable housing or to some affordable housing on each site - or if he was actually referring to Starter Homes.
2.52 In early December the Government launched a consultation on changes to the NPPF. This included the following sections and provides a degree of clarification:
7. It is important that the definition of affordable housing for planning purposes supports present and future innovation by housing providers in meeting the needs of a wide range of households who are unable to access market housing. The provision of affordable housing is about supporting households to access home ownership, where that is their aspiration, as well as delivering homes for rent.
8. The current affordable housing definition includes some low cost home ownership models, such as shared ownership and shared equity, provided that they are subject to 'in perpetuity' restrictions or the subsidy is recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. This limits the current availability of home ownership options for households whose needs are not met by the market.
9. We propose to amend the national planning policy definition of affordable housing so that it encompasses a fuller range of products that can support people to access home ownership. We propose that the definition will continue to include a range of affordable products for rent and for ownership for households whose needs are not met by the market, but without being unnecessarily constrained by the parameters of products that have been used in the past which risk stifling innovation. This would include products that are analogous to low cost market housing or intermediate rent, such as discount market sales or innovative rent to buy housing. Some of these products may not be subject to 'in perpetuity' restrictions or have recycled subsidy. We also propose to make clearer in policy the requirement to plan for the housing needs of those who aspire to home ownership alongside those whose needs are best met through rented homes, subject as now to the overall viability of individual sites.
10. By adopting the approach proposed, we are broadening the range of housing types that are taken into account by local authorities in addressing local housing needs to increase affordable home ownership opportunities. This includes allowing local planning authorities to secure starter homes as part of their negotiations on sites.
11. In parallel, the Housing and Planning Bill is introducing a statutory duty on local authorities to promote the delivery of starter homes, and a requirement for a proportion of starter homes to be delivered on all suitable reasonably-sized housing developments. We will consult separately on the level at which this requirement should be set. The Bill defines starter homes as new dwellings for first time buyers under 40, sold at a discount of at least $20 \%$ of market value and at less than the price cap

[^7]of $£ 250,000$ (or $£ 450,000$ in London). Support is available through the Help to buy ISA to help purchasers save for a deposit.
2.53 This does provide further clarity, however the key question as to how much should be provided is not addressed.
2.54 These changes are certainly going to impact on viability; however, the impact is going to be positive rather than negative. Housing provided as Starter Homes would have a value of $80 \%$ of Market Value, compared to $65 \%$ of market value if provided as intermediate housing or $£ 1,000 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for Affordable Rent. In KLWN, CIL is being set against the current policy framework (rather than one that may apply in the future). It is therefore not appropriate (or necessary to test the impact of these changes.

## Environmental Standards

2.55 The Government also confirmed within the Fixing the foundations productivity report ${ }^{12}$ its intention not to proceed with the zero carbon buildings policy, which was initially announced in 2007.
... repeat its successful target from the previous Parliament to reduce net regulation on housebuilders. The government does not intend to proceed with the zero carbon Allowable Solutions carbon offsetting scheme, or the proposed 2016 increase in on-site energy efficiency standards, but will keep energy efficiency standards under review, recognising that existing measures to increase energy efficiency of new buildings should be allowed time to become established
2.56 As a result, there will be no uplift to Part L of the Building Regulations during 2016 and both the 2016 zero carbon homes target and the 2019 target for non-domestic zero carbon buildings will be dropped, including the Allowable Solutions programme. This is considered in Chapter 7 below.

## Viability Guidance

2.57 There is no specific technical guidance on how to test the viability in the CIL Regulations or Guidance. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF says:
'..... 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 land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable......' This seems quite straightforward - although 'competitive returns' is not defined.

[^8]2.58 There are several sources of guidance and appeal decisions ${ }^{13}$ that support the methodology we have developed. In this study we have followed the Viability Testing in Local Plans Advice for planning practitioners (LGA/HBF - Sir John Harman) June $2012^{14}$ (known as the Harman Guidance). This contains the following definition:
'An individual development can be said to be viable if, after taking account of all costs, including central and local government policy and regulatory costs and the cost and availability of development finance, the scheme provides a competitive return to the developer to ensure that development takes place and generates a land value sufficient to persuade the land owner to sell the land for the development proposed. If these conditions are not met, a scheme will not be delivered.'

Page 6 Viability Testing in Local Plans - Advice for planning practitioners (LGA/HBF - Sir John Harman) June 2012
2.59 The planning appeal decisions, and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) good practice publication suggest that the most appropriate test of viability for planning policy purposes is to consider the Residual Value of schemes compared with the Existing Use Value (EUV), plus a premium. The premium over and above the EUV needs to be set at a level to provide the landowner with a competitive return and the inducement to sell. The Harman Guidance and Financial viability in planning, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN $94 / 2012$ ) which was published during August 2012 (known as the RICS Guidance) set out the principles of viability testing. Additionally, the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) ${ }^{15}$ provides viability guidance and manuals for local authorities.

[^9]
2.60 There is considerable common ground between the RICS and the Harman Guidance but they are not consistent. The RICS Guidance recommends against the 'current / alternative use value plus a margin' - which is the methodology recommended in the Harman Guidance:
'One approach has been to exclusively adopt current use value (CUV) plus a margin or a variant of this, i.e. existing use value (EUV) plus a premium. The problem with this singular approach is that it does not reflect the workings of the market as land is not released at CUV or CUV plus a margin (EUV plus).

Financial viability in planning, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN 94/2012)
2.61 The Harman Guidance advocates an approach based on Threshold Land Value. Viability Testing in Local Plans says:
'Consideration of an appropriate Threshold Land Value needs to take account of the fact that future plan policy requirements will have an impact on land values and landowner expectations. Therefore, using a market value approach as the starting point carries the risk of building-in assumptions of current policy costs rather than helping to inform the potential for future policy. Reference to market values can still provide a useful 'sense check' on the threshold values that are being used in the model (making use of cost-effective sources of local information), but it is not recommended that these are used as the basis for the input to a model.
We recommend that the Threshold Land Value is based on a premium over current use values and credible alternative use values (noting the exceptions below).'

Viability Testing in Local Plans - Advice for planning practitioners. (June 2012)
2.62 The RICS dismisses a Threshold Land Value approach as follows.
'Threshold land value. A term developed by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) being essentially a land value at or above that which it is assumed a landowner would be prepared to sell. It is not a recognised valuation definition or approach.'
2.63 On face value these statements are contradictory. In order to avoid later disputes and delays, the approach taken in this study brings these two sources of guidance together. The methodology adopted is to compare the Residual Value generated by the viability appraisals, with the Existing Use Value (EUV) or an Alternative Use Value (AUV) plus an appropriate
uplift to incentivise a landowner to sell. The amount of the uplift over and above the existing use value is central to the assessment of viability. It must be set at a level to provide 'competitive returns' ${ }^{16}$ to the landowner. To inform the judgement as to whether the uplift is set at the appropriate level we make reference to the market value of the land both with and without the benefit of planning.
2.64 This approach is in line with that recommended in The Harman Guidance (as endorsed by LGA, PAS) - and also broadly in line with the main thrust of the RICS Guidance of having reference to market value in the context of existing and emerging Development Plan policies. It is relevant to note that the Harman methodology was endorsed by the Planning Inspector who approved the London Mayoral CIL Charging Schedule in January $2012^{17}$. In his report, the Inspector dismissed the theory that using historical market value (i.e. as proposed by the RICS) to assess the value of land was a more appropriate methodology than using EUV plus a margin.
2.65 The methodology was presented at the January 2013 event and there was a unanimous consensus that it was appropriate to follow the Harman Guidance. There were no challenges to the methodology at the time of the PDCS Consultation in early 2015.

[^10]
## 3. Viability Methodology

Viability Testing - Outline Methodology

3.1 There is no statutory technical guidance on how to go about viability testing (the PPG sets out principles rather than a detailed methodology). We have therefore followed the Harman Guidance. The availability and cost of land are matters at the core of viability for any property development. The format of the typical valuation, which has been standard for as long as land has been traded for development is:

Gross Development Value
(The combined value of the complete development)

## LESS

## Cost of creating the asset, including a profit margin

(Construction + fees + finance charges)

$$
=
$$

## RESIDUAL VALUE

3.2 The result of the calculation indicates a land value, the Residual Value. The Residual Value is the top limit of what a developer could offer for a site and still make a satisfactory profit margin.
3.3 In the following graphic, the bar illustrates all the income from a scheme. This is set by the market (rather than by the developer or local authority) so is, to a large extent, fixed. The developer has relatively little control over the costs of development (construction and fees) and whilst there is scope to build to different standards and with different levels of efficiency the costs are largely out of the developer's direct control - they are what they are depending on the development.

Gross Development Value
All income from a Scheme

3.4 It is well recognised in viability testing that the developer should be rewarded for taking the risks of development. The NPPF terms this the 'competitive return'. The essential balance in viability testing is around the land value, and whether or not land will come forward for development. The more policy requirements and developer contributions the planning authority asks for the less the developer can afford to pay for the land. The purpose of this update is to assess the effect of CIL and to quantify the costs of the Council's various policies on development and then make a judgement as to whether or not land prices are squeezed to such an extent that, in the NPPF context, that the Development Plan is put at 'serious risk' or, in the context of the CIL Guidance, whether development is 'threatened' to such an extent that the Plan is not delivered.
3.5 The 'likely land value' is a difficult topic since a landowner is unlikely to be entirely frank about the price that would be acceptable, always seeking a higher one. This is one of the areas where an informed assumption has to be made about the 'uplift': the margin above the 'existing use value' which would make the landowner sell. Both the RICS Guidance and the PPG make it clear that when considering land value that this must be done in the context of current and emerging policies.
3.6 It is important to note that this study is not trying to exactly mirror any particular developer's business model - rather it is making a broad assessment of viability in the context of planmaking and the requirements of the NPPF and CIL Regulations.

## Limitations of viability testing in the context of CIL and the NPPF

3.7 The high level and broad brush viability testing that is appropriate to be used to assess the effect of CIL does have limitations. The assessment of viability is a largely quantitative process based on financial appraisals - there are however types of development where viability is not at the forefront of the developer's mind and they will proceed even if a 'loss' is shown in a conventional appraisal. By way of example, an individual may want to fulfil a dream of building a house and may spend more than the finished home is actually worth, a community may extend a village hall even through the value of the facility in financial terms is not significantly enhanced or the end user of an industrial or logistics building may build a new factory or depot that will improve its operational efficiency even if, as a property development, the resulting building may not seem to be viable.
3.8 This sets the Council a challenge when considering its proposals. It needs to determine whether or not introducing CIL that will impact on a development type that may appear only to be marginally viable, will have any material impact on the rates of development, or will the developments proceed anyway. It is clear that some development in the area is coming forward for operational reasons, rather than property development purposes.

## The meaning of 'competitive return'

3.9 The meaning of 'competitive return' is at the core of a viability assessment. The RICS Guidance includes the following definition:
'Competitive returns - A term used in paragraph 173 of the NPPF and applied to 'a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable'. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of land and/or premises equates to the Site Value as defined by this guidance, i.e. the Market Value subject to the following assumption: that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material planning considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of a developer bringing forward development should be in accordance with a 'market risk adjusted return' to the developer, as defined in this guidance, in viably delivering a project.'
3.10 Whilst this is useful it does not provide guidance as to the size of that return. To date there has been much discussion within the industry as to what may and may not be a competitive return. As yet the term has not been given a firm definition through the appeal, planning examination or legal processes.
3.11 Competitive return was considered at the Shinfield appeal ${ }^{18}$. We have discussed this further in Chapter 6 below. More recently, further clarification has been added in the Oxenholme Road appeal ${ }^{19}$ where the inspector confirmed that the principle set out in Shinfield is very site specific and should only be given limited weight.
3.12 It should be noted that this study is about the economics of development. Viability brings in a wide range of factors, not just financial. The PPG says:
'Understanding Local Plan viability is critical to the overall assessment of deliverability. Local Plans should present visions for an area in the context of an understanding of local economic conditions and market realities. This should not undermine ambition for high quality design and wider social and environmental benefit but such ambition should be tested against the realistic likelihood of delivery.'

PPG ID: 10-001-20140306
3.13 The following graphic is taken from the Harman Guidance and illustrates some of the nonfinancial as well as financial factors that contribute to the assessment process. Viability is an important factor in the plan making process, but it is one of many factors.

[^11]
3.14 The above methodology, and in particular the differences between the Harman Guidance and the RICS Guidance, were presented and discussed through the consultation process. There was a consensus that this was the appropriate way to undertake a study of this type.

## Existing Available Evidence

3.15 The NPPF, the PPG, the CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance are clear that the assessment of the potential impact of CIL should, wherever possible, be based on existing available evidence rather than new evidence. We have reviewed the evidence that is available from the Council. This falls into three broad types:
3.16 The first is that which has been prepared by the Council to inform its Local Development Framework (LDF) being the Affordable Housing Site Viability Study (AHVS) carried out by Fordham Research in October 2008 and extended to cover thresholds in January 2011.
3.17 Secondly, the Council holds a substantial amount of evidence in the form of development appraisals that have been submitted by developers in connection with specific developments - most often to support negotiations around the provision of affordable housing or s106 contributions. Our approach has been to draw on this existing evidence and to consolidate it so that it can then be used as a sound base for considering the deliverability of the Plan.
3.18 Thirdly, the Council also holds records of past planning consents with details of the affordable housing included in projects and the contributions made under the s106 regime. This has been collated by the Council outside this report. This forms practical and real evidence of what has been delivered historically. We have considered the Council's policies for developer contributions (including affordable housing) and the amounts that have actually been collected from developers.

## Stakeholder Engagement

3.19 The CIL Guidance requires, and the Harman Guidance puts considerable emphasis on stakeholder engagement - particularly with members of the development industry. From our experience examiners and inspectors put considerable weight on the comments of the development industry. In preparing the 2013 Viability Study we sought to engage with practitioners involved in the development industry.
3.20 As set out in Chapter 1 of the 2013 Viability Study, an event was held on $22^{\text {nd }}$ January 2013. This was in the form of a presentation to the promoters of the key development sites within the Borough and the representatives of the main developers, development site landowners and housing providers. The meeting was used to introduce the development industry to the NPPF and CIL, to set out the methodology test the assumptions used in the report, to put the report in context. The event was divided into three parts.
a) An introduction to viability testing in the context of the CIL Regulation 14 and paragraph 173 of the NPPF.
b) Viability Assumptions. The methodology and main assumptions for the viability assessments were set out including development values, development costs, land prices, developers' and landowners' returns.
c) Workshops. The consultees divided into groups, each led by an officer from the Council, and talked through the main points. The feedback from these sessions were carefully recorded.
3.21 A lively, wide ranging and informative discussion took place. The comments of the consultees are reflected through this report and the assumptions have been adjusted where appropriate. The comments were wide ranging and there was not agreement on all points although there was a broad consensus on most matters.
3.22 Following the January 2013 consultation event, the main assumptions were circulated to the consultees (including those who did not attend the event). The consultees were invited to make written representations. It was stressed that that the comments needed to be made in the context of the Harman Guidance and to be specific. Where specific representations were made we re-considered the assumptions made.
3.23 Appendix 2 of the 2013 Viability Study includes a list of those consulted and Appendix 3 of the 2013 Viability Study includes the presentation from the consultation event.
3.24 Further consultation was carried out prior to this update with the PDCS. The main points made are summarised in Chapter 1 above. The comments of the consultees are reflected through this report and the assumptions have been adjusted where appropriate. There was not agreement on all points although there was a broad consensus on most matters. Where there was disagreement we have made a judgement and set out why we have used the assumptions we have.
3.25 We take this opportunity to thank those developers, landowners and agents who attended the event and provided written responses. We believe that the consultation process has been carried out fully in accordance with the requirements of the Harman Guidance.

## Viability Process

3.26 CIL is not calculated by some pre-determined formula. The assessment of viability as required under the NPPF and the CIL Regulations is a quantitative and qualitative assessment based on professional judgment. The NPPF requires that 'the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened ${ }^{20,}$ and whether 'the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk ${ }^{21}$. The CIL Regulations require that 'councils must strike an appropriate balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability ${ }^{22}$.
3.27 The basic viability methodology is summarised in Figure 3.1 below. It involves preparing financial development appraisals for a representative range of sites, and using these to assess the effect that CIL may have on development viability. Details of the site modelling are set out in Chapter 9.
3.28 The sites were modelled based on discussions with Council officers, the existing available evidence supplied to us by the Council, and on our own experience of development. In particular we drew on the sites in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), and the strategic sites and broad locations for development that the Council has identified and / or is considering as part of the plan-making process. This process ensures that the appraisals are representative of typical development.

[^12]Figure 3.1 Viability methodology


Source: HDH 2015
3.29 The appraisals are based on adopted Core Strategy policy requirements and the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan. In the 2013 Viability Study, for appropriate sensitivity testing of a range of scenarios including different levels of affordable housing provision and different levels of developer contributions was carried out. In this update the scenarios are limited to levels of CIL.
3.30 We surveyed the local housing and commercial markets, in order to obtain a picture of sales values. We also assessed land values to calibrate the appraisals and to assess alternative use values. Alongside this we considered local development patterns, in order to arrive at appropriate built form assumptions for those sites where information from a current planning permission or application was not available. These in turn informed the appropriate build cost figures. A number of other technical assumptions were required before appraisals could be produced. The appraisal results were in the form of $£ /$ ha 'residual' land values,
showing the maximum value a developer could pay for the site and still return a target profit level.
3.31 The Residual Value was compared to the Existing Use Value (EUV) for each site. Only if the Residual Value exceeded the EUV, and by a satisfactory margin, could the scheme be judged to be viable.
3.32 We have used a bespoke viability testing model designed and developed by us specifically for area wide viability testing as required by the NPPF and CIL Regulations ${ }^{23}$. The purpose of the viability model and testing is not to exactly mirror any particular business model used by those companies, organisations and people involved in property development. The purpose is to capture the generality and to provide high level advice to assist the Council to set CIL.

## Additional Profit

3.33 In order to assess whether or not a contribution to CIL can be made, a calculation needs to be undertaken to establish the 'additional profit'.
3.34 Additional Profit is a concept that we developed and is the amount of profit over and above the normal profit (or competitive return) made by the developers having purchased the land (alternative land value plus uplift), developed the site and sold the units (including providing any affordable housing that is required). In this study 'normal profit' is the $20 \%$ of the development value that we used in the appraisals (see Chapter 7). Our approach to calculating additional profit is to complete the appraisal using the same base cost and price figures and other financial assumptions as used to establish the Residual Value, except for S106 obligations which are to be replaced, in part, by CIL, but instead of calculating the Residual Value we incorporate the cost of the land (alternative use value plus uplift) into the cost side of the appraisal to show the resulting profit (or loss).
3.35 The amount by which the resulting profit exceeds the target level of profit, represents the additional profit, and provides a measure of the scope for contributing to CIL without impairing development viability. CIL contributions can viably be paid out of this additional profit.
3.36 The starting point of these calculations is to base them on the Council's current affordable housing target and development requirements. The following formula was used:

[^13]
## Gross Development Value

(The combined value of the complete development including $x \%$ affordable housing)

## LESS

## Cost of creating the asset, including a profit margin

(land* + construction + fees + finance charges + developers' profit)
including mitigation measures, and affordable housing commuted sums
=

## Additional Profit

* Where 'land' is the Alternative Use Value and uplift'


## Development Types

3.37 The modelling in this study was based on the types of development most likely to come forward on the sites within the Plan. The work in this study is proportionate to allowing a judgement be made as to whether CIL, when considered with the cumulative impact of the policies in the Plan will threaten the development and delivery of the Plan. Inevitably some of the development will be on land that was not included in the Plan.

## 4. Residential Property Market

4.1 This chapter sets out an updated assessment of the housing market (including sheltered and extracare housing), providing the basis for the assumptions on house prices to be used in the financial appraisals for the sites tested in the study. We are concerned not just with the prices but the differences across different areas.
4.2 Although development schemes do have similarities, every scheme is unique, even schemes on neighbouring sites. Market conditions will broadly reflect a combination of national economic circumstances, and local supply and demand factors. However even within a town there will be particular localities, and ultimately site specific factors, that generate different values and costs.
4.3 For practical purposes, we have based our research on the settlements referred to in the Section 6.1 of the Core Strategy which sets out the following Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy:
a. Sub-regional centre - King's Lynn including West Lynn, and Gaywood
b. Main towns - Hunstanton and Downham Market
c. Settlements adjacent to King's Lynn and the main towns - Emneth (adjacent Wisbech), North Wootton, South Wootton, Walsoken (adjacent Wisbech), West Winch.
4.4 It is important to note that development is also planned in the Key Rural Service Centres and more widely. We have considered values in these areas as well.

## The Residential Market

4.5 The current direction and state of the housing market has improved markedly since the earlier viability evidence was prepared. The housing market peaked late in 2007 (see the following graph) and then fell considerably in the 2007 / 2008 recession during what became known as the 'Credit Crunch'.
4.6 Average house prices across England and Wales have recovered to their pre-recession peak, however this is strongly influenced by London. Prices in London are now well in excess of the 2007 / 2008 peak but as can be seen in the figure below, away from the South East, in areas such as Norfolk there has been a general recovery, albeit that prices are still marginally below the previous peak.


Source: Land Registry August 2015 (Note: the Land Registry only release the above data at County and Unitary Authority level)
4.7 It is important to note that at the time of this report (December 2015) the housing market is actively supported by the Government with about one third of mortgages being provided through a state backed entity or scheme (a publically controlled financial institution or assisted purchase scheme such as shared ownership ${ }^{24}$ ).
4.8 There are various commentators talking about a recovery in house prices. As shown in the figure above, average prices in Norfolk have more or less recovered to the late 2007 peak. There has been considerable coverage in the national press.
"This highlights the need to not pin too much weight on one particular house price survey or measure, but to try and take an overall view from the data," he said.
The June RICS Residential Market Survey shows a further acceleration in price growth with the headline price balance hitting an eleven month high 40. Prices are reported to be rising in the majority of areas, with Northern Ireland and East Anglia seeing particularly firm momentum during the month. Driving this pick up in growth was a further modest rise in demand across most parts of the UK alongside yet another decrease in the level on new instructions.
... With mortgage rates still near record lows and the labour market continuing to strengthen, this modest increase in demand is no real surprise. Although the most recent mortgage approvals data (from the Bank of England) for May shoe a 4.7\% fall versus the April figure, this probably just reflects some recoil from the sharp rise the previous month, and the underlying trend does appear to be

[^14]gently upwards. Reflecting this, respondents expect activity levels to pick up across all areas over the coming three months...

The outlook for prices strengthened once again in June with respondents in all areas now expecting an increase at both the three and twelve month horizons. A net balance of $41 \%$ of respondents envisage prices rising in the coming three months while twelve month expectations reached a 15 month high of 75 . Contributors, on average, foresee process rising by a little over $3 \%$ in the year with price growth accelerating thereafter to an average of $4.8 \%$ per annum over the coming 5 years.

The RICS reported in the RICS UK Residential Market Survey (June 2015)

### 4.9 The BBC News reported on the $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ August 2015:

Growth in UK house prices slowed in the year to July, the country's largest mortgage lender has said, although they are still rising "robustly".

The Halifax said that prices rose at an annual pace of $7.9 \%$ last month - down from 9.6\% in June.
During July itself, prices actually fell, by 0.6\%, the largest monthly drop since April 2014.
It brings the average price of a flat or house across the country back down to £198,883.
The sharp fall in July was described as "a correction" by Howard Archer, chief UK economist with IHS Global Insight, following a $1.6 \%$ rise in prices in June.
The Halifax figures are in contrast to those from rival lender Nationwide, which said earlier this week that the rate of house price growth picked up to 3.5\% in July, from 3.3\% a month earlier.
'Continuing recovery'
However, the Halifax said it expected strong growth in prices for the rest of the year.
"The underlying pace of house price growth remains robust notwithstanding the easing in July," said Stephen Noakes, Halifax's managing director of retail customer products.
"Continuing economic recovery, earnings growth in excess of consumer price inflation, and very low mortgage rates all underpin housing demand."

Mr Archer said the contrasting figures from the Halifax and Nationwide served as a warning against reading too much into any one survey.
http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-33800016
4.10 This improved sentiment can also be seen in the non-residential sectors:

The Q2 2015 RICS UK Commercial Property Market Survey results continue to paint a robust picture of the commercial real estate sector's health, with strong demand from investors and occupiers alike showing no sign of waning. These firm trends are helping to push capital value and rental expectations higher both in the near term and further out.

To start with feedback on the occupier market, survey data shows demand for leasable space has now been rising for eleven quarters in succession (extending the longest run of uninterrupted occupier demand growth since the surveys inception in 1998). The retail sector continues to see more modest gains relative to office and industrial space, although the gap has narrowed somewhat recently.

At the same time, available space fell once more, a trend which has now persisted for nine consecutive quarters. Again, the steepest declines were reported in the office and industrial sectors (severely restricted supply is frequently mentioned as an issue by contributors). In a sign of the improving health of the market, the value of landlord incentive packages decreased further in each sector.

RICS Commercial Market Survey UK Q2 2015
4.11 KLWN has a mixed residential market. When ranked across England, the average house price for the Borough is $106^{\text {th }}$, at just over $£ 180,181^{25}$. To set this in context, the Council at the middle of the rank (174), Lichfield, has an average price of just over £202,000. It is relevant to note that median price is somewhat lower in KLWN at $£ 156,000^{26}$.
4.12 The above figure shows that prices in Norfolk have seen a recovery since the bottom of the market in mid-2009 and are on an upward trajectory. The rate of sales (i.e. sales per month) in the county has fallen substantially and is still running below that seen at the previous peak of the market - although it is a little better than the wider market and is seeing a firm recovery.


Source: Land Registry August 2015 (Note: the Land Registry only releases the above data at County and Unitary Authority level)

[^15]4.13 There is clearly uncertainty in the market, and it is not for this study to try to predict how the market may change in the coming years, and whether or not there will be a further increase in house prices. Having said this, it notable that property agents Savills are predicting a $6.5 \%$ increase in 2015, and an 18.2\% increase over the next 5 years in the mainstream residential markets ${ }^{27}$.
4.14 To assist the Council to 'strike the balance' in an informed way, we have run further sets of appraisals to show the effects of $5 \%$ and $10 \%$ increases, and of $5 \%$ and $10 \%$ decreases in house prices.
4.15 We carried out a survey of asking prices by house size and by settlement. Through using online tools such as rightmove.com, zoopla.co.uk and other resources we estimated the median asking prices for the main settlements.

[^16]

Source: Rightmove.com August 2015 (Note: For some areas figures are based on a small number of dwellings.)

Table 4.1 Average House Price and Change

|  | Average <br> Price | 12 month \% <br> change | 24 month \% <br> change | 36 month \% <br> change |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Sub-regional centre | $£ 208,899$ | $1.17 \%$ | $11.24 \%$ | $16.75 \%$ |  |
| King's Lynn | $£ 160,441$ | $1.18 \%$ | $11.25 \%$ | $16.75 \%$ |  |
| West Lynn |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gaywood |  |  |  |  |  |
| Main towns |  |  |  |  | $£ 280,974$ |
| Hunstanton | $10.94 \%$ | $25.36 \%$ | $20.54 \%$ |  |  |
| Downham Market | $£ 200,538$ | $3.25 \%$ | $13.65 \%$ | $19.31 \%$ |  |
| Settlements adjacent to King's Lynn and the main towns |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emneth (adjacent Wisbech) | $£ 190,711$ | $2.87 \%$ | $9.94 \%$ | $14.86 \%$ |  |
| North Wootton | $£ 230,565$ | $1.17 \%$ | $11.24 \%$ | $16.75 \%$ |  |
| South Wootton | $£ 232,486$ | $1.17 \%$ | $11.24 \%$ | $16.75 \%$ |  |
| Walsoken (adjacent Wisbech) | $£ 348,688$ | $1.27 \%$ | $9.41 \%$ | $13.62 \%$ |  |
| West Winch | $£ 217,331$ | $1.17 \%$ | $11.24 \%$ | $16.75 \%$ |  |

Source: Zoopla.co.uk August 2015. Note the data for Walsoken appears to be out of step with local prices and should be given limited weight.
4.16 The above data points towards an increase of between $10 \%$ and $20 \%$ across the Borough since the earlier work was undertaken.
4.17 The geographical differences in prices are illustrated in the following map showing the median price for all homes and newbuild homes.

Figure 4.4 Median Prices


Source: HDH based on Land Registry Data

## Newbuild Sales Prices

4.18 This study is concerned with the viability of newbuild residential property so the key input for the appraisals are the prices of units on new developments. We conducted a survey of new homes for sale in late 2012 and have now refreshed this (June 2015). A summary of new developments in the area is provided below. We identified about 100 new homes for sale on about 35 different sites. The prices range from $£ 78,995$ to $£ 2,695,000$ with an average price of $£ 301,711$. This is an increase of $£ 78,812$ ( $35 \%$ ) from $£ 222,899$ at the time of the earlier work. For the purpose of this study the information is needed in a $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ basis. This is also shown below, however the information collected was not comprehensive as different developers and agents make different levels of information available.
4.19 The analysis shows that asking prices for newbuild homes vary considerably, across the area ranging between about $£ 1,342 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to nearly $£ 6,500 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. These are set out in full in Appendix 1 and are summarised in the table below - note this table only shows values where $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ were available.

| Table 4.2 Newbuild Asking Prices ( $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\pi}}{\underline{L}}$ | E E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{N}{N}$ |  |  | + |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N゙ } \\ & \underset{\sim}{w} \\ & \bar{\omega} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{N}{\circ} \\ \frac{0}{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8 \\ \hline \stackrel{0}{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \underset{N}{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{O} \\ & \hline \underset{\sim}{o} \\ & \bar{\omega} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\Omega}{\circ} \\ \frac{-}{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \infty \\ \mathbf{O} \\ \underset{\sim}{j} \end{array}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \bar{N} \\ \bar{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \bar{m} \\ \underset{\sim}{u} \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \mathbf{0} \\ \text { N } \\ \text { NiN } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \mathrm{~B} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | ¢ <br> ¢ <br> ¢ <br> 1 |  | 立 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{3}{5} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  | 0 $\stackrel{0}{0}$ $\stackrel{0}{0}$ 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { तo } \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |

Source: HDH Market Survey (June 2015)
4.20 During the course of the research, we re-contacted several of the sales offices and agents to enquire about the availability of discounts, relative to asking prices, available to buyers. In most cases the feedback was that the units were 'realistically priced', and that as the market was improving large discounts are no longer offered. When pressed, it appeared that the discounts and incentives offered equated to $2 \%$ to $3 \%$ or so. It would be prudent to assume that prices achieved, net of incentives offered to buyers, are $3 \%$ less than the above asking prices.
4.21 It was notable that the situation is different in relation to the houses being offered under the Help to Buy scheme. Where buyers are purchasing a home under Help to Buy the asking price tends to be very close to the price paid with discounts being unavailable to buyers (although in some cases limited incentives in the form of upgraded fitting may be available).

## New Data

4.22 The majority of the data used in this update has been updated from earlier work. The values of market housing were derived by drawing on a range of information sources. These included asking prices, Price Paid Data from the Land Registry and other secondary sources. The assumptions were presented to stakeholders through the earlier consultation process and amended to reflect the feedback and comments made.
4.23 To review the residential value assumptions we have analysed the Price Paid Data from the Land Registry with information from the Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) Register. This information was not available at the time of the earlier work. We have also refreshed the survey of asking prices of newbuild houses currently for sale in the area.

## Land Registry

4.24 This study is concerned with the viability of newbuild residential property so the key input for the appraisals is the prices of new units. We have reviewed recent newbuild sales prices from the Land Registry from the start of $2014^{28}$. The Land Registry publishes data of all homes sold. Across the KLWN area 171 newbuild home sales were recorded in the period. These transactions are summarised as follows and detailed in Appendix 2.

| Table 4.3 Newbuild Sales - Price Paid, January 2014 to July 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Detached | Semi- <br> detached | Terrace | Flat | All |
| Count | 65 | 53 | 44 | 9 | $\mathbf{1 7 1}$ |
| Max | $£ 660,000$ | $£ 810,000$ | $£ 762,500$ | $£ 182,000$ | $£ 810,000$ |
| Min | $£ 130,000$ | $£ 121,000$ | $£ 62,500$ | $£ 79,995$ | $£ 62,500$ |
| Mean | $£ 288,394$ | $£ 214,687$ | $£ 207,056$ | $£ 115,326$ | $£ 235,511$ |
| Median | $£ 249,995$ | $£ 179,995$ | $£ 161,498$ | $£ 104,995$ | $£ 195,000$ |

$\qquad$

[^17]4.25 Each house sold requires an Energy Performance Certificate. This is a public document that can be viewed on the EPC Register. The EPC contains the floor area (the Gross Internal Area - GIA) as well as a wide range of other information about the construction and energy performance of the building. This GIA information is also included in Appendix 2.
4.26 We have married the price data from the Land Registry with homes' floor area from the EPC Register:

| Table 4.4 Newbuild Price Paid by Floor Area, January 2014 to July $2015 £ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Detached | Semi- <br> detached | Terrace | Flat | All |
| Mean | $£ 2,276$ | $£ 1,940$ | $£ 1,798$ | $£ 1,983$ | $£ 2,035$ |
| Median | $£ 2,147$ | $£ 1,870$ | $£ 1,662$ | $£ 1,833$ | $£ 1,908$ |
| Source: Land Registry and EPC Register (July 2015) |  |  |  |  |  |

## Affordable Housing

4.27 The Council has a policy for the provision of affordable housing (the requirements are summarised in Chapter 8). In this study we have assumed that such housing is constructed by the site developer and then sold to a Registered Provider (RP). This is a simplification of reality as there are many ways in which affordable housing is delivered, including the transfer of free land to RPs for them to build on, or the retention of the units by the scheme's overall developer. There are three main types of affordable housing: Social Rent, Affordable Rent and Intermediate Housing Products for Sale. The Council seeks to deliver affordable housing as Affordable Rent and Intermediate Housing. We consider the values of each below.
4.28 In the work to date we have assumed that the value of Affordable Rent was derived based on $80 \%$ the median open market rents (restricted to the Local Housing Allowance Cap) and making allowance for $10 \%$ management costs, $4 \%$ voids and bad debts and $6 \%$ repairs. These assumptions were developed and tested through the consultation process and have not been subject to comment or challenge at the PDCS stage - although were discussed earlier in the process. It has been suggested that the allowance of $4 \%$ for voids is too high and an assumption of $2 \%$ should be used as this is the normal assumption used by the housing associations operating in the area.
4.29 In the 2013 Viability Study it was assumed that affordable housing was provided as $30 \%$ Intermediate Housing and 70\% Affordable Rent.
4.30 Prior to the 2015 Summer Budget, rents of affordable housing (both Affordable Rents and Social Rents) were generally increased by inflation (CPI) plus up to $1 \%$ each year. These provisions were to prevail until 2023. The result was that Housing Associations knew their rents would go up and those people and organisations who invest in such properties (directly or indirectly) knew that the rents were going up year on year. This made them a particularly attractive and secure form of investment or security for a loan.
4.31 In the Budget it was announced that social and affordable rents would be reduced by $1 \%$ per year for 4 years ${ }^{29}$.
4.32 It is too early to be certain of the impact and effect on the delivery of new housing isn't yet known but the knock on effect of reducing rents is inevitably going to have an effect on values. There are a number of views as to what impact this change may have. Savills said in their paper Impact On The Housing Sector of the July Budget:

## VALUATIONS

## Valuations for Accounts - Existing Use Value Social Housing

The effect of the proposed rent reductions on valuations for accounts is significant.
The scale of the effect is broadly similar across different Provider types and we estimate will result in a reduction in current values of around $25 \%-30 \%$. The impact will increase in future years. Relative to what they would have been, we estimate valuations will be some $30 \%-40 \%$ lower in ten years time.
The RPs at the higher end of the reduction scale tend to be those with smaller surpluses.

## Valuations for Loan Security - Existing Use Value for Social Housing

Valuations for loan security on an EUV-SH basis are undertaken against the background of the rent freedoms granted to mortgagees in possession (and the landlord they sell the stock to) under the insolvency provisions originally in the Rent Influencing Guidance and now in the Rent Standard. Similar exemptions for mortgagees are contained in the Welfare Reform and Work Bill now before Parliament.
Our interpretation of these provisions is that Mortgagees and their successors would be able to charge a rent that they consider 'affordable' to those in low paid employment, and would be able to increase that rent in line with earnings in order to maintain a level affordability ratio (rent over household income). In our view valuations for loan security can therefore be based on rents and rent growth that sit outside the new rent regime.
As a result - on the assumption that the insolvency provisions in the Bill remain as they are - it is our view that the proposal to reduced rents by $1 \%$ per annum for the next four years should not significantly affect current loan security valuations. Our valuations would assume the current rent could quickly converge to our opinion of an appropriate 'affordable' rent and continue to grow in line with earnings - which we generally assume over the longer term is broadly equivalent to CPI+1\% and keep in step with growth in the sector over the long term.
However valuations in future years valuations will not grow as previously expected (eg circa 5\% relative reduction by year 10) as the starting rent for future valuations will be lower than it otherwise would have been.
Of course the Budget provisions may impact on bad debts, voids and discount rates which may adversely feed through into EUV-SH valuations.

[^18]4.33 It is clearly necessary to reconsider the value affordable housing. Whilst this is a rapidly changing area it is possible to make some assumptions. From a valuation perspective, we reconsidered the value of affordable housing from first principles and adjusted the yield by up to 50BPS (i.e. $0.5 \%)^{30}$. We have also specifically consulted with housing associations operating in the area as well as agents acting for developers.

## Affordable Rent

4.34 Under Affordable Rent a rent of no more than $80 \%$ of the open market rent for that unit can be charged. One of the aims of the Government's policy on affordable housing is to make the HCA budget go further. The Affordable Rent that is over and above the Social Rent is used by Registered Providers (RPs) to raise capital through borrowing or securitisation ${ }^{31}$. This supports the building of the affordable units - the extra borrowing replacing grant.
4.35 The objective of Affordable Rent is that by charging higher rents for the affordable housing, less grant and subsidy is required and thus the development of affordable housing would be self-funded as, on market housing led schemes, grant is only now available in exceptional circumstances. For example on high priority sites where there is still a funding gap after the higher affordable rent has been allowed for. As the amount is uncertain we have assumed no grant will be available in the future.
4.36 In the development of affordable housing for rent, the value of the units is, in large part, the worth of the income that the completed let unit will produce. This is the amount an investor (or another RP) would pay for the completed unit. This will depend on the amount of the rent and the cost of managing the property (letting, voids, rent collection, repairs etc.).
4.37 Following discussion with the Council's housing officers, we have assumed the rent is to be set at $80 \%$ of the full open market rent. We have assumed that, because a typical affordable rent unit will be new, it will command a premium rent that is a little higher than equivalent older private sector accommodation. In the earlier work we estimated the likely level of Affordable Rent, based on a survey of market rents across the Borough.

[^19]4.38 In this update we have based our analysis on affordable rents being charged in the area, capped at the Local Housing Allowance cap ${ }^{32}$.

| Table 4.5 Local Housing Allowance Caps |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Bury St Edmunds | King's Lynn | Lincolnshire Fens | Peterborough |
| Shared | $£ 64.14$ | $£ 53.67$ | $£ 58.38$ | $£ 57.15$ |
| 1 Beds | $£ 102.25$ | $£ 90.64$ | $£ 88.28$ | $£ 92.05$ |
| 2 Beds | $£ 126.31$ | $£ 112.21$ | $£ 110.67$ | $£ 115.07$ |
| 3 Beds | $£ 150.36$ | $£ 129.47$ | $£ 129.47$ | $£ 132.32$ |
| 4 Beds | $£ 216.00$ | $£ 163.16$ | $£ 153.02$ | $£ 168.41$ |

4.39 In the 2013 Viability CIL Viability Study the following values were assumed, having been calculated assuming $10 \%$ management costs, $4 \%$ voids and bad debts and $6 \%$ repairs, and capitalised the income at $5.5 \%$. Above we noted that it had been suggested that the $4 \%$ voids assumption was too high and that a $2 \%$ allowance should be used. The Summer Budget included a reduction in rents on affordable housing that should improve affordability and reduce bad debts and therefore evictions and voids, however overall benefit caps were reduced and 'pay to stay' introduced which may result in an increase in voids. Having considered this we have not made this adjustment, thus taking a cautious approach.
4.40 This is summarised in the table below.

| Table 4.6 Value of Affordable Rent |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Affordable <br> rent | Value |  |
|  |  | $£ /$ month | $£$ | $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
|  | 2 Bed | 412 | 71,913 | 922 |
| King's Lynn | 3 Bed | 500 | 87,273 | 1,027 |
|  | 2 Bed | 420 | 73,309 | 940 |
| King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough | 3 Bed | 500 | 87,273 | 1,027 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

[^20]4.41 Based on this we assumed the following values for affordable rents in the appraisals:
\[

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\text { King's Lynn } & £ 950 / \mathrm{m}^{2} & \text { Wider KL\&WN } & £ 975 / \mathrm{m}^{2}
\end{array}
$$
\]

4.42 These values were put to the consultees at the event in January 2013 and it was agreed that this was an appropriate approach and that the values were representative.
4.43 We have re-assessed the value of Affordable Rents assuming 10\% management costs, $4 \%$ voids and bad debts and $6 \%$ repairs, and capitalised the income at $6 \%$ - being an increase on the $5.5 \%$ used in the earlier work.

| Table 4.7 Revised Worth of Affordable Rent (£) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 Bed | King's Lynn | Parished Area |
| Affordable Rent (£/week) | £104 | £102 |
| Affordable Rent (£/year) | £5,408 | £5,304 |
| Net Rent pa | £4,326 | £4,243 |
| Worth | £72,107 | £70,720 |
| $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 72 | 72 |
| $\underline{\varepsilon} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | £1,001 | £982 |
| 3 Bed |  |  |
| Affordable Rent (£/week) | £114 | £112 |
| Affordable Rent (£/year) | £5,928 | £5,824 |
| Net Rent pa | £4,742 | £4,659 |
| Worth | £79,040 | £77,653 |
| $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 83 | 83 |
| $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | £952 | $£ 936$ |

4.44 We have re-consulted with housing associations as to their views of these changes. These vary, with a minority view being that there will be a reluctance to acquire new stock due to the general uncertainty that the change will bring to the whole organisation (and the potential impact on the organisation's balance sheet). There is a consensus that there will be a fall in the values of affordable housing, but this is unlikely to be fully reflected in the offers made by Housing Associations to developers. It is clear that some Housing Associations are continuing their acquisition programs.
4.45 In this update we have assumed a value of Affordable Rent of $£ 1,000 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. This is a reduction on values that were being paid just before the Summer Budget, and marginally greater than the assumption used in the 2013 Viability Study.
4.46 The amount of the fall is likely to depend on the scheme in question. Housing Associations have indicated that this is likely to be in the range of $3 \%$ to $15 \%$, with the smallest falls being seen on the largest sites and the largest falls being on sites with just a few units that are
relatively unattractive due to the difficulties around management. Generally it was felt that bids for Social Rented housing would fall to be in the range of $45 \%$ to $52 \%$ of open market value, with larger sites being in the range of $50 \%$ to $52 \%$ of open market value and smaller sites being worth $45 \%$ of open market value.
4.47 It was also suggested that typically Affordable Rent property would be worth $5 \%$ to $7 \%$ over and above the value of Social Rent with a top price (only achievable on the best, large scale sites) of $60 \%$ of Open Market Value.

Intermediate Products for Sale
4.48 Intermediate products for sale include shared ownership and shared equity products. The market for these is slow at present and we have found little evidence of the availability of such products in the study area. We believe that this is in part due to the success of the Government's Help to Buy scheme and low levels of supply.
4.49 Initially we assumed a value of $70 \%$ of open market value for shared ownership and shared equity products.
4.50 Whilst no comments were made by consultees with regard to the value of intermediate housing we have revisited this, based on work we have been doing elsewhere in England. We have assumed a value of $65 \%$ of open market value for these units. This value is broadly based on purchasers buying an initial $50 \%$ share of a property and a $2.5 \%$ per annum rent payable on the equity retained. The rental income is capitalised at $5.5 \%$ having made a $2.5 \%$ management allowance.

Residential Price Assumptions
4.51 The price of units is one of the most significant inputs into the appraisals. This applies not just to the market homes but also the affordable uses (intermediate and affordable rented). Informed by the findings set out above, we have assumed the following prices. These reflect the comments of the stakeholders and the developers at the consultation event. The modelling and description of sites is set out in the first part of Chapter 9 below.

| Table 4.8a Revised Price assumptions - Larger Sites $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Market | Intermediate <br> to Buy | Affordable <br> Rent |
| 1 | Boal Lane | King's Lynn | 1,950 | 1,267 | 1,000 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | King's Lynn | 2,000 | 1,300 | 1,000 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | King's Lynn | 2,200 | 1,430 | 1,000 |
| 4 | Bankside | King's Lynn | 2,000 | 1,300 | 1,000 |
| 5 | West Winch | King's Lynn | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 2,100 | 1,365 | 1,000 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 2,100 | 1,365 | 1,000 |

Source: HDH 2015

| Table 4.8b Revised Price assumptions - North East and East $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Market | Intermediate <br> to Buy | Affordable <br> Rent |  |  |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | 2,750 | 1,788 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | 2,500 | 1,625 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | 2,700 | 1,755 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | 2,500 | 1,625 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | 2,750 | 1,788 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | 2,400 | 1,560 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 7 | Larger Urban | 2,400 | 1,560 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 8 | Urban Infill | 2,500 | 1,625 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 9 | Small Infill | 2,450 | 1,593 | 1,000 |  |  |
| 10 | Single Plot | 3,000 | 1,950 | 1,000 |  |  |

Source: HDH 2015

| Table 4.8c Revised Price assumptions -West and South $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Market | Intermediate <br> to Buy | Affordable <br> Rent |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | 2,400 | 1,560 | 1,000 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | 2,300 | 1,495 | 1,000 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | 2,400 | 1,560 | 1,000 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | 2,100 | 1,365 | 1,000 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | 2,000 | 1,300 | 1,000 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | 1,900 | 1,235 | 1,000 |
| 9 | Small Infill | 2,000 | 1,300 | 1,000 |
| 10 | Single Plot | 2,500 | 1,625 | 1,000 |

Source: HDH 2015

| Table 4.8d Revised Price assumptions -King's Lynn £/m ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Market | Intermediate to Buy | Affordable Rent |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | 2,200 | 1,430 | 1,000 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | 2,200 | 1,430 | 1,000 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | 2,350 | 1,528 | 1,000 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | 2,300 | 1,495 | 1,000 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | 2,300 | 1,495 | 1,000 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | 2,050 | 1,333 | 1,000 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | 1,950 | 1,268 | 1,000 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | 1,900 | 1,235 | 1,000 |
| 9 | Small Infill | 1,900 | 1,235 | 1,000 |
| 10 | Single Plot | 2,750 | 1,788 | 1,000 |

## Older People's Housing

4.52 The 2013 Viability Study reflected the comments of representations from the Retirement Housing Group (RHG) being a trade group representing developers and operators of retirement, care and extracare homes, who set out a case that these products should be tested separately. Further comments have now been received.
4.53 Within this sector there are a multitude of different products offered by developers.
4.54 Private Sheltered / Retirement accommodation is self-contained accommodation that is available to the open market for sale or rent. In some cases a concierge service may be provided as opposed to on site care and some communal cleaning and laundry services. Ultimately however these tend to be age restricted market accommodation. An example of this would be the McCarthy \& Stone independent living model.
4.55 Housing with Care (HWC) is sometime known as extracare housing. There are a wide range of models that can fall under the HWC term/umbrella and it is difficult to categorise every model. In this study we have assumed that HWC is self-contained housing with facilities and services such as round the clock, on-site care and facilities that has been specifically designed to suit people with long-term conditions or disabilities that make living in their own home difficult, but who don't want to move into a residential care home. Schemes can be brought forward in the open market or in the social sector. Most residents are older people, but this type of housing is becoming popular with people with disabilities regardless of their age. Usually, it is seen as a long-term housing solution. Typically these schemes have relatively large common and communal areas that includes dining facilities, bathing facilities, circulation space as well as administrative areas and community facilities. Extracare housing residents still have access to means-tested local authority services.
4.56 In KL\&WNBC, there is both Sheltered Accommodation and HWC accommodation provided by Registered Providers (RPs). This, in line with other affordable housing, will be exempt from CIL.
4.57 In line with the RHG representations we have assumed the price of a 1 bed sheltered property is about $75 \%$ of price of existing 3 bed semi-detached house and a 2 bed sheltered property is about equal to the price of existing 3 bed semi-detached house. In addition we have assumed extracare housing is $25 \%$ more expensive than sheltered.
4.58 In King's Lynn the median price of a 3 bed semi-detached home is $£ 160,000^{33}$ (up from $£ 132,000$ ), $£ 165,000$ in Downham Market and $£ 195,000$ in Hunstanton, so we have used these as a starting point. On this basis we have assumed retirement housing in King's Lynn has the following worth:

[^21]| Table 4.9 Worth of Sheltered and Extracare Housing |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| King's Lynn | Area $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ | $£$ | $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| 3 bed semi-detached |  | 160,000 |  |
| I bed Sheltered | 50 | 120,000 | 2,400 |
| 2 bed Sheltered | 75 | 160,000 | 2,133 |
| 1 bed Extracare | 65 | 150,000 | 2,308 |
| 2 bed Extracare | 80 | 200,000 | 2,500 |
| Downham Market |  |  |  |
| 3 bed semi-detached |  | 165,000 |  |
| I bed Sheltered | 50 | 123,750 | 2,475 |
| 2 bed Sheltered | 75 | 165,000 | 2,200 |
| 1 bed Extracare | 65 | 154,688 | 2,380 |
| 2 bed Extracare | 80 | 206,250 | 2,578 |
| Hunstanton |  |  |  |
| 3 bed semi-detached |  | 195,000 |  |
| I bed Sheltered | 50 | 146,250 | 2,925 |
| 2 bed Sheltered | 75 | 195,000 | 2,600 |
| 1 bed Extracare | 65 | 182,813 | 2,813 |
| 2 bed Extracare | 80 | 243,750 | 3,047 |

4.59 The above prices are applied to the net saleable areas.
4.60 We have considered the value of the units where provided as affordable housing. We have not been able to find any direct comparables where housing associations have purchased social units in a market led extracare scheme. We have consulted private sector developers of extracare housing. They have indicated that whilst they have never disposed of any units in this way, they would expect the value to be in line with other affordable housing - however they stressed that the buyer (be that the local authority or housing association) would need to undertake to meet the full service and care charges.
4.61 It is more likely that a scheme will be developed by or for a Registered Provider. We have assumed that in such a case the affordable extracare housing would be valued, as for affordable rent, at $50 \%$ of the market value. In addition we have run a scenario where the affordable housing is affordable housing to buy at a value of $80 \%$ of the market value.

## 5. Non-Residential Property Market

5.1 This chapter sets out an assessment of the markets for non-residential property, providing a basis for the assumptions of prices to be used in financial appraisals for the sites tested in the study.
5.2 The CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance require the use of existing available evidence and for the viability testing to be appropriate to the likelihood of raising CIL. There is no need to consider all types of development in all situations - and certainly no point in testing the types of scheme that are unlikely to come forward - or which are unlikely to be viable.
5.3 Although development schemes do have similarities, every scheme is unique, even schemes on neighbouring sites. Market conditions will broadly reflect a combination of national economic circumstances and local supply and demand factors. However even within a town there will be particular localities, and ultimately site specific factors, that generate different values and costs.
5.4 No comments were made in relation to non-residential development during the PDCS consultation - we have however refreshed the research.

## KLWN Overview

5.5 As with the housing market, the various non-residential markets in KLWN area reflect national trends, but there are local factors that underpin the market. King's Lynn is the major employment centre and service centre - however employment uses are spread through the Borough.
5.6 Commercial activity does of course take place more widely than this - indeed the majority of the area (by land use) is actively and commercially farmed. There is, however, little evidence of significant non-residential development happening much beyond the main centre (in part due to the Council's development control policies) and even in King's Lynn it remains limited at the moment. We have centred this study on this main area.
5.7 We had expected to find a number of distinct market areas that broadly correspond to the different price areas that we found in relation to residential property. There is evidence that there are variances in the market with a reduction in rents and values as one moves away from the main east - west transport routes and King's Lynn. Having said this, and bearing in mind that this study is concerned with new property that is likely to be purpose built, we found little variance for newer premises more suited to modern business.
5.8 The overwhelming characteristic of the commercial property market is that very little is happening, and that little development is being completed at the moment. Indeed, development that there is, is for identified end users rather than being carried out speculatively by developers. The Borough is a little different to many areas in that it holds its own large portfolio of retail, office and industrial space that it lets through an in-house Estates Department that manages a number of properties on the following estates:

| Table 5.1 KLWN Commercial Property |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Downham Market | King's Lynn |
| Trafalgar Estate | Austin Fields, Industrial Units |
| St Johns Estate | Hardwick Industrial Units |
| Downham Market <br> Trafalgar Industrial Estate <br> St Johns Industrial Estate | Hardwick Narrows Industrial Units <br> Horsleys Field Industrial Units <br> Lower Canada Industrial Units |
| Flitcham <br> Flitcham Barns, Abbey Road | Saddlebow Industrial Units <br> Saunders Yard Industrial Units |
| Heacham <br> Heacham Hall Industrial Units | Saint John's Business Estate |

Source: KL\&WNBC
5.9 In addition to the above, the Council also owns and manages eight of the town centre retail units on Broad Street and Norfolk Street in King's Lynn.
5.10 We analysed various sources of market information. The principle sources being the information held by the Council (in their capacity as a significant landowner), local agents, research published by national agents, and through the Estates Gazette's EGI database. Over $80 \%$ of the commercial property that we identified as being available was for rent rather than for sale. Appendix 5 of the 2013 Viability Study included a schedule of commercial space that was being advertised through EGI Property Link (a commercial equivalent to Rightmove.com) in and close to the area. Clearly, much of this commercial space is 'second-hand' and not of the configuration, type and condition of new space that may come forward in the future and be subject to CIL, so is likely to command a lower rent than new property in a convenient well accessed location with car parking and that is well suited to the modern business environment.
5.11 We have reviewed data from CoStar concerning the value assumptions of non-residential uses. CoStar is a subscription service of non-residential property transactions. The following data shows the standard Costar report for the KLWN area. The summary information is included in Appendix 3.

| Table 5.2 KLWN Rental Data |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Office |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Asking Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 33 | £46.7 | £101.6 | £107.6 | £161.5 |
| Achieved Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 12 | £26.9 | £51.7 | £85.9 | £135.5 |
| Net Effective Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| Asking Rent Discount | 9 | -20.0\% | -0.3\% | 0.0\% | 62.7\% |
| Rent Free Months | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 31 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 48 |
| Deal Size | 36 | 13 | 157 | 70 | 1,180 |
| Industrial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Asking Rent /m ${ }^{2}$ | 46 | £7.9 | £39.0 | £53.9 | £438.3 |
| Achieved Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 21 | £29.8 | £46.1 | £53.8 | £76.9 |
| Net Effective Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 2 | £57.4 | £59.7 | £61.9 | £66.3 |
| Asking Rent Discount | 19 | -6.6\% | 6.8\% | 0.0\% | 33.4\% |
| Rent Free Months | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 44 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 31 |
| Deal Size | 48 | 21 | 529 | 271 | 4,847 |
| Retail |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Asking Rent $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 49 | £53.7 | £191.1 | £195.1 | £610.5 |
| Achieved Rent /m² | 16 | £40.7 | £111.4 | £139.9 | £374.2 |
| Net Effective Rent /m ${ }^{2}$ | - | - | - | - | - |
| Asking Rent Discount | 15 | -1.5\% | 23.5\% | 12.5\% | 65.1\% |
| Rent Free Months | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 49 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 65 |
| Deal Size | 50 | 17 | 167 | 109 | 697 |

Source: CoStar (August 2015). Note the retail rents quotes are overall rather than Zone A.
5.12 As in the earlier work there is a variance in the levels of rents and values. We have updated the rents as follows. In this update we have extended the modelling to include an extra typology to be representative of smaller supermarkets. This sector is currently expanding through operators such as Aldi, Lidl, Farmfoods and Spar, but also includes some smaller format stores from the more established operators such as Waitrose and M\&S. The sector has become more active since this work commenced and is now expected to form an element of future net new development in this sector.

| Table 5.3 Typical rents $£ / \mathbf{m}^{2} /$ year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | North |  | King's Lynn |  | South |  |  |
|  | Pre <br> PDCS | August <br> 2015 | Pre <br> PDCS | August <br> 2015 | Pre <br> PDCS | August <br> 2015 |  |
| Large industrial | 40 | 40 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 40 |  |
| Small industrial | 65 | 65 | 60 | 65 | 45 | 65 |  |
| Large office | 85 | 110 | 105 | 125 | 100 | 110 |  |
| Small office | 100 | 110 | 110 | 125 | 100 | 110 |  |
| Large supermarket | 180 | 180 | 180 | 180 | 180 | 180 |  |
| Smaller supermarket |  | 120 |  | 120 |  | 120 |  |
| Retail aarehouse | 100 | 100 | 120 | 120 | 70 | 70 |  |
| Medium retail | 100 |  | 120 |  | 70 |  |  |
| Small retail (Shop) | 200 | 200 | 220 | 220 | 150 | 150 |  |

Source: KLWN Viability Update (HDH 2015)
5.13 Through analysis of the available rental space and the space for sale, we have formed a view as to the capital value of industrial and office space. In capitalising the rents we initially assumed a yield of $7.5 \%$ (a Year's Purchase of 13.3 ) ${ }^{34}$, but acknowledged that the yield will vary from property to property and will depend on the terms of the lease and the standing of the tenant, however, we believe that this is a fair figure across the market. There are several exceptions to this. In this work we have held this assumption in and around King's Lynn but used a higher yield of $9 \%$ in the southern and northern areas. For the large industrial and office space in the King's Lynn area, which we have identified as being more attractive to institutional investors, we have assumed a lower yield of $7 \%$ (an increase from $6.5 \%$ in the 2013 Viability Study). For the supermarket typologies we have assumed a lower yield of 5.5\% (an increase from 5\% in the 2013 Viability Study). We have also assumed a yield of 10\% (a decrease from 11\% in the 2013 Viability Study).

[^22]| Table 5.4 Capitalised rents $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | North | King's Lynn | South |
| Large industrial | 444 | 571 | 444 |
| Small industrial | 722 | 867 | 722 |
| Large office | 1,222 | 1,786 | 1,222 |
| Small office | 1,222 | 1,667 | 1,222 |
| Large supermarket | 3,273 | 3,273 | 3,273 |
| Smaller supermarket | 2,909 | 2,909 | 2,909 |
| Retail warehouse | 1,111 | 1,600 | 778 |
| Medium retail | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small retail (Shop) | 2,000 | 2,200 | 1,500 |

Source: KLWN Viability Update (HDH August 2015)

## Appraisal Assumptions

5.14 Inevitably, the data in the tables above does not match perfectly with the asking prices of properties in the market. We have therefore looked at further sources of information, including the feedback from consultees, to produce the following values that we have used in our appraisals.

| Table 5.5 Non-residential Values $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | North | King's Lynn | South |
| Large industrial | 550 | 600 | 500 |
| Small industrial | 850 | 850 | 700 |
| Large office | 1,250 | 1,500 | 1,250 |
| Small office | 1,300 | 1,700 | 1,300 |
| Large supermarket | 3,000 | 3,000 | 3,000 |
| Smaller supermarket | 2,800 | 2,800 | 2,800 |
| Retail warehouse | 1,200 | 1,800 | 1,000 |
| Medium retail | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small retail (Shop) | 2,500 | 2,900 | 2,000 |

Source: KLWN Viability Update (HDH August 2015)
5.15 As well as the above development types we have assumed a rental of $£ 3,750$ / room per year for a modern hotel to apply across the area. Assuming a yield of $6.5 \%$, this equates to a value of about $£ 2,150 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$.

## 6. Land Prices

6.1 In Chapters 2 and 3 above we set out the methodology used in this study to assess viability. An important element of the assessment, is the value of the land. Under the method recommended in the Harman Guidance, the worth of the land before consideration of any increase in value, from a use that may be permitted though a planning consent, is the Existing Land Value (ELV) or Alternative Land Value (ALV). We use this as the starting point for the assessment as this is one of the key variables in the financial development appraisals.
6.2 In this chapter we have considered the values of different types of land. The value of land relates closely to the use to which it can be put and will range considerably from site to site. However, as this is a high level study, we have looked at the three main uses, being agricultural, residential and industrial. We then considered the amount of uplift that may be required to ensure that land will come forward and be released for development.

## Existing and Alternative Use Values

6.3 In order to assess development viability, it is necessary to analyse existing and alternative use values. Current or Existing Use Values (EUV) refer to the value of the land in its current use before planning consent is granted, for example, as agricultural land. Alternative Use Values (AUV) refer to any other potential use for the site. For example, a brownfield site may have an alternative use as industrial land.
6.4 The PPG includes a definition of land value as follows:

## 'Land Value

Central to the consideration of viability is the assessment of land or site value. The most appropriate way to assess land or site value will vary but there are common principles which should be reflected.
In all cases, estimated land or site value should:

- reflect emerging policy requirements and planning obligations and, where applicable, any Community Infrastructure Levy charge;
- provide a competitive return to willing developers and land owners (including equity resulting from those building their own homes); and
- be informed by comparable, market-based evidence wherever possible. Where transacted bids are significantly above the market norm, they should not be used as part of this exercise.'

PPG ID: 10-014-20140306
6.5 It is important to fully appreciate that land value should reflect emerging policy requirements and planning obligations. When considering comparable sites, the value will need to be adjusted to reflect this requirement.
6.6 To assess viability, the value of the land for the particular scheme needs to be compared with the AUV, to determine if there is another use which would derive more revenue for the landowner. If the Residual Value does not exceed the AUV, then the development is not
viable; if there is a surplus (i.e. profit) over and above the 'normal' developer's profit having paid for the land, then there is scope to pay CIL.
6.7 For the purpose of the present study, it is necessary to take a comparatively simplistic approach to determining the Alternative Use Value. In practice, a wide range of considerations could influence the precise value that should apply in each case, and at the end of extensive analysis the outcome might still be contentious.
6.8 Our 'model' approach is outlined below:
i. For sites previously in agricultural use, then agricultural land represents the Existing Use Value. We have assumed that the sites of 0.5 ha or more fall into this category.
ii. For paddock and garden land on the edge of or in a smaller settlement we have adopted a 'paddock' value. We have assumed the sites of less than 0.5 ha fall in this category.
iii. Where the development is on brownfield land we have assumed an industrial value.

## Industrial Land

6.9 In the AHVS, Fordham Research used $£ 450,000 /$ ha for urban industrial land and $£ 334,000 /$ ha for industrial land in the rural areas. These prices were at the top of the market. The VOA published the Property Market Report. In the January 2011 report (being the most recent one) they reported the following industrial land values.

| Norwich | $£ 425,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ | Cambridge | $£ 740,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nottingham | $£ 500,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ | Leicester | $£ 400,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |

6.10 The only direct comparable is that of Norwich which shows a $£ 90,000 /$ ha fall which equates to about $15 \%$ from the time of the 2007 study.
6.11 This was discussed at some length at the January 2013 consultation event and it was agreed that there were large differences between different parcels of land in similar locations but it was appropriate to make some broad assumptions as to value. We have assumed industrial values of $£ 284,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ in rural areas and a higher figure of $£ 380,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ in urban areas.
6.12 Having reviewed this we have not altered the assumption. This is a simplification of a complex market, however it is appropriate in this high level study.

## Agricultural and Paddocks

6.13 Agricultural values rose for a time several years ago after a long historic period of stability. Values are around $£ 15,000-£ 25,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ depending upon the specific use. We have assumed a value of $£ 25,000 /$ ha in this study.
6.14 A proportion of the sites expected to come forward are on smaller paddock sites and have an alternative amenity use. A benchmark of $£ 50,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ is assumed to apply here to reflect this situation.

## Residential Land

6.15 In the 2013 Viability Study we considered general figures from the Valuation Office Agency (VOA) relating to residential land values. Land values vary dramatically depending upon the development characteristics (size and nature of the site, density permitted etc.) and any affordable or other development contribution.
6.16 The VOA publishes figures for residential land in the Property Market Report. These cover areas which generate sufficient activity to discern a market pattern. That means that locally we have figures for Norwich and Cambridge. These values can only provide broad guidance, they can therefore be only indicative.

| Table 6.1Residential <br> Land $£ /$ Land (£alues at January 2011 Bulk |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Norwich | $1,600,000$ |
|  | $(650,000)$ |
| Cambridge | $2,900,000$ |
|  | $(1,175,000)$ |
| Nottingham | $1,200,000$ |
|  | $(486,000)$ |
| Leicester | $1,580,000$ |
|  | $(640,000)$ |

6.17 The values in the Property Market Report are based on the assumption that land is situated in a typically average greenfield edge of centre / suburban location for the area, that services are available to the edge of the site, and that it is ripe for development with planning permission being available. The values provided assume a maximum of a two storey construction with the density, the S106 provision and the affordable housing ratios to be based on market expectations for the locality. The report cautions that the values should be regarded as illustrative rather than definitive, that represent typical values for sites with no abnormal constraints, and with residential planning permission of a type generally found in the area. It is important to note that these values are net - that is to say they relate to the net developable area and do not take into account open space that may form part of the scheme.
6.18 It should also be noted that the above values will assume that grant was available to assist the delivery of affordable housing (due to the date of the VOA Report). This grant is now very restricted so these figures should be given limited weight. Further, due to the date of the report, these values are well before the introduction of CIL, so do not reflect this new
charge on development. As acknowledged by the RICS Guidance, a new charge such as CIL will inevitably adversely impact on land values.
6.19 More recently (February 2014) DCLG published Land value estimates for policy appraisa ${ }^{\beta 5}$. This sets out land values as at January 2014 and was prepared by the VOA. The KLWN figure is $£ 370,000 / \mathrm{ha}$. It is important to note this figure assumes nil affordable housing. As stressed in the paper this is hypothetical situation and 'the figures on this basis, therefore, may be significantly higher than could be reasonably obtained in the actual market ${ }^{36}$.
6.20 The Valuation Office Agency assumed that each site is 1 hectare in area, of regular shape, with services provided up to the boundary, without contamination or abnormal development costs, not in an underground mining area, with road frontage, without risk of flooding, with planning permission granted and that no grant funding is available; the site will have a net developable area equal to $80 \%$ of the gross area. For those local authorities outside London, the hypothetical scheme is for a development of 35 two storey, $2 / 3 / 4$ bed dwellings with a total floor area of $3,150 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
6.21 At the time of the 2013 Viability Study there was very little land available. At the time of this update a range of (mostly smaller) sites is available in (and nearby) the area:
a. $\quad 0.17$ ha former pumping station near King's Lynn. $£ 5,000$ ( $£ 30,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ )
b. About 1ha amenity land (SSSI) near Syderstone. £25,000
c. Single Building Plot near Wisbech (about $20 \mathrm{~m} \times 25 \mathrm{~m}$ ). £40,000
d. Single building plot at Terrington St Clement. £80,000
e. Single Plot at Wisbech ( $21 \mathrm{ft} \times 85 \mathrm{ft}$ ). £45,000
f. Double plot in King's Lynn. $£ 50,000$
g. Triple Building Plot in Wisbech. $£ 75,000$
h. Single Plot, King's Lynn. £85,000
i. Double Plot in Holbeach. $£ 95,000$
j. Three Building Plots in Little Dunham. £100,000
k. Rural Building Plot. $£ 110,000$

[^23]I. 2 Building Plots at Long Sutton. $£ 120,000$
m. Conversion to 5 apartments in King's Lynn. £125,000
n. 2 plots in Long Sutton. £130,000.
o. Single plot for 5 bed house in Sporle, $1 / 4$ acre. $£ 150,000$
p. Development site for 4 houses in Downham Market. $£ 160,000$
q. Site for $3 \times 4$ bed homes in South Lynn. £250,000
r. Willows Business Park. 1.8ha. £295,000 ( $£ 120,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ )
s. 4 detached plots at Walpole Cross Keys. $£ 300,000$
t. Residential development site at Stoke Ferry, 1ha. $£ 450,000$.
u. Hillgate Nursery site with consent for 41 houses. $£ 1,250,000$
v. About 4.7ha of industrial land near Wisbech. $£ 1,100,000$ ( $£ 232,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ )
6.22 We also sought information about values from residential land currently on sale in the Borough. We have therefore consulted agents who attended the consultation event, one of whom suggested prices from about $£ 250,000 /$ ha to $£ 300,000 /$ ha when calculated per net developable acre, although this was thought low by consultees.
6.23 It is necessary to make an assumption about the value of residential land. Initially we assumed a value of $£ 300,000 /$ ha (net) for residential land. This amount is on a net basis so does not include the areas of open space. It is inevitable that CIL will depress land prices somewhat (as recognised by the Greater Norwich CIL Inspector).
6.24 We do acknowledge that for development of land currently in a residential use (say for garden land) a value in excess of residential uses would need to be achieved to persuade the landowner to release the land for development.
6.25 At the time of the 2013 Viability Study we contacted agents operating in the area and assumed a value for residential land in this study of $£ 750,000$ / net developable hectare. This was discussed through the consultation process. There was a comment that this level of land value was only likely to be received in the higher value areas such as the north coast, rather than in King's Lynn where residential land values are lower.
6.26 There was some concern about the assumptions in this regard raised through the consultation process. Through the Land Registry it is possible to obtain the price paid for non-residential land as well as the data set out in Chapter 4 above. We have reviewed the planning consents for residential schemes for larger sites since 2011 and acquired the Land Registry title information. In most cases this includes the price paid. This is set out in full in Appendix 4 below.
6.27 On average the price of residential land, based on the 19 known transactions is $£ 354,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ or $£ 14,000$ per unit. It is important to note that these values are per gross ha - so calculated over the whole site area.

## Use of Alternative Use Benchmarks

6.28 The results from appraisals are compared with the Alternative Use Values set out above in order to form a view about each of the sites' viability. This is a controversial part of the viability process and the area of conflicting guidance (the Harman Guidance versus the RICS Guidance). In the context of this report, it is important to note that it does not automatically follow that, if the Residual Value produces a surplus over the Existing Use Value (EUV) or Alternative Use Value (AUV) benchmark, the site is viable. The land market is more complex than this and as recognised by paragraph 173 of the NPPF, the landowner and developer must receive a 'competitive return'. The phrase competitive return is not defined in the NPPF, nor in the Guidance.
6.29 Competitive return has not been fully defined through planning appeals and the court system ${ }^{37}$. The RICS Guidance includes the following definition:
'Competitive returns - A term used in paragraph 173 of the NPPF and applied to 'a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable'. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of land and/or premises equates to the Site Value as defined by this guidance, i.e. the Market Value subject to the following assumption: that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material planning considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of a developer bringing forward development should be in accordance with a 'market risk adjusted return' to the developer, as defined in this guidance, in viably delivering a project.'
6.30 The PPG includes the following section:

## 'Competitive return to developers and land owners

The National Planning Policy Framework states that viability should consider "competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable." This return will vary significantly between projects to reflect the size and risk profile of the development and the risks to the project. A rigid approach to assumed profit levels should be avoided and comparable schemes or data sources reflected wherever possible.

A competitive return for the land owner is the price at which a reasonable land owner would be willing to sell their land for the development. The price will need to provide an incentive for the land owner to sell in comparison with the other options available. Those options may include the current use value of the land or its value for a realistic alternative use that complies with planning policy.'

PPG ID: 10-015-20140306.

[^24]6.31 Whilst this is useful it does not provide any guidance as to the size of that return. To date there has been much discussion within the industry and amongst planners as to what may and may not be a competitive return, as yet the term has not been given a firm definition through the appeal, planning examination or legal processes. The Shinfield Appeal (January 2013) does shed some light on this. We have copied a number of key paragraphs below as, whilst these do not provide a strict definition of competitive return, the inspector does set out his analysis clearly. The following paragraphs are necessarily rather long, however as they are the only current steer in this regard we have included all that are relevant.
38. Paragraph' 173 of the Framework advises that 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 land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. The Framework provides no advice as to what constitutes a competitive return; the interpretation of that term lies at the heart of a fundamental difference between the parties in this case. The glossary of terms appended to the very recent RICS guidance note Financial viability in planning (RICS GN) says that a competitive return in the context of land and/ or premises equates to the Site Value (SV), that is to say the Market Value subject to the assumption that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan. It is also the case that despite much negotiated agreement, in respect of calculating the viability of the development, other significant areas of disagreement remain.

## Competitive return

64. Determining what constitutes a competitive return inevitably involves making a subjective judgement based upon the evidence. Two very different viewpoints were put forward at the Inquiry with the appellants seeking a land value of $£ 4,750,000$ which is roughly the mid-point between the EUV/CUV and the RLV with planning permission for housing and no obligations. This ties in with the 50:50 split between the community and the landowner sought by the appellants. The Council considered that a sum of $£ 1.865 \mathrm{~m}$ would ensure a competitive return; that is to say the Council's calculation of the EUV/CUV.
65. Paragraph 173 of the Framework says that the costs of any requirements should provide competitive returns to a willing landowner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. The paragraph heading is "Ensuring viability and deliverability"; it is clear that its objective is to ensure that land comes forward for development. I am not convinced that a land value that equates to the EUV/CUV would provide any incentive to the landowner to sell the site. Due to the particular circumstances of this site, including the need to remediate the highly significant level of contamination, such a conclusion would not provide any incentive to the landowner to carry out any remediation work. There would be no incentive to sell the land and so such a low return would fail to achieve the delivery of this site for housing development. In these circumstances, and given the fact that in this case only two very different viewpoints on what constitutes a competitive return have been put forward, the appellants' conclusions are to be preferred. In the scenario preferred by the Council, I do not consider that the appellants would be a willing vendor.

## Viable amount of Affordable Housing

66. The RICS GN says that any planning obligations imposed on a development will need to be paid out of the uplift in the value of the land but it cannot use up the whole of the difference, other than in exceptional circumstances, as that would remove the likelihood of land being released for development. That is exactly what is at issue here in that the Council's valuation witness, in cross examination, stated that a landowner should be content to receive what the land is worth, that is to say the SV. In his opinion this stands at $£ 1.865 \mathrm{~m}$. I accept that, if this figure was agreed (and it is not), it would mean that the development would be viable. However, it would not result in the land being released for development. Not only is this SV well below that calculated by the appellants, there is no
incentive to sell. In short, the appellants would not be willing landowners. If a site is not willingly delivered, development will not take place. The appellants, rightly in my opinion, say that this would not represent a competitive return. They argue that the uplift in value should be split 50:50 between the landowner and the Council. This would, in this instance, represent the identified s106 requirements being paid as well as a contribution of $2 \%$ of the dwellings as affordable housing.
67. I conclude on this issue that, allowing the landowner a competitive return of $50 \%$ of the uplift in value, the calculations in the development appraisal allowing for $2 \%$ affordable housing are reasonable and demonstrate that at this level of affordable housing the development would be viable (Document 26). The only alterations to these calculations are the relatively minor change to the s106 contribution to allow for a contribution to country parks and additions to the contributions to support sustainable modes of travel. These changes would have only a limited impact on the return to the landowner. The development would remain viable and I am satisfied that the return would remain sufficiently competitive to enable the land to come forward for development. Overall, therefore I conclude that the proposed amount of affordable housing (2\%) would be appropriate in the context of the viability of the development, the Framework, development plan policy and all other material planning considerations.'
6.32 More recently, further clarification has been added in the Oxenholme Road Appeal (October 2013). The inspector confirmed that the principle set out in Shinfield is very site specific and should only be given limited weight. At Oxenholme Road the inspector said:
'47. The parties refer to an appeal decision for land at Shinfield, Berkshire, which is quoted in the LADPD Viability Study. However, little weight can be given to that decision in the present case, as the nature of the site was quite different, being partly previously developed, and the positions taken by the parties on the proportion of uplift in site value that should be directed to the provision of affordable housing were at odds with those now proposed. There is no reason in the present case to assume that either $100 \%$ or $50 \%$ of the uplift in site value is the correct proportion to fund community benefits.
68. Both the RICS Guidance Note and the Harman report comment on the danger of reliance on historic market land values, which do not take adequate account of future policy demands
6.33 It is clear that for land to be released for development, the uplift over the Existing Use Value needs to be sufficiently large to provide an incentive to the landowner to release the site and cover any other appropriate costs required to bring the site forward for development. It is therefore appropriate, and an important part of this assessment to have regard to the market value of land as it stands. However the Shinfield Appeal was determined on the specific circumstances that were put forward to the inspector. Whilst it sets out an approach it does not form a binding precedent, appeals will continue to be determined on the facts that relate to the particular site in question. At Shinfield the inspector only considered the two approaches put to him and did not consider the landowners' competitive return in any other way. The appellant's method and approach was preferred to the Council's - but it should not be considered to be the only acceptable approach.
6.34 The RICS Guidance recognises that the value of land will be influenced by the requirements imposed by planning authorities. It recognises that the cost to the developer of providing affordable housing, building to increased environmental standards, and paying CIL, all have a cumulative effect on viability and are reflected in the ultimate price of the land. A central question for this study is at what point do the requirements imposed by the planning authorities make the price payable for land so unattractive that it does not provide a competitive return to the landowner, and so does not induce the owner to make the land available for development?
6.35 The reality of the market is that each and every landowner has different requirements and different needs and will judge whether or not to sell by their own criteria. We therefore have to consider how large such an 'uplift' or 'cushion' should be for each type of site to broadly provide a competitive return. The assumptions must be a generalisation as, in practice, the size of the uplift will vary from case to case depending on how many landowners are involved, each landowner's attitude and their degree of involvement in the current property market, the location of the site and so on. An 'uplift' of, say, $5 \%$ or $£ 25,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ might be sufficient in some cases, whilst in a particular case it might need to be five times that figure, or even more.
6.36 At an early stage it was decided to review the approach taken in the AHVS as practice has changed with the introduction of the NPPF and publication of the Harman Guidance. Initially, we assumed that the Viability Threshold (being the amount that the Residual Value must exceed for a site to be viable) of the EUV / AUV plus a $15 \%$ uplift on all sites would be sufficient. This is supported both by work we have done elsewhere and by appeal decisions (see Chapter 2). Based on our knowledge of rural development, and from working with farmers, landowners and their agents, we have made a further adjustment for those sites coming forward on greenfield land. We added a further $£ 250,000 /$ ha ( $£ 100,000 /$ acre) to reflect this premium.
6.37 This was discussed at some length at the consultation event and it was agreed that the Existing Use Value plus approach was appropriate. It was also agreed that the quantum of the 'plus' was difficult to estimate as it would vary from landowner to landowner. An alternative suggestion was made that rather than a $15 \%$ uplift with an extra amount on greenfield sites, that a simple $50 \%$ on all sites would be appropriate. We do not believe that this would be sufficient in the greenfield situation. Based on our wider experience we consider it unlikely that agricultural land with a current value of $£ 25,000$ or so would come forward for residential development at a value of a little less than $£ 40,000 /$ ha. We have not followed this.
6.38 Following the January 2013 consultation event, we amended the assumptions in calculating the viability thresholds to a $20 \%$ uplift on all sites and with a further $£ 300,000 /$ ha on the greenfield sites. This is a simplification of the market, however in a high level study of this type that is based on modelled sites, simplifications and general assumptions need to be made.
6.39 This approach does reflect a very considerable uplift for a landowner selling a greenfield site with consent for development ${ }^{38}$. In the event of the grant of planning consent they would receive over ten times the value compared with before consent was granted. This approach (but not the amount) is the one suggested in the Harman Guidance (see Chapter 2 above) and by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS). The approach was endorsed by the Planning Inspector who approved the London Mayoral CIL Charging Schedule in January $2012^{39}$.
6.40 We have considered how these amounts relate to prices for land in the market (see the first part of this chapter), with a view to providing competitive returns to the landowner.
6.41 When considering land values it is important to note that both the Lynn Sport and the Marsh Lane sites are owned by the Council. In both cases the Council is committed to releasing these for development, at a price that is reflective of the prevailing planning policies (i.e. the requirements to provide affordable housing and mitigate the impact of development.
6.42 We have considered how these amounts relate to prices for land in the market (see above), with a view to providing competitive returns to the landowner. Whilst there are certainly land transactions at higher values than these, we do believe that these are appropriate for a study of this type.
6.43 It is useful to consider the assumptions used in other studies in other parts of England. We have reviewed viability thresholds used by other councils in England in development plans approved during the first half of 2014. These are set out in the table below.
[^25]| Table 6.2 Viability thresholds used elsewhere |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local Authority | Threshold Land Value |
| Babergh | $£ 370,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Cannock Chase | $£ 100,000-£ 400,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Christchurch \& East Dorset | $£ 308,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ (un-serviced) |
|  | $£ 1,235,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ (serviced) |
| East Hampshire | $£ 450,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Erewash | $£ 300,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Fenland | $£ 1-2 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ha}$ (serviced) |
| GNDP | $£ 370,000-£ 430,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Reigate \& Banstead | $£ 500,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| Staffordshire Moorlands | $£ 1.26-£ 1.41 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{ha}$ (serviced) |
| Warrington | $£ 100,000-£ 300,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ |

Source: Planning Advisory Service (collated by URS) July 2014
6.44 Care has to be taken drawing on such general figures without understanding the wider context and other assumptions in the studies, but generally the assumption used in this work are within the normal range.
6.45 There is no doubt that CIL will be an additional cost on some development sites, and that some sites may not be able to bear the costs of all the requirements a planning authority makes - such as delivering affordable homes and higher environmental standards. This is noted in the RICS Guidance which recognises that there may well be a period of adjustment in the price of land following the introduction of CIL.
6.46 In this study, having taken into account the comments received through the consultation process, we have assumed alternative land prices of:
i. Agricultural Land
£25,000/ha
ii. Paddock Land
£50,000/ha
iii. Garden Land £100,000/ha
iv. Industrial Land £380,000/ha
v. Residential Land £650,000 /net ha, £350,000 /gross ha
6.47 In the case of non-residential uses, we have taken a similar approach to that taken with residential land except in cases where there is no change of use. Where industrial land is being developed for industrial purposes we have assumed a viability threshold of the value of industrial land.

## 7. Appraisal Assumptions - Development Costs

7.1 This chapter considers the costs and other assumptions required to produce financial appraisals for the development sites and typologies. These assumptions were presented to stakeholders at the December 2014 consultation event.

## Development Costs

Construction costs: baseline costs
7.2 We have based the cost assumptions on the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) data - using the figures re-based for Norfolk. There has been an increase in construction costs since the earlier viability work and this is an important area of change. The cost figure for 'Estate Housing - Generally' is $£ 922 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ at the time of this study (July 2015). This is an increase of $22.6 \%$ from the figure of $£ 784 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in June 2013 and as used in the 2013 Viability Study.
7.3 In August 2015, a report was published that considered the construction costs on smaller sites. Housing development: the economics of small sites - the effect of project size on the cost of housing construction (August 2015) was carried out by BCIS, having been commissioned by The Federation of Small Businesses. This study concluded that the construction price for schemes of 1 to 5 units was about $13 \%$ higher than the for schemes of over 10 units and that the construction price for schemes of 1 to 10 units was about $6 \%$ higher than the for schemes of over 10 units. These adjustments have been made to the smallest schemes modelled in this report.
7.4 We have consulted with a local Quantity Surveyor about the appropriateness of using the BCIS costs and in relation to smaller sites. They have confirmed that using the median costs is appropriate and the costs reflect the level of build cost inflation experienced locally. They have however raised some concern in relation the costs of the smaller sites, particularly in relation to sites of less than 5 units where they have direct experience. The smaller builders, likely to bring these smaller sites forward, tend to have lower overheads and preliminary costs and are able to bring sites forward at less than the BCIS costs.
7.5 The Council has developed policies relating to the construction standards and environmental performance of new buildings. The current policy requirement is that homes are built to the basic Building Regulation Part L 2010 Standards. From April 2008, the Code’s Level 3 was a requirement for all homes commissioned by housing associations but would not necessarily be the case for affordable homes built by developers for disposal to a housing association, unless grant was made available from the Homes and Communities Agency.
7.6 The national policies in relation to climate change and overall national minimum building standards have been clarified and not all the requirements of CfSH Level 4 will become
mandatory (and are not a requirement of the Core Strategy). Having said this environmental standards are increasing.
7.7 Based on the best currently available information, the costs of building to the now clarified, enhanced building standards is estimated to be between $1 \%$ and $2 \%$ of the BCIS costs. In this viability assessment, we have used the median BCIS costs. For residential property this has been increased by $1.5 \%$ to reflect the increases in environmental standards contained in the Building Regulations. No adjustment has been made for non-residential property.

## Construction costs: affordable housing

7.8 The procurement route for affordable housing is assumed to be through construction by the developer and then disposal to a housing association on completion. In the past, when considering the build cost of affordable housing provided through this route, we took the view that it should be possible to make a saving on the market housing cost figure, on the basis that one might expect the affordable housing to be built to a slightly different specification than market housing. However, the pressures of increasingly demanding standards for housing association properties have meant that, for conventional schemes of houses at least, it is no longer appropriate to use a reduced build cost; the assumption is of parity.

## Other normal development costs

7.9 In addition to the BCIS $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ build cost figures described above, allowance needs to be made for a range of site costs (roads, drainage and services within the site, parking, footpaths, landscaping and other external costs). Many of these items will depend on individual site circumstances and can only properly be estimated following a detailed assessment of each site. This is not practical within this broad brush study and the approach taken is in line with the PPG and the Harman Guidance.
7.10 Nevertheless, it is possible to generalise. Drawing on experience and the comments of stakeholders it is possible to determine an allowance related to total build costs. This is normally lower for higher density than for lower density schemes since there is a smaller area of external works, and services can be used more efficiently. Large greenfield sites would also be more likely to require substantial expenditure on bringing mains services to the site.
7.11 We have given careful thought as to how the strategic sites should be treated as these large sites, by their nature, can have very significant infrastructure requirements that can have a dramatic impact on viability. Additionally, these large sites are a vital part of the Council's strategy to deliver its housing target - in some cases if the urban extension does not come forward then the Development Plan may be put at risk. In this regard page 23 of the Harman Guidance says:

Landowners and site promoters should be prepared to provide sufficient and good quality information at an early stage, rather than waiting until the development management stage. This will allow an informed judgement by the planning authority regarding the inclusion or otherwise of sites based on their potential viability.
7.12 The modelling and appraisals carried out in a high level strategic report such as this are going to be based on generic and borough wide assumptions. As the Plan progresses further, the Council will need to work with the owners and or promoters of the sites that are perceived to have higher costs inviting them to contribute to the assessment process.

## Abnormal development costs

7.13 The NPPF says (with our emphasis) at Paragraph 174:
... 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 land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable...
7.14 The PPG adds to this saying:
'For an area wide viability assessment, a broad assessment of costs is required. This should be based on robust evidence which is reflective of local market conditions. All development costs should be taken into account including:

- build costs based on appropriate data, for example that of the Building Cost Information Service;
- known abnormal costs, including those associated with treatment for contaminated sites or listed buildings, or historic costs associated with brownfield, phased or complex sites;'

PPG ID: 10-013-20140306
7.15 Abnormal costs will be reflected in land value. Those sites that are less expensive to develop will command a premium price over and above those that have exceptional or abnormal costs. It is not the purpose of a study of this type to standardise land prices across an area.
7.16 The treatment of abnormals was considered at Gedling Council's Examination in Public. There is an argument, as set out in Gedling ${ }^{40}$, is that it may not be appropriate for abnormals to be built into appraisals in a high level study of this type. A council should not plan for the worst case scenario - rather for the norm. For example if two similar sites were offered to the market and one was previous in industrial use with significant contamination and one was 'clean' then the landowner of the contaminated site would have to take a lower land receipt for the same form of development due to the condition of the land. The Inspector said:

[^26]... demolition, abnormal costs and off site works are excluded from the VA, as the threshold land values assume sites are ready to develop, with no significant off site secondary infrastructure required. While there may be some sites where there are significant abnormal construction costs, these are unlikely to be typical and this would, in any case, be reflected in a lower threshold land value for a specific site. In addition such costs could, at least to some degree, be covered by the sum allowed for contingencies.
7.17 We have made allowance for abnormal costs associated with brownfield sites. In some cases where the site involves redevelopment of land which was previously developed, there is the potential for abnormal costs to be incurred. Abnormal development costs might include demolition of substantial existing structures; flood prevention measures at waterside locations; remediation of any land contamination; remodelling of land levels; and so on.
7.18 In the case of brownfield sites we have made an additional allowance of $5 \%$ of the BCIS costs is made.
7.19 For the non-residential property, we have run a scenario where the site is on previously developed land. With this variable we have increased the costs by an additional $5 \%$ cost.

## Fees

7.20 For residential development we have assumed professional fees amount to $10 \%$ of build costs in each case. This amount is exclusive of acquisition, sales and finance fees that are treated separately and is made up as follows and includes the various assessments and appraisals that the Council requires under its various adopted Core Strategy policies:

Architects 6\% Quantity Surveyors 0.5\%
Planning Consultants 1\% Others 2.5\%
7.21 For non-residential development we have assumed 8\%.

## Contingencies

7.22 For previously undeveloped and otherwise straightforward sites, we would normally allow a contingency of $2.5 \%$, with a higher figure of $5 \%$ on more risky types of development, previously developed land and on central locations. So the $5 \%$ figure was used on the brownfield sites and the $2.5 \%$ figure on the remainder.

## S106 Contributions and the costs of infrastructure

7.23 In preparing appraisals for the 2008 AHVS and the 2011 update, it was necessary to make assumptions about the level of developer contributions under s106 across the range of sites. The assumptions made (see AHVS paras 3.13 to 3.21 ) were based upon the levels of contributions typically made under the then current, i.e. pre-CIL, regime. In moving forward to CIL, there will remain scope for specific contributions, but the general scope will be considerably limited (subject to the detail of the Council's 123 List), so as to minimise overlap and avoid the possibility that developers would have to pay twice over. Only site specific matters would therefore qualify for s106 contributions.
7.24 The Council currently collects a range of payments from developers to contribute towards improvements to infrastructure - some of which are on behalf of the Country Council (being the appropriate spending authority) and as set out in the Norfolk County Council (NCC) Planning Obligations Standards (April 2015). The initial request is based on the following tariffs - although it is important to note that these amounts are only applied where there is an actual local requirement.

| Table 7.1 Developer Contributions |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Infrastructure/Service Area | Cost per Dwelling (£) |
| Education | £6,956 |
| Libraries | £60 |
| Adult Social Services | To be negotiated |
| Fire Hydrant | £16.24 |
| Household Waste Recycling Facilities | To be negotiated |
| Highways and Transport | To be negotiated |
| Green Infrastructure | To be negotiated |
| Other Items (relating to Green Infrastructure, <br> Historic Environment and Climate Change ) | To be negotiated |
| Total | £7,032.24 <br> (plus monitoring charge and other items to be <br> negotiated) |

7.25 The Council has also gathered details of payments that have been collected under s106 in recent years. This information is presented separately to this report.
7.26 The analysis in this study is in several parts. Firstly in relation to the larger sites (those over 150 units) in the Plan and then in relation to the remaining development.
7.27 For the larger sites the following s106 assumptions were used in the 2013 Viability Study:

| Table 7.2 2013 Developer Contribution Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Marsh Lane | King's Lynn | $£ 800,000$ | $£ 5,229 /$ unit |
| Lynnsport | King's Lynn | $£ 1,560,000$ | $£ 3,570 /$ unit |
| Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | $£ 500,000$ | $£ 909 / \mathrm{unit}$ |
| Hall Lane | South Wootton | $£ 2,000,000$ | $£ 6,667 /$ unit |
| South East KL | King's Lynn | $£ 3,500,000$ | $£ 2,188 /$ unit |
| All other sites |  |  | $£ 5,000 /$ unit |

Source: KLWNBC
7.28 The Council has provided additional information as to the anticipated requirements, we have used that figure. It should be noted that, as schemes are brought forward, the actual requirement may well be different:

| Table 7.3 2015 Developer Contribution Assumptions |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | ha | Units | Infrastructure | $£ /$ unit |  |
| Boal Quay | 4.1 | 350 | $£ 105,684$ | $£ 302$ |  |
| South of Parkway | 8.8 | 260 | $£ 104,222$ | $£ 401$ |  |
| Lynn Sport | 9.1 | 297 | $£ 2,734,576$ | $£ 9,207$ |  |
| Land at Bankside | 2.6 | 200 | $£ 1,303,248$ | $£ 6,516$ |  |
| West Winch | 192.0 | 3,820 | $£ 18,341,237$ | $£ 4,801$ |  |
| Hall Lane | 18.52 | 500 | $£ 222,872$ | $£ 446$ |  |
| Knights Hill | 27.0 | 700 | $£ 448,744$ | $£ 641$ |  |
| Land east of Lynn Road | 14.93 | 400 | $£ 104,060$ | $£ 260$ |  |
| Land east of Wisbech | 25.3 | 550 | $£ 4,615,832$ | $£ 8,392$ |  |

7.29 In this study we have incorporated the site specific s106 costs into the appraisals. These are the costs that would meet the post April 2015 restrictions on pooling s106 contributions. These sites do put significant further pressure on the infrastructure, and improvements will be required that will not be sufficiently site specific to pass the tests for payments to be required through s106. These items will be funded through a range of other sources including CIL.
7.30 On the smaller sites represented by the typologies (i.e. not the strategic sites) it has been assumed that contributions for open space, education, and transport and flood defences would be subsumed within a general CIL charge. Site specific and on site provision may still be dealt with under s106 so we recognise that some site related s106 contributions may be due so, we have assumed a payment of $£ 2,000$ per dwelling over and above CIL payable on both market and affordable units within the appraisals for the non-strategic sites.
7.31 It is necessary to consider the measures required for mitigation of the potential impact of development on European habitats. The Council is currently exploring the options of how to ensure appropriate measures are taken and funded. At the time of this update (December 2015) the cost is anticipated to be $£ 50$ per new dwelling and is expected to affect all new homes in the Borough. This will be collected by either a unilateral undertaking or s106 agreement. For the purpose of this study this is assumed to be within the £2,000/unit allowance for s106 applied to the modelled sites or to be within the infrastructure payments set out above.
7.32 We have modelled a range of developer contributions (see Chapter 10) to assist in the CIL setting process.

## Financial and Other Appraisal Assumptions

VAT
7.33 For simplicity it has been assumed throughout, that either VAT does not arise, or that it can be recovered in full.

Interest rate
7.34 In the 2013 Viability Study an assumption of $7 \%$ was used for total debit balances, we have made no allowance for any equity provided by the developer. This does not reflect the current working of the market nor the actual business models used by developers. In most cases the smaller (non-plc) developers are required to provide between $30 \%$ and $40 \%$ of the funds themselves, from their own resources, so as to reduce the risk to which the lender is exposed. The larger plc developers tend to be funded through longer term rolling arrangements across multiple sites and from their own resources (shareholder's capital).
7.35 The 7\% assumption may seem high given the very low base rate figure (0.5\% August 2015). Developers that have a strong balance sheet, and good track record, can undoubtedly borrow less expensively than this, but this reflects the banks' view of risk for housing developers in the present situation. In the residential appraisals we have prepared a simple cashflow to calculate interest. This includes allowance for appropriate arrangement fees.
7.36 For the non-residential appraisals, and in line with the 'high level' nature of this study, we have used the developer's rule of thumb to calculate the interest - being the amount due over one year on half the total cost. We accept that is a simplification, however, due to the high level and broad brush nature of this analysis, we believe that it is proportionate bearing in mind the requirements of the NPPF and CIL Regulations.
7.37 The relatively high assumption of the $7 \%$ interest rate, and the assumption that interest is chargeable on all the funds employed, has the effect of overstating the total cost of interest as most developers are required to put some equity into most projects. In this study a cautious approach is being taken, so we believe this is a sound assumption.

## Developer's profit

7.38 An allowance needs to be made for developer's profit / return and to reflect the risk of development. Neither the NPPF, nor the CIL Regulations, nor the CIL Guidance provide useful guidance in this regard so, in reaching this decision, we have considered the RICS's 'Financial Viability in Planning' (August 2012), the Harman Guidance Viability Testing Local Plans, Advice for planning practitioners (June 2012), and referred to the HCA's Economic Appraisal Tool. None of these documents are prescriptive, but they do set out some different approaches.
7.39 RICS's 'Financial Viability in Planning' (August 2012) says:
'3.3.2 The benchmark return, which is reflected in a developer's profit allowance, should be at a level reflective of the market at the time of the assessment being undertaken. It will include the risks
attached to the specific scheme. This will include both property-specific risk, i.e. the direct development risks within the scheme being considered, and also broader market risk issues, such as the strength of the economy and occupational demand, the level of rents and capital values, the level of interest rates and availability of finance. The level of profit required will vary from scheme to scheme, given different risk profiles as well as the stage in the economic cycle. For example, a small scheme constructed over a shorter timeframe may be considered relatively less risky and therefore attract a lower profit margin, given the exit position is more certain, than a large redevelopment spanning a number of years where the outturn is considerably more uncertain.

### 7.40 The Harman Guidance says:

## 'Return on development and overhead

The viability assessment will require assumptions to be made about the average level of developer overhead and profit (before interest and tax).

The level of overhead will differ according to the size of developer and the nature and scale of the development. A 'normal' level of developer's profit margin, adjusted for development risk, can be determined from market evidence and having regard to the profit requirements of the providers of development finance. The return on capital employed (ROCE) is a measure of the level of profit relative to level of capital required to deliver a project, including build costs, land purchase, infrastructure, etc.

As with other elements of the assessment, the figures used for developer return should also be considered in light of the type of sites likely to come forward within the plan period. This is because the required developer return varies with the risk associated with a given development and the level of capital employed.

Smaller scale, urban infill sites will generally be regarded as lower risk investments when compared with complex urban regeneration schemes or large scale urban extensions.

Appraisal methodologies frequently apply a standard assumed developer margin based upon either a percentage of Gross Development Value (GDV) or a percentage of development cost. The great majority of housing developers base their business models on a return expressed as a percentage of anticipated gross development value, together with an assessment of anticipated return on capital employed. Schemes with high upfront capital costs generally require a higher gross margin in order to improve the return on capital employed. Conversely, small scale schemes with low infrastructure and servicing costs provide a better return on capital employed and are generally lower risk investments. Accordingly, lower gross margins may be acceptable.

This sort of modelling - with residential developer margin expressed as a percentage of GDV should be the default methodology, with alternative modelling techniques used as the exception. Such an exception might be, for example, a complex mixed use development with only small scale specialist housing such as affordable rent, sheltered housing or student accommodation.'
7.41 The HCA's Economic Appraisal Tool - the accompanying guidance for the tool kit says:

## 'Developer's Return for Risk and Profit (including developer's overheads)

## Open Market Housing

The developer 'profit' (before taxation) on the open market housing as a percentage of the value of the open market housing. A typical figure currently may be in the region of 17.5-20\% and overheads being deducted, but this is only a guide as it will depend on the state of the market and the size and complexity of the scheme. Flatted schemes may carry a higher risk due to the high capital employed before income is received.

## Affordable Housing

The developer 'profit' (before taxation) on the affordable housing as a percentage of the value of the affordable housing (excluding SHG ${ }^{41}$ ). A typical figure may be in the region of $6 \%$ (the profit is less than that for the open market element of the scheme, as risks are reduced), but this is only a guide.'
7.42 It is unfortunate that the above are not consistent, but it is clear that the purpose of including a developers' profit figure is not to mirror a particular business model, but to reflect the risk a developer is taking in buying a piece of land, and then expending the costs of construction before selling the property. The use of developers' profit in the context of area wide viability testing of the type required by the NPPF and CIL Regulation 14, is to reflect that level of risk.
7.43 At the Shinfield Appeal ${ }^{42}$ (January 2013) the Inspector considered this specifically saying:

## Developer's profit

43. The parties were agreed that costs ${ }^{43}$ should be assessed at $25 \%$ of costs or $20 \%$ of gross development value (GDV). The parties disagreed in respect of the profit required in respect of the affordable housing element of the development with the Council suggesting that the figure for this should be reduced to 6\%. This does not greatly affect the appellants' costs, as the affordable housing element is $2 \%$, but it does impact rather more upon the Council's calculations.
44. The appellants supported their calculations by providing letters and emails from six national housebuilders who set out their net profit margin targets for residential developments. The figures ranged from a minimum of $17 \%$ to $28 \%$, with the usual target being in the range $20-25 \%$. Those that differentiated between market and affordable housing in their correspondence did not set different profit margins. Due to the level and nature of the supporting evidence, I give great weight [to] it. I conclude that the national housebuilders' figures are to be preferred and that a figure of $20 \%$ of GDV, which is at the lower end of the range, is reasonable.
7.44 Through the consultation process it was suggested that the profit must be calculated on Gross Development Value (GDV) as this is the 'norm'. Generally we do not agree that linking the developer's profit to GDV is reflective of risk, as the risk relates to the cost of a scheme - the cost being the money put at risk as the scheme is developed. As an example (albeit an extreme one to illustrate the point) we can take two schemes, $A$ and $B$, each with a GDV $£ 1,000,000$, but scheme $A$ has a development cost of $£ 750,000$ and scheme $B$ a lesser cost of $£ 500,000$. All other things being equal, in $A$ the developer stands to lose $£ 750,000$ (and make a profit of $£ 250,000$ ), but in B 'only' $£ 500,000$ (and make a profit of $£ 500,000$ ). Scheme A is therefore more risky, and it therefore follows that the developer will wish (and need) a higher return. By calculating profit on costs, the developer's return in scheme A

[^27]would be $£ 150,000$ and in scheme B would be $£ 100,000$ and so reflect the risk - whereas if calculated on GDV the profits would be $£ 200,000$ in both.
7.45 Broadly there are four different approaches that could be taken:
a) To set a different rate of return on each site to reflect the risk associated with the development of that site. This would result in a lower rate on the smaller and simpler sites - such as the greenfield sites, and a higher rate on the brownfield sites.
b) To set a rate for the different types of unit produced - say $20 \%$ for market housing and $6 \%$ for affordable housing, as suggested by the HCA.
c) To set the rate relative to costs - and thus reflect the risks of development.
d) To set the rate relative to the gross development value as suggested by several of the stakeholders following the consultation event.
7.46 In deciding which option to adopt, it is important to note that we are not trying to re-create any particular developer's business model. Different developers will always adopt different models and have different approaches to risk.
7.47 The argument is sometimes made that financial institutions require a $20 \%$ return on development value and if that is not shown they will not provide development funding. In the pre-Credit Crunch era there were some lenders who did take a relatively simplistic view to risk analysis but that is no longer the case. Most financial institutions now base their decisions behind providing development finance on sophisticated financial modelling that it is not possible to replicate in a study of this type. They require the developer to demonstrate a sufficient margin to protect them in the case of changes in prices or development costs. They will also consider a wide range of other factors, including the amount of equity the developer is contributing - both on a loan to value and loan to cost basis, the nature of development and the development risks that may arise due to demolition works or similar, the warranties offered by the professional team, whether or not the directors will provide personal guarantees, and the number of pre-sold units.
7.48 This is a high level study where it is necessary and proportionate to take a relatively simplistic approach, so, rather than apply a differential return (either site by site or split between market and affordable housing) it is appropriate to make some broad assumptions.
7.49 We have calculated the profit to reflect risk from development as $20 \%$ of Gross Development Value. This assumption should be considered with the assumption about interest rates in the previous section, where a cautious approach was taken with a relatively high interest rate, and the assumption that interest is charged on the whole of the development cost. Further consideration should also be given to the contingency sum in the appraisals which is also reflective of the risks.
7.50 It is useful to consider the assumptions used in other studies in other parts of England. We have reviewed developer's return assumptions used by other councils in England in
development plans approved during the first half of 2014. These are set out in the table below.

| Table 7.4 Developer's Return Assumptions Used Elsewhere |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local Authority | Developer's Profit |
| Babergh | $17 \%$ |
| Cannock Chase | $20 \%$ on GDV |
| Christchurch \& East Dorset | $20 \%$ on GDC |
| East Hampshire | $20 \%$ market/6\% Affordable |
| Erewash | $17 \%$ |
| Fenland | $15-20 \%$ |
| GNDP | $20 \%$ market/17.5\% large sites/6\% Affordable |
| Reigate \& Banstead | $17.5 \%$ market/6\% Affordable |
| Staffordshire Moorlands | $17.5 \%$ market/6\% Affordable |
| Warrington | $17.5 \%$ |

Source: Planning Advisory Service (collated by URS) July 2014
7.51 Interestingly the assumptions with regard to developer's return / profit are at the upper end of the range. Together these assumptions illustrate the generally cautious approach taken through the viability work and the comments made by the development industry through the consultation process.

## Voids

7.52 On a scheme comprising mainly individual houses, one would normally assume only a nominal void period as the housing would not be progressed if there was no demand. In the case of apartments in blocks this flexibility is reduced. Whilst these may provide scope for early marketing, the ability to tailor construction pace to market demand is more limited.
7.53 For the purpose of the present study, a three month void period is assumed for all residential and non-residential developments. We have given careful consideration to this assumption in connection to the commercial developments. There is very little speculative commercial development taking place so we believe that this is the appropriate assumption to make.

## Phasing and timetable

7.54 A pre-construction period of six months is assumed for all of the sites. Each dwelling is assumed to be built over a nine month period. The phasing programme for an individual site will reflect market take-up and would, in practice, be carefully estimated taking into account the site characteristics and, in particular, the size and the expected level of market demand. We have developed a suite of modelled assumptions to reflect site size and development type.
7.55 The rate of delivery will be an important factor when the Council is considering the release of sites so as to manage the delivery of housing and infrastructure. We have considered two aspects, the first is the number of outlets that a development site may have, and secondly the number of units that an outlet can deliver.
7.56 In this iteration of the study we have increased this to a maximum of 50/outlet, to be in line with development appraisals being submitted to the Council through the development management process.
7.57 We believe that these are conservative and do, properly, reflect current practice. This is the appropriate assumption to make to be in line with the PPG and Harman Guidance. There is little research in this field, but in 2008 research was published by CLG \& University of Glasgow ${ }^{44}$. This study, based on research undertaken in the immediate pre-recessionary period, presented the results of a literature review, survey work amongst 18 national housebuilders and an examination of one large site developed by ten separate companies. The study considered build-out rates setting out optimal build-out rates for both greenfield and brownfield sites:

Table 7.5 Optimal Average Sales Rate: Greenfield
Typical 200 unit Greenfield Development comprising mainly 2, 3 \& 4 Bedroom Houses

| Sales rate | AlI <br> respondents | Volume <br> developers | Medium-sized <br> developers | Smaller <br> developers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 per 2/3 days | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1 per week | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| 1 per 10 days | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 per fortnight | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Note: Not all respondents answered this question but all who did not offered a written response to an open-ended question element. Table. 4 considers all 18 responses.

Table 2 DCLG \& University of Glasgow, Factors Affecting Housing Build Out Rates, February 2008

[^28]
## Table 7.6 Optimal Average Sales Rate: Brownfield

Typical 200 unit Brownfield Development comprising mainly 2, 3 \& 4 Bedroom Apartments

| Sales rate | All respondents | Volume <br> developers | Medium-sized <br> developers | Smaller <br> developers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 per $2 / 3$ days | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 per week | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 1 per 10 days | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 per fortnight | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Note: Not all respondents answered this question but all who did not offered a written response to an open-ended question element. Table 4 considers all 18 responses.

Table 3 DCLG \& University of Glasgow, Factors Affecting Housing Build Out Rates, February 2008

| Table 7.7 Imputed Annual Optimal Sales Rates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Optimal annual rate | All respondents | Volume <br> developers | Medium-sized <br> developers | Smaller <br> developers |
| Greenfield housing | 58.61 | 55.83 | 45.71 | 80.00 |
| Brownfield apartments | 67.18 | 81.33 | 54.14 | 68.75 |
| Table 4 DCLG \& University of Glasgow, Factors Affecting Housing Build Out Rates, February 2008 |  |  |  |  |

Table 4 DCLG \& University of Glasgow, Factors Affecting Housing Build Out Rates, February 2008
7.58 Whilst it is important to recognise the date of this research (2008), it is still relevant to note ${ }^{45}$ :

Most builders generally appear to set a target of between 40 and 80 units built and sold from each outlet annually.
7.59 Bearing in mind that this study is considering development across the economic cycle we have not adjusted the assumptions in this regard.

## Site Acquisition and Disposal Costs

## Site holding costs and receipts

7.60 Each site is assumed to proceed immediately (following a 6 month mobilisation period). Other than interest on the site cost during construction, there is no allowance for holding costs, or indeed income, arising from ownership of the site.

[^29]
## Acquisition costs

7.61 We have taken a simplistic approach and assumed an allowance $1.5 \%$ for acquisition agents' and legal fees. Stamp duty is calculated at the prevailing rates.

## Disposal costs

7.62 For the market and the affordable housing, sales and promotion costs are assumed to amount to some $3.0 \%$ of receipts, with additional legal fees of $0.5 \%$. For disposals of affordable housing, these figures can be reduced significantly depending on the category, so in fact the marketing and disposal of the affordable element is probably less expensive than this.

## 8. Local Plan Requirements

8.1 The purpose of this study is to consider the representations received following the consultation on the PDCS. This needs to be done in the context of the existing and emerging policy framework. This is somewhat different to the earlier work which was also to consider the deliverability of the emerging Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD. In this chapter we have reviewed the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan (July 2013) (being known as Site Specific Allocations and Policies DPD Issues Options Consultation (September 2011) in its previous iteration), and reviewed the Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) to consider those policies that may have an impact on development viability.
8.2 In this assessment we considered each of the emerging policies. In each case we have considered whether that add to the costs already covered in the BCIS costs. The Council have taken a light touch in its policy making, largely relying on the national standards set out in the NPPF.
8.3 We have also reviewed the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan (July 2013). Chapter 10 consists of detailed, area specific Development Management Policies, which, in conjunction with the Core Strategy, will be used to determine planning applications. These do not cover every type of potential development, but rather those issues upon which the Borough Council considers more guidance is needed.
8.4 In the following sections we have made selective quotations from the Council's policies to highlight those parts of the policy that are costly to the developer and for the purpose of assessing the cumulative impact of the policies. The policies are often wider than the selected quotations.

## Core Strategy (adopted July 2011) Policies

## CS08 Sustainable Development

All new development in the borough should be of high quality design. New development will be required to demonstrate its ability to:

- protect and enhance the historic environment;
- enrich the attraction of the borough as an exceptional place to live, work and visit;
- respond to the context and character of places in West Norfolk by ensuring that the scale, density, layout and access will enhance the quality of the environment;
- optimise site potential, making the best use of land including the use of brownfield land;
- enhance community wellbeing by being accessible, inclusive, locally distinctive, safe and by promoting healthy lifestyles (see Policy CS14 Community \& culture);
- achieve high standards of sustainable design.
8.5 We have not modelled these standards separately as they are covered within the base costs of the assumptions.

To promote and encourage opportunities to achieve high standards of sustainability and energy efficiency, measures should include:

- construction techniques, layout, orientation, internal design and appropriate insulation maximised to improve efficiency;
- innovative use of re-used or recycled materials of local and traditional materials to decrease waste and maintain local character;
- reduction of on site emissions by generation of cleaner energy;
- provision of green space to safeguard wildlife, provide recreation opportunities and improve the quality of life for people living in the area;
- good access links for walking and cycling;
- integration of water saving devices and Sustainable Drainage Systems; designs that exceed the present standards set by Building Regulations and achieve higher levels of the Code for Sustainable Homes will be encouraged;
- at the design stage, attention should be had to the CABE 'Building for Life' national standard for well-designed homes and neighbourhoods and all new schemes should be assessed against the Building for Life Criteria, or successor documents as appropriate;
- new development of more than 10 dwellings (new build or conversions) or 1,000m2 non residential floor space should reduce their predicted CO2 emissions by at least 10\% (by using decentralised and renewable and low carbon sources) as compared to the Standard Assessment Methodology. For developments over 100 dwellings a $20 \%$ reduction of CO2 emissions will be encouraged.

The Council will take account of the impact of achieving these targets on the viability of a scheme and where appropriate agree a lower or nil target provided:

- the development of the site is in the wider public interest; and
- the developer is prepared to share information on development costs and margins with the Council prior to consent being granted.
8.6 In the 2013 Viability Study we assumed all new development is to be carried out to the environmental standards as set out in Chapter 7 of this document. We have made a further allowance of $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ on residential development to cover additional measures to meet the requirements of this policy.
8.7 As set out earlier in this report, the Government also confirmed within the Fixing the foundations productivity report ${ }^{46}$ its intention not to proceed with the zero carbon buildings policy, which was initially announced in 2007.
... repeat its successful target from the previous Parliament to reduce net regulation on housebuilders. The government does not intend to proceed with the zero carbon Allowable Solutions

[^30]carbon offsetting scheme, or the proposed 2016 increase in on-site energy efficiency standards, but will keep energy efficiency standards under review, recognising that existing measures to increase energy efficiency of new buildings should be allowed time to become established
8.8 As a result, there will be no uplift to Part L of the Building Regulations during 2016 and both the 2016 zero carbon homes target and the 2019 target for non-domestic zero carbon buildings will be dropped, including the Allowable Solutions programme. We have not made a further adjustment in this regard.

## Density of development

- In seeking to make the most efficient use of land, the Council will scrutinise Design and Access Statements to confirm that the proposal optimises the density of development in the light of local factors such
- as: the setting of the development; the form and character of existing development; and the requirement for any on site infrastructure including amenity space.
8.9 We have based our modelling on past planning applications and on the current development types seen in the market. These were put to the development industry through the consultation process and there was a broad consensus that they were realistic and appropriate.


## CS09 Housing Distribution

The plan will identify sufficient land for a minimum of 16,500 new dwellings......

## Housing - type, size, tenure

Proposals for housing must take appropriate account of need identified in the most up to date strategic housing market assessment with particular regard to size, type and tenure of dwellings. (These needs will include appropriate provision for all sectors of the community, for example including the needs of elderly people or people with disabilities).
8.10 In the 2013 Viability Study, we modelled the sites on the mix and type of development that is expected to come forward. In this iteration of the work we have updated this to reflect the mix of housing identified in the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA):


## Affordable Housing

The Council will work with partner organisations to maximise the delivery of affordable housing to respond to identified housing need throughout the borough. This will be achieved by having regard to up to date strategic housing market assessments and affordable housing needs viability studies.
The overall target for affordable housing in the Borough during the plan period will be related to the ability to deliver in the market conditions that prevail at the time a planning application is made. At the present time the percentage which will be sought for affordable housing provision on qualifying sites is:

- $15 \%$ within the built up area of King's $L y n n^{47}$
- $20 \%$ in all other areas

The thresholds over which affordable housing provision will be sought are:

- King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton - Sites of 0.33 ha or 10 or more dwellings
- Rural areas - Sites of 0.165 of ha or 5 or more dwellings

The Borough Council will vary this percentage......

[^31]Tenure mix - 70:30 Rented to 'shared ownership', adjusted where necessary to balance housing need and make schemes viable, subject to negotiation. $30 \%$ 'shared ownership' to inc/ude other forms of intermediate tenure, including intermediate rented.
In negotiating the proportions and tenures of affordable housing account will be taken of the site characteristics and effects on the economic viability of the development through open book explanations. Provision will be 'on-site' unless demonstrated that this is not feasible.

It is appropriate to consider the exceptional provision of affordable housing (maintained in 'perpetuity') are within the Rural Villages classification in Policy CSO2.
8.11 As set out in Chapter 2 above, since the earlier work there have been a number of changes in this area of policy, particularly around national thresholds and Starter Homes. These changes are certainly going to impact on viability; however, the impact is going to be positive rather than negative. Housing provided as Starter Homes would have a value of $80 \%$ of market value, compared to $65 \%$ of market value if provided as intermediate housing or $£ 1,000 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for Affordable Rent. In KLWN, CIL is being set against the current policy framework (rather than one that may apply in the future). It is therefore not appropriate (or necessary) to test the impact of these changes.
8.12 In parallel with these announcements, changes were also made in relation to Vacant Buildings Credit whereby affordable housing contributions and CIL would not be sought on the elements (or proportion) of schemes that were existing vacant buildings. It is not necessary to consider these changes in the context of this study.
8.13 Bearing in mind that the Council have an up to date and adopted Core Strategy we have assumed that the policy will apply as drafted, but due to the uncertainty we have considered a scenario where the national affordable housing is reintroduced.

The detailed interpretation of the Affordable Housing Policy was discussed with officers following the January 2013 consultation event. Concern was expressed by the developers that the model works on a $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ basis but the policy is written and implemented on a unit basis. This causes a distortion as, on the whole, the affordable units are smaller than the market units. The typical market units are a little over $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and the typical affordable units are about $75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
8.14 In this iteration of the report we have revisiting the modelling and based it on the mix of housing identified in the SHMA.
8.15 The Council's adopted Core Strategy includes a 'dynamic viability mechanism' whereby the Affordable Housing target is altered throughout the Plan period by reference to published indices (house prices and costs). Since the policy was developed there have been a number of significant changes that impact on development viability. Firstly, Affordable Rented housing has largely replaced Social Rent. Affordable Rented accommodation has a higher value than the Social Rent that was used in the model. Secondly the move to higher environmental standards has been clarified.

## CS11 Transport

## Strategic issues

The Council will work with partner organisations . $\qquad$
The Council will seek appropriate contributions to necessary transport improvements.
8.16 We have modelled a range of developer contributions as set out in Chapter 7.

CS12 Environmental Assets Green Infrastructure, Historic Environment, Landscape
Character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity
.... The Council will require development proposals to be accompanied by an ecological impact study and assessment proportionate to the degree of the impact and importance of the species affected. It may be necessary to secure biodiversity, geodiversity and heritage needs through planning conditions and/or obligations. This can include timing of work, Section106 Agreements, pre-application negotiations, conditions, mitigation and compensation measures.
8.17 We have allowed for this under the 10\%/8\% allowance for professional fees.

## Character Assessment

Proposals for development will be informed by, and seek opportunities to reinforce the distinctive character areas and potential habitat creation areas identified in the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment, the West Norfolk Econet Map and other character assessments.
Development proposals should demonstrate that their location, scale, design and materials will protect, conserve and, where possible, enhance the special qualities and local distinctiveness of the area (including its historical, biodiversity and cultural character), gaps between settlements, landscape setting, distinctive settlement character, landscape features and ecological networks.
8.18 This is an additional cost to the developer. We have allowed for this under the $10 \% / 8 \%$ allowance for professional fees.

## CS13 Community \& Culture

## (i) Delivering community well-being and enhancing quality of life through good design.

Where possible, developers should examine best practice on design in new development and should aim to involve the community early in the design process of new development.
The form, design, location and layout of development should enhance community wellbeing, by:

- being accessible and inclusive - ensuring that people of any age, gender, ethnicity and ability can use and access the development;
- being adaptable - creating high quality development which is capable of being modified either for different uses or to suit people with different needs;
- being locally distinctive - contributing to a sense of place and identity; reducing the opportunity for crime - considering factors such as natural surveillance, boundaries and security features, lighting and the management of public space to promote safe living environments;
- being within walking distance of open space - to increase peoples quality of life and enable active and healthy lifestyles.
8.19 This is an additional cost to the developer. We have allowed for this under the $10 \% / 8 \%$ allowance for professional fees.


## CS14 Infrastructure Provision

8.20 This is a detailed policy that has a range of requirements to ensure that the impact of development is mitigated. We have modelled a range of developer contributions as set out in Chapter 7.

## Detailed Policies and Sites Plan (July 2013)

8.21 The majority of this document is concerned with identifying parcels of land for development and the selection of the preferred sites. The document sets out the principal topics that will need to be taken into account when considering actual planning applications in due course. These are not proposed policies, however we have drawn on this information to inform the modelling. On the whole these concern design issues which are covered in the base modelling.
8.22 Chapter 10 consists of detailed, area specific Development Management Policies, which, in conjunction with the Core Strategy, will be used to determine planning applications. These do not cover every type of potential development, but rather those issues upon which the Borough Council considers more guidance is needed.
8.23 These policies do set out in further detail the framework for future development, in particular about where it may take place. The policies seek to impose additional costs on the development industry, for example, by introducing higher environmental standards, new rates of development density or the like. We have not modelled specific policy requirements from this document.

## 9. Modelled Sites

9.1 In the previous chapters we have set out the general assumptions to be inputted into the development appraisals. In this chapter we have set out the modelling. This has been updated to reflect the mix of housing identified in the SHMA and extended to ensure that the full range of development expected in the Borough is fully represented.
9.2 Initially, the project was based on simply updating the appraisals for the eight modelled sites that were assessed in the 2008 AHVS. Early in the project it was decided to supplement the original eight sites to ensure a full assessment could be made. As the project went forward, particularly in the light of the comments received as part of the consultation process, it became apparent that the modelled sites were representative of past development - but not the mix of sites that are identified in the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan. It was therefore decided to take a step back and revisit the site modelling and extend the scope of the study to cover the sites within the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan (July 2013).
9.3 This is a high level study that is seeking to capture the generality rather than the specific. The purpose is to establish the cumulative impact of the Council's policies on development viability, to inform the CIL setting process. This information will be used with the other information gathered by the Council to assess whether or not the sites are actually deliverable.
9.4 In the 2013 Viability Study 16 sites were modelled. These were based on actual sites but were representative of the development expected across all sites over the plan period. In this study update we have modelled the 9 sites within the site allocations document with a capacity of over 150 units and a set of typologies to be representative of smaller sites in the Borough. The smallest site modelled in the earlier work was for 6 units. In this update we have modelled 10 typologies (as well as the 9 sites with a capacity of over 150 ) up to 100 units.

| Table 9.1 KLWN Larger Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | ha | Units | Units/ha |
| 1 | Boal Quay | 4.10 | 350 | 85.37 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | 8.80 | 260 | 29.55 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | 9.10 | 297 | 32.64 |
| 4 | Land at Bankside | 2.60 | 200 | 76.92 |
| 5 | West Winch | 192.00 | 3820 | 19.90 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | 18.52 | 500 | 27.00 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | 27.00 | 700 | 25.93 |
| 8 | Land East of Lynn Road | 14.93 | 400 | 26.79 |
| 9 | Land East of Wisbech | 25.30 | 550 | 21.74 |

Source: KLWN Post PDCS Viability Update (HDH, November 2015)
9.5 The CIL Regulations require the charging authority to use 'appropriate available evidence'. It is not necessary to test every type of development that may occur in the Borough for every situation. It is also important to note that this assessment is looking at the ability of new projects to bear an element of CIL - it is only therefore necessary to look at the main types of development likely to come forward in the future. The majority of the area is subject to tight development control policies which impose very considerable constraint on future development directing the development towards King's Lynn and the main towns.
9.6 We acknowledge that modelling cannot be totally representative, however the aim of this work is to test the effect of CIL on viability on sites likely to come forward over the planperiod. This will inform the Council's CIL setting process. The work is high level, so there are likely to be sites that will not be able to deliver the affordable housing target and CIL. Indeed as set out at the start of this report, there are some sites that will be unviable even without any policy requirements (for example brownfield sites with high remediation costs), but there will also be sites that can afford more. Once CIL has been adopted, it is nonnegotiable there is little scope for exemptions to be granted. However, where it is demonstrated by viability evidence that the affordable housing target and other policy requirements cannot be met as well as CIL payments, the developer will continue to be able to negotiate with the planning authority on s106 and affordable housing contributions. The modelled sites are reflective of development sites in the study area that are likely to come forward during the plan-period.

## Residential Development Sites

9.7 This update is based on modelling 11 actual sites and 10 typologies. The modelled sites are informed by the sites in the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan, but also reflect the smaller windfall sites expected over the plan period.
9.8 In arriving at appropriate assumptions for residential development on each site we have ensured that the built form used in our appraisals is appropriate to the current development practices. We have developed a typology which responds to the variety of development situations and densities typical in KLWN, and this is used to inform development assumptions for sites. The typology enables us to form a view about floorspace density, based on the amount of development, measured in net floorspace per hectare, to be accommodated upon the site. This is a key variable because the amount of floorspace which can be accommodated on a site relates directly to the Residual Value, and is an amount which developers will normally seek to maximise (within the constraints set by the market).
9.9 The typology uses, as a base or benchmark, a typical post- PPS3 built form which would provide development at between $3,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{ha}$ to $3,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{ha}$ on a substantial site, or sensibly shaped smaller site. A representative housing density might be around $35 /$ net ha. This has become a common development format. It provides for a majority of houses but with a small element of flats, in a mixture of two storey and two and a half to three storey form, with some rectangular emphasis to the layout.
9.10 There could be some schemes of appreciably higher density development providing largely or wholly apartments, in blocks of three storeys or higher, with development densities of $6,900 \mathrm{~m}^{2} / \mathrm{ha}$ and dwelling densities of 100 units/ha upwards; and schemes of lower density, in the rural edge situations.
9.11 The density, in terms of units and floorspace, has been used to ensure appropriate development assumptions for a majority of the sites.
9.12 We have based the densities used in the site modelling on the expected density that is likely to come forward in current market conditions. These follow the densities used in the SHLAA and HELAA, including the open space assumptions and densities:

| Table 9.2 Site Density Assumptions |  |
| :--- | :---: |
|  | Density (units/ha) |
| King's Lynn (Sub-Regional Centre) | 39 |
| Downham Market, Hunstanton and Wisbech Fringe (Main Town) | 36 |
| Key Rural Service Centres | 24 |
| Rural Villages | 24 |

Source: KLWNBC

| Table 9.3 Net / Gross Area Assumptions |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Site Size (ha) | Development Ratio (Net <br> Developable Area) |
| $<0.4$ ha | $100 \%$ |
| $0.4-2$ ha | $90 \%$ |
| $>2$ ha | $75 \%$ |
| Source: KLWNBC |  |

9.13 The above information was used to develop model development assumptions. We have set out the main characteristics of the modelled sites in the tables below.
9.14 It is important to note that the modelled sites are not actual sites. These modelled typologies have been informed by the sites included in the Plan and in the SHLAA, both in terms of scale and location. A proportion of the housing to come forward over the plan-period will be on smaller sites, therefore several smaller sites have been included. Single plots have been included however it is anticipated that these will, predominantly, be brought forward by 'selfbuilders' so would be exempt from CIL.
9.15 The details of the larger sites are set out in the following table:

| Table 9.4 KLWN Large Sites |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site | Details |  | Notes |
| Boal Quay KL2 King's Lynn | Units | 350 | Brownfield site with river frontage. Assume mainly flatted development. No open space allowed. <br> Allow for raised floors and additional works. Estimated s106 payments of £105,684. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 4.1 ha |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 85 |  |
| South of Parkway KL3 King's Lynn | Units | 260 | Playing fields in King's Lynn. Mix of family housing and flats in higher density development. 25\% openspace to give net developable area of 6.6ha. Estimated s106 payments of $£ 2,734,576$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 8.8ha |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 30 |  |
| Lynnsport KL4 King's Lynn | Units | 297 | Amenity Land within the built up area. Assume a mix of family housing on about half the site. Assume retaining of allotments etc. $25 \%$ openspace to give net developable area of 9 ha. <br> Within Flood zone 2 and 3. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 734,576$. <br> This site is owned by the Council. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 9.1 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 32.6 |  |
| Bankside KL6 King's Lynn | Units | 200 | Previous industrial use. <br> High density with about half units as flats - no openspace. <br> No known abnormal costs-however flood defence measures may be significant (Assume $£ 1,000,000$ ). <br> Possibility of high quality design given proximity to King's Lynn conservation area. <br> Provision of additional car parking to serve West Lynn Ferry. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 1,303,248$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 2.6 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 77 |  |
| West Winch King's Lynn | Units | 3,820 | Known as South East KL in 2013 Viability Study. <br> Large strategic site south of the A47. Overall site area for residential and associated development is some 171ha. Significant openspace provision, assume net developable area of 100 ha (about $40 \%$ openspace). <br> Restricted by gas main easement <br> Link road needed, but to serve development so no additional costs. <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 18,341,237$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 192 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 20 |  |
| Hall Lane South Wootton | Units | 500 | Large greenfield strategic site. 40ha in all. Assumed 10 ha developed at 30 units/ha and a gross area of 16ha. <br> South Wootton Parish Council have prepared a Parish Plan. <br> Some flood issues - assumed in undeveloped parts. <br> Estimated s106 payments of £222.872. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 18.5 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 27 |  |

Source: HDH / KLWNBC (September 2015) Note density calculated on gross area

| Table 9.4 KLWN Large Sites (Continued) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knights Hill <br> South Wootton | Units | 700 | Large greenfield strategic site. 36.9ha in all. Assumed 20ha developed at 30units/ha. <br> South Wootton Parish Council have prepared a Parish Plan. Only part of the site is in South Wootton, rest is Castle Rising and King's Lynn. <br> Some flood issues - assumed in undeveloped parts. Estimated s106 payments of $£ 4,448,744$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 27.0 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 26 |  |
| East of Lynn Road <br> Downham Market | Units | 400 | Large strategic site. Total site area in excess of 45ha submitted for consideration in LDF process. Modelled for 250 units in line with DPD with about $50 \%$ open space - net developable (8.3ha at $30 / \mathrm{ha}$ ) <br> Currently in agricultural land <br> Mix of family housing <br> Part of site ex-WW2 airfield - not considered significant. <br> Estimated s106 payments of £104,060. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 14.9 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 27 |  |
| Wisbech Fringe <br> Wisbech | Units | 550 | This site is assumed to accommodate 550 units, when being developed with an adjacent allocation from the Fenland Local Plan. <br> Assume $25 \%$ open space, 19ha net developable. <br> A master plan for the whole site is required <br> Mix of family housing <br> Estimated s106 payments of $£ 4,616,000$. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 25.3 |  |
|  | Density (units/ha) | 21.74 |  |

9.16 The details of the typologies are set out in the following table:

| Table 9.5 Summary of Modelled Typologies |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Greenfield <br> Greenfield 1 | Units | 100 | Larger urban edge, greenfield site. 36/net ha and $25 \%$ open space, 2.78 net developable ha. <br> Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 3.70 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 27 |  |
| Medium Greenfield <br> Greenfield <br> 2 | Units | 40 | Medium greenfield site. 36/net ha and 10\% open space, 1.39 net developable ha. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.55 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 32 |  |
| Large Settlement Edge <br> Greenfield $3$ | Units | 30 | Greenfield site. 24/net ha and 10\% open space, 1.25 net developable ha. <br> Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.4 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 21 |  |
| Settlement Edge <br> Greenfield <br> 4 | Units | 12 | Greenfield site on settlement edge. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.5 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 24 |  |
| Small Greenfield <br> Greenfield <br> 5 | Units | 7 | Greenfield site on settlement edge or infill site. No open space. Mix of family housing. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.3 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 28 |  |
| Smaller Infill Infill <br> 6 | Units | 2 | Greenfield infill on garden land. Pair of semi-detached. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 20 |  |
| Larger Urban <br> Brownfield <br> 7 | Units | 30 | Large brownfield site. $25 \%$ open space 36 units/ha, 0.83ha net developable ha. <br> Mix of family housing |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 1.11 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 27 |  |
| Urban Infill <br> Brownfield <br> 8 | Units | 7 | Small brownfield site. No open space. Mix of semidetached and terrace. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.3 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 23 |  |
| Small Infill Brownfield 9 | Units | 3 | Small brownfield site. No open space. Pair of semidetached and one detached. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.1 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 30 |  |
| Small Infill <br> Greenfield <br> 10 | Units | 1 | Single detached house. |
|  | Area (Gross ha) | 0.05 |  |
|  | Density /ha | 20 |  |

9.17 The typologies have been modelled at the locally appropriate affordable housing and values. The gross and net areas and the site densities are summarised below:

| Table 9．6 KLWN Large Sites－Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 菏 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{\pi}{N} \\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{y}{N} \\ \stackrel{N}{0} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{g}} \\ & \mathrm{C} \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\substack{\mathrm{N} \\ \mathrm{~N}}}{ }$ | $$ | m N N |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \overline{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \mathrm{~m} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \stackrel{D}{n} \\ \dot{N} \end{array}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{m} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{m}} \\ \underset{\sim}{\mathbf{j}} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{O} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\mathrm{O}} \\ & \hline \mathbf{C} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathrm{O} \\ \text { in } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \stackrel{\infty}{\infty} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \end{array}$ |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ 0.0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \hat{m} \\ \underset{\infty}{\infty} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\sim}{0} \\ \underset{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \underset{\sim}{2} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{array}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{N}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{R}{\hat{2}} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \stackrel{1}{N} \end{array}$ |
|  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ | $\stackrel{O}{\dot{\sim}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline 6 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{o}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{~N}} \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{m}{c} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \stackrel{N}{N} \\ \stackrel{1}{\sim} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{\underset{~}{2}} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathrm{O} \\ \stackrel{\mathrm{O}}{ } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  | $$ | $\stackrel{O}{\dot{\gamma}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \infty \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{O}{\sigma}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \dot{\sim} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{O} \\ & \text { í } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline N \\ \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \mathrm{O} \\ \underset{\sim}{2} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \underset{\sim}{+} \\ \dot{\sim} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{e}{\mathrm{M}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \frac{n}{5} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 융 | $\stackrel{\circ}{0}$ | ㅅN | Oi | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \stackrel{్}{\infty} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $8$ | প্র | $8$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  | ［ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{\overline{0}} \\ & \underline{\underline{0}} \\ & \underline{5} \\ & \underline{\underline{0}} \\ & \hline \underline{y} \end{aligned}$ | 彦 |  |  | 或 |  |
|  |  | 年 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \overline{\overleftarrow{D}} \\ \stackrel{0}{\top} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \overline{\overleftarrow{W}} \\ \stackrel{0}{\top} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{D}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\top} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{Q}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sigma} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | － | － |
| 欹 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \frac{1}{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\tilde{m}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | － | $\sim$ | m | $\downarrow$ | n | 0 | 入 | $\infty$ | の |


9.18 The price of units is one of the most significant inputs into the appraisals. This applies not just to the market homes but also the affordable uses (intermediate, social rented and affordable rented). Informed by the findings set out in Chapter 4, we have used the prices set out towards the end of that chapter (Table 4.8).

## Older People's Housing

9.19 We have modelled a private sheltered / retirement and an extracare scheme, each on a 0.5 ha site as follows.
9.20 A private sheltered/retirement scheme of $20 \times 1$ bed units of $50 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and $25 \times 2$ bed units of $75 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to give a net saleable area $\left(\mathrm{GIA}^{48}\right)$ of $2,875 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. We have assumed a further $20 \%$ nonsaleable service and common areas to give a scheme GIA of $3,450 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.
9.21 An HWV Extracare scheme of $24 \times 1$ bed units of $65 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ and $16 \times 2$ bed units of $80 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ to give a net saleable area (GIA) of $2,840 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. We have assumed a further $30 \%$ non-saleable service and common areas to give a scheme GIA of $3,834 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$.

## Non-Residential Sites

9.22 For the purpose of this study we have assessed a number of development types. We have based our modelling on the following development types:
i. Large offices. These are units of more than $250 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, of steel frame construction over several floors and will be located on larger business parks. Typical units in the Borough are around $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ - we will use this as the basis of our modelling.
ii. Small offices. Modern offices of less than $250 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. These will normally be built of block and brick, will be of an open design, and be on a market town edge or in a more rural situation. Typical small office units in the Borough are around $150 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ - we will use this as the basis of our modelling.
iii. Large industrial. Modern industrial units of over $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. There is little new space being constructed. Typical units in the Borough are around $1,500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ - we will use this as the basis of our modelling.
iv. Small industrial. Modern industrial units of less than $500 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. These will normally be on a small business park and be of simple steel frame construction, the walls will be of block work and insulated cladding, and there will be a small office area. Typical

[^32]small units in the area are around $200 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ - we will use this as the basis of our modelling.
9.23 In developing these typologies, we have made assumptions about the site coverage and density of development on the sites. We have assumed $66 \%$ coverage on the industrial sites, $60 \%$ coverage on the offices.

Hotels and Leisure
9.24 The leisure industry is very diverse and ranges from conventional hotels and roadside budget hotels, to cinemas, theatres, historic attractions, equestrian centres, stables and ménages. We have reviewed this sector and there is very little activity at the moment, either at the planning or construction stage. This is an indication that development in this sector is at the margins of viability at the moment. Having considered this further we have assessed a modern hotel on a town edge site (both Travelodge and Premier Inn are seeking sites in the area). We have assumed that this is a 60 bedroom product with ample car parking on a 0.4 ha (1 acre) site.

## Community / Institutional

9.25 This includes development used for the provision of any medical or health services and development used wholly or mainly for the provision of education as a school or college under the Education Acts or as an institution of higher education. The majority of development in this sector is mainly brought forward by the public sector or by not-for-profit organisations - many of which have charitable status (thus making them potentially exempt from CIL).

## Retail

9.26 For the purpose of this study, we have assessed the following types of space. It is important to remember that this assessment is looking at the ability of new projects to bear an element of CIL - it is only therefore necessary to look at the main types of development likely to come forward in the future. We have modelled the following distinct types of retail development for the sake of completeness - although it should be noted that no such development is scheduled to take place on the specific sites.
i. Supermarket Two typologies have been modelled.

The first is a single storey retail unit development with a gross (i.e. GIA) area of 4,000 $\mathrm{m}^{2}$. It is assumed to require 400 car parking spaces, and to occupy a total site area of 1.6 ha. The building is taken to be of steel construction. The development was modelled alternatively on greenfield and on previously developed sites.

The second is based on a smaller supermarket. We have assumed a $1,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ unit on a 0.4 ha site ( $30 \%$ coverage) to allow for car parking.
ii. Retail Warehouse is a single storey retail unit development with a gross (i.e. GIA) area of $3,000 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. It is assumed to require 150 car parking spaces, and to occupy a total site area of 0.8 ha . The building is taken to be of steel construction. The
development was modelled alternatively on greenfield and on previously developed sites.
iii. Shop is a brick built development on two storeys, of $150 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. No car parking or loading space is allowed for, and the total site area (effectively the building footprint) is 0.019 ha.
9.27 In line with the CIL Regulations, we have only assessed developments of over $100 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. There are other types of retail development, such as small single farm shops, petrol filling stations and garden centres. We have not included these in this high level study due to the great diversity of project that may arise. For the larger units we have looked at Bulky Goods and Food.
9.28 In developing these typologies, we have made assumptions about the site coverage and density of development on the sites. We have assumed simple, single storey construction and have assumed there are no mezzanine floors.

## 10. Residential Appraisal Results

10.1 At the start of this chapter, it is important to stress that the results of the appraisals do not, in themselves, determine CIL. The results of this study are one of a number of factors that the Council will consider, including the need for infrastructure, other available evidence, such as the Council's track record in delivering affordable housing and collecting payments under s106, and, importantly, the results of the consultation process. The purpose of the appraisals is to provide an indication of the viability in different areas under different scenarios.
10.2 The appraisals use the residual valuation approach - that is, they are designed to assess the value of the site (strategic or typology) after taking into account the costs of development, the likely income from sales and/or rents and an appropriate amount of developer's profit. The Residual Value represents the maximum bid for the site where the payment is made in a single tranche on the acquisition of a site. In order for the proposed development to be described as viable, it is necessary for this value to exceed the Existing Use Value (EUV) by a satisfactory margin. We have discussed this in Chapter 6 above.
10.3 The appraisals are based on the assumptions set out in the previous chapters of this report, including the affordable housing requirement.
10.4 For each development type we have calculated the Residual Value. In the tables in this chapter we have colour coded the results using a simple traffic light system:
a. Green Viable - where the Residual Value per hectare exceeds the indicative Viability Threshold Value per hectare (being the Existing Use Value plus the appropriate uplift to provide a competitive return for the landowner).
b. Amber Marginal - where the Residual Value per hectare exceeds the Existing Use Value or Alternative Use Value, but not the Viability Threshold Value per hectare. These sites should not be considered as viable when measured against the tests set out, however depending on the nature of the site, the owner and any negotiations with the planning authority, they may come forward.
c. Red Non-viable - where the Residual Value does not exceed the Existing Use Value or Alternative Use Value.
10.5 The results are set out and presented for each site and per gross hectare to allow comparison between sites.
10.6 It is important to note that a report of this type applies relatively simple assumptions that are broadly reflective of an area to make an assessment of viability. The fact that a site is shown as viable does not necessarily mean that it will come forward and vice versa. An important part of any final consideration of viability will be relating the results of this study to what is actually happening on the ground in terms of development and what planning applications are being determined - and on what basis.

## Financial appraisal approach and assumptions

10.7 On the basis of the assumptions set out in the earlier chapters, we prepared financial appraisals for each of the 11 strategic sites and the 10 typologies, using a bespoke spreadsheet-based financial analysis package. We produced financial appraisals based on the build costs, and infrastructure costs and financial assumptions for the full adopted policy scenarios and the scenario where the affordable housing is delivered as shared equity at $80 \%$ of OMV. The impact of the possible reintroduction of the national affordable housing thresholds is also considered. The detailed appraisal base results for the modelled sites are included in Appendix 5, and for the strategic sites in Appendix 6.

## Base Appraisals - full current policy requirements

10.8 We prepared financial appraisals for each of the modelled and strategic residential sites using a bespoke spreadsheet-based financial analysis package. These appraisals are based on the full policy requirements of the Local Plan, but with a range of affordable housing and developer contribution assumptions base options:
a) Affordable Housing

As per the policy requirements. 15\% in King's Lynn (in the un-parished area) and $20 \%$ elsewhere. Delivered as $70 \%$ Affordable Rent and $30 \%$ intermediate housing - on sites of 10 and over in King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton and sites of 5 or more elsewhere.
b) Environmental Standards Enhanced Building Regulations (Part L) (BCIS +1.5\%).
c) ClL

As per PDCS, but $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ on larger sites.
d) $\mathbf{s 1 0 6}$
£2,000 per unit except of the following sites where more detailed information is available. On these sites the anticipated cost, as advised by the Council, is used:

|  | Infrastructure | $£ /$ unit |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Boal Quay | $£ 105,684$ | $£ 302$ |
| South of Parkway | $£ 104,222$ | $£ 401$ |
| Lynn Sport | $£ 2,734,576$ | $£ 9,207$ |
| Land at Bankside | $£ 18,341,237$ | $£ 4,801$ |
| West Winch | $£ 222,872$ | $£ 446$ |
| Hall Lane | $£ 448,744$ | $£ 641$ |
| Knights Hill | $£ 104,060$ | $£ 260$ |
| Land East of Lynn Road | $£ 4,615,832$ | $£ 8,392$ |

10.9 The Residual Value for each of the modelled sites is shown in the right hand column of the following table. The two columns to the left show the Residual Value on a per gross ha basis (where the Residual Value is divided by the whole site area) and on a per net ha basis (where the Residual Value is divided by the net developable site area).

Table 10．1a Residual Values－Large Sites CIL $£ 0 / \mathbf{m}^{2}$－FULL POLICY

|  |  |  <br>  <br> $\omega$ |  |  | 0 <br> 0 <br> 0 <br>  <br>  <br>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{0}{5}$ |  | O-O心 | $\stackrel{O}{\mathrm{~N}}$ | $\stackrel{\underset{\sim}{N}}{ }$ | 옷 | ON্ল | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | 앗 | 앙 |  |  |
|  |  | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2}$ |  | $\stackrel{\bullet}{\bullet}$ | の | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{e}{\mathrm{Q}} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\stackrel{\underset{N}{\mathrm{~N}}}{\substack{n}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\infty} \\ & \stackrel{\Gamma}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No } \\ \text { Ni } \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\square}$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \tilde{0} \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c} -\dot{\gamma} & \infty \\ \infty \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \infty \\ \infty \\ \infty \end{gathered},$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sigma} \mid$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{e}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{array}\right\|$ | 깓 | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{N} \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | N | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \dot{j} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \underline{\overline{0}} \\ \underline{\omega} \\ \underline{\omega} \\ \underline{0} \\ \underline{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\bar{W}}{5} \\ & \frac{5}{3} \\ & \frac{0}{2} \\ & \frac{0}{6} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{ᄃ}{\mathbb{U}} \\ \stackrel{\otimes}{\Xi} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \substack{\mathbb{0} \\ \stackrel{\omega}{\circlearrowleft} \\ \hline \\ \hline} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ᄃ}{\grave{0}} \\ & \stackrel{\nu}{\top} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ᄃ}{\bar{\otimes}} \\ & \stackrel{⿺}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | － |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ 00 \\ 0 \\ 5 \\ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline \frac{0}{0} \\ \frac{0}{2} \\ \frac{1}{\pi} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | ¢ |  | 3 |
|  |  |  | $-\sim$ |  | m | $\pm$ | م | $\bigcirc$ | N | $\infty$ |  | の |

Source：Post PDCS Update－November 2015

Table 10.1b Residual Values - North East and East with CIL at $£ 60 / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ - FULL POLICY


Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.1c Residual Values - West and South with CIL at $£ 60 / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ - FULL POLICY


Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.1d Residual Values - King's Lynn with CIL at $£ 60 / \mathbf{m}^{2}$ - FULL POLICY

|  |  |  |  |  | Area |  | Units | Residual Value |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Gross | Net |  | Gross ha | Net ha | $£$ site |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | Green | Agricultural | 3.7 | 2.78 | 100 | 451,552 | 600,986 | $1,670,741$ |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | Green | Agricultural | 1.55 | 1.39 | 40 | 520,273 | 580,161 | 806,424 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | Green | Agricultural | 1.4 | 1.25 | 30 | 630,037 | 705,642 | 882,052 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | Green | Paddock | 0.5 | 0.5 | 14 | 803,322 | 803,322 | 401,661 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | Green | Paddock | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7 | 754,867 | 754,867 | 226,460 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | Green | Garden | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2 | 25,467 | 25,467 | 2,547 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | Brown | Industrial | 1.11 | 0.83 | 30 | $-32,829$ | $-43,903$ | $-36,440$ |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | Brown | Industrial | 0.3 | 0.3 | 7 | $-169,992$ | $-169,992$ | $-50,997$ |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | Brown | Industrial | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2 | $-409,148$ | $-409,148$ | $-40,915$ |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | Green | Plot | 0.05 | 0.05 | 1 | $1,517,687$ | $1,517,687$ | 75,884 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.10 The results are very much as would be expected and are in line with the earlier work with some very substantial residual values being generated on some sites, but others, particularly those brownfield sites with additional site clearance and abnormal costs producing negative values.
10.11 The Residual Value is not a good indication of viability by itself, being the maximum price a developer may bid for a parcel of land and still make an adequate return (i.e. the competitive return) and not having regard to the competitive return for the willing landowner.
10.12 In the following tables we have compared the Residual Value with the Viability Threshold. The Viability Threshold is the amount over and above the Existing Use Value that is sufficient to provide the willing landowner with a competitive return and induce them to sell the land for development as set out in Chapter 6 above.

| Table 10.2a Residual <br> Value compared to Viability Threshold - Larger Sites. CIL <br> $\mathbf{£ 0 / \mathbf { m } ^ { 2 }}(\boldsymbol{£} / \mathbf{g r o s s}$ ha) <br> FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Alternative <br> Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual <br> Value |
| 1 | Boal Quay | King's Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | $-1,746,423$ |
| 2 | South of Parkway | King's Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 143,258 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | King's Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 407,456 |
| 4 | Bankside | King's Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-1,018,107$ |
| 5 | West Winch | King's Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 221,010 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 630,588 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 599,572 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 362,156 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 134,915 |

10.13 The appraisals include the most recently available information as to the sites' strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs as set out in Table 7.3 above. The Council has worked closely with the County Council to improve its understanding of these, particularly around the costs of education. The viability of the larger sites in the emerging Plan (that is subject to examination at the time of this update) varies somewhat.
10.14 The two brownfield sites within King's Lynn (Boal Quay and Bankside) are shown as making a loss. This is due to a number of factors, including the fact that these are planned for higher density development incorporating a high proportion of flats which are generally more expensive to develop on a $£ / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ basis but do not (in King's Lynn) generally develop higher relative prices. Further, these sites are subject to increased costs due to site clearance.
10.15 It important to note that the above results are presented on a gross basis - that is to say the Residual Value over the whole site, including the areas of openspace. This can lead to a false impression as it is assumed that the landowner disposes of the whole allocation, rather than a smaller element of it.
10.16 The sites with costs of over $£ 4,000$ /unit (Lynn Sport - $£ 9,207 /$ unit, West Winch $£ 4,801 /$ unit and Land to the East of Wisbech £8392/unit) generally have lower Residual Values. The exception is Lynn Sport where the reduced open space balances this.
10.17 As in the previous tables the appraisals for the modelled typologies include an allowance for site specific infrastructure costs of $£ 2,000$ /unit.

Table 10.2b Residual Value compared to Viability Threshold - North East and East CIL $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ( $£ /$ gross ha) - FULL POLICY

|  |  |  | Alternative <br> Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | $1,038,814$ |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 750,708 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 870,499 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 900,518 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 941,941 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 374,895 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 453,189 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 375,276 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 282,886 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | $1,842,785$ |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.2c Residual Value compared to Viability Threshold - West and South CIL £60/m ${ }^{2}$ (£/gross ha) - FULL POLICY

|  |  |  | Alternative <br> Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 484,217 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 620,741 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 473,495 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 597,304 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 492,201 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | $-7,366$ |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-126,662$ |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-442,840$ |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-372,505$ |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 913,898 |

Table 10.2d Residual Value compared to Viability Threshold - King's Lynn CIL $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ( $£ /$ gross ha) - FULL POLICY

|  |  |  | Alternative <br> Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual <br> Value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | King's Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 451,552 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | King's Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 520,273 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | King's Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 630,037 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | King's Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 803,322 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | King's Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 754,867 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | King's Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | 25,467 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | King's Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-32,829$ |
| 8 | Urban Infill | King's Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-169,992$ |
| 9 | Small Infill | King's Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-409,148$ |
| 10 | Single Plot | King's Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | $1,517,687$ |

10.18 The results correspond with the Council's experience on the ground with the sites coming forward across the Borough and generally delivering the full policy requirements of the Plan, but on occasion, on brownfield sites, it is necessary for the Council to be flexible over the provision of affordable housing - however this is the exception rather than the rule.
10.19 Overall the results are consistent with those in the earlier viability work, confirming that, on the whole, development across the Borough is viable and in most cases by a substantial margin.

The Potential for CIL
10.20 In Chapter 3 above we set out the principle of Additional Profit. Additional Profit is the amount of profit over and above the 'normal profit' (competitive return at $20 \%$ GDV) made by the developers having purchased the land, developed the site and sold the units (including providing any affordable housing that is required). The appraisals for the larger sites include the strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs set out in Table 7.3 above, and for the other modelled sites a £2,000/unit s106 contribution:

| Table 10.3a Additional Profit - Larger Sites - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Additional Profit |  |
|  |  |  | $£$ site | $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | King's Lynn | $-10,331,080$ | -491 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | King's Lynn | $-1,855,183$ | -59 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | King's Lynn | 932,564 | 74 |
| 4 | Bankside | King's Lynn | $-4,847,375$ | -290 |
| 5 | West Winch | King's Lynn | $-44,254,034$ | -129 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | $2,007,872$ | 177 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 654,574 | 170 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | $-2,905,160$ | 19 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | $-6,443,562$ | -144 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.21 The additional profit varies considerably on these sites, however it is important to note that this is calculated after the site specific strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs set out in Chapter 7 above. There is capacity at Lynn Sport, Hall Lane, Knights Hill, and East of Lynn Road to bear CIL in addition to the s106 costs, although at East of Lynn Road the capacity is somewhat limited.

| Table 10.3b Additional Profit - North East and East - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Additional Profit |  |
|  |  |  | $£$ site | $£ / \mathrm{m2}$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | $3,597,123$ | 443 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 948,209 | 290 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | $1,016,477$ | 410 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 368,849 | 324 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 228,629 | 386 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 20,111 | 106 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 154,237 | 63 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 11,013 | 19 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | $-4,242$ | -20 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 95,135 | 705 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

| Table 10.3c Additional Profit - West and South - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | $£$ site | $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |
|  |  |  | $1,194,836$ | 147 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 710,056 | 217 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 385,471 | 155 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 203,868 | 179 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 80,563 | 136 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | $-20,058$ | -106 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | $-539,686$ | -221 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | $-249,507$ | -421 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | $-72,953$ | -337 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 46,329 | 343 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South |  |  |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

| Table 10.3d Additional Profit - King's Lynn Area - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | $£$ site | $£ / \mathrm{m} 2$ |
|  |  |  | 622,556 | 72 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | King's Lynn | 368,909 | 106 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | King's Lynn | 500,021 | 190 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | King's Lynn | 257,345 | 213 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | King's Lynn | 134,923 | 182 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | King's Lynn | $-26,753$ | -141 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | King's Lynn | $-556,349$ | -215 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | King's Lynn | $-190,932$ | -258 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | King's Lynn | $-88,222$ | -407 |
| 9 | Small Infill | King's Lynn | 70,732 | 524 |
| 10 | Single Plot | King's Lynn |  |  |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.22 When the additional profit is considered across the modelled sites it can be seen that there is considerable capacity to introduce CIL, however on the brownfield sites the capacity is limited as these sites are generally not viable in the context of the full policy requirements of the Plan.

## Effect of CIL

10.23 CIL is not calculated and the purpose of viability testing, as set out in CIL Regulation 14, is to assess the effect of CIL. In the following tables we have incorporated CIL into the appraisals at a range of levels from $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ with a range of affordable housing requirements.

In the following analysis no other changes have been made. In the appraisals for the larger sites the full strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs set out in Table 7.3 above are included, in the others there is a $£ 2,000$ per unit s106 allowance.

| Table 10.4a Residual Values - Larger Sites - FULL POL | Affordable Housing $0 \%$ to $20 \%$ and CIL from $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Viability } \\ \text { Threshold } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,264,024 | $-1,323,128$ | -1,382,232 | -1,441,336 | $-1,500,440$ | -1,559,544 | $-1,618,648$ | -1,677,752 | $-1,736,855$ | -1,795,959 | $-1,855,063$ |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 323,211 | 302,507 | 281,803 | 261,099 | 240,395 | 219,691 | 198,987 | 178,283 | 157,579 | 136,875 | 116,171 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 672,699 | 644,593 | 616,486 | 588,379 | 560,273 | 532,166 | 504,059 | 475,953 | 447,846 | 419,739 | 391,633 |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -526,673 | -590,016 | -654,049 | -720,846 | -787,643 | -854,440 | -921,238 | -988,035 | -1,056,864 | -1,127,885 | -1,198,906 |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 367,316 | 356,670 | 346,024 | 335,377 | 324,731 | 314,084 | 303,438 | 292,791 | 282,145 | 271,498 | 260,852 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 933,589 | 912,911 | 892,233 | 871,555 | 850,668 | 829,496 | 808,325 | 787,154 | 765,982 | 744,811 | 723,639 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 891,709 | 871,402 | 851,094 | 830,786 | 810,479 | 790,171 | 769,863 | 749,556 | 729,248 | 708,940 | 688,633 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 617,300 | 595,186 | 573,073 | 550,959 | 528,846 | 506,732 | 484,619 | 462,505 | 440,392 | 418,278 | 396,165 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 338,309 | 320,619 | 302,928 | 285,238 | 267,547 | 249,857 | 232,167 | 214,476 | 196,786 | 179,096 | 161,405 |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Alternative } \\ & \text { Use Value } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,424,824 | -1,480,973 | -1,537,121 | -1,593,270 | -1,649,419 | -1,705,567 | -1,761,716 | -1,817,865 | -1,874,013 | -1,930,162 | -1,986,311 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 263,227 | 243,558 | 223,889 | 204,220 | 184,551 | 164,883 | 145,214 | 125,545 | 106,880 | 87,025 | 67,169 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 584,285 | 557,584 | 530,882 | 504,181 | 477,480 | 450,778 | 424,077 | 397,376 | 370,674 | 343,973 | 316,860 |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -684,742 | -748,199 | -811,657 | -875,114 | -938,571 | -1,002,516 | -1,069,986 | -1,137,456 | -1,204,926 | -1,272,396 | $-1,339,866$ |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 330,740 | 320,626 | 310,512 | 300,397 | 290,283 | 280,169 | 270,055 | 259,941 | 249,827 | 239,713 | 229,463 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 858,524 | 838,880 | 818,937 | 798,824 | 778,711 | 758,598 | 738,485 | 718,372 | 698,259 | 678,147 | 658,034 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 818,675 | 799,383 | 780,090 | 760,798 | 741,506 | 722,213 | 702,921 | 683,629 | 664,337 | 645,044 | 625,752 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 553,514 | 532,506 | 511,498 | 490,490 | 469,483 | 448,475 | 427,467 | 406,459 | 385,451 | 364,444 | 343,373 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 287,460 | 270,655 | 253,849 | 237,043 | 220,237 | 203,431 | 186,625 | 169,820 | 153,014 | 136,208 | 119,402 |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,585,624 | $-1,638,817$ | -1,692,010 | -1,745,204 | -1,798,397 | -1,851,591 | $-1,904,784$ | -1,957,978 | -2,011,171 | -2,064,365 | -2,117,558 |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 203,242 | 184,609 | 165,975 | 147,341 | 128,708 | 111,118 | 92,307 | 73,497 | 55,210 | 36,220 | 17,566 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 495,870 | 470,574 | 445,279 | 419,983 | 394,687 | 369,391 | 344,095 | 318,799 | 292,641 | 266,446 | 240,252 |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -849,030 | -909,147 | -969,474 | -1,033,393 | -1,097,312 | -1,161,231 | $-1,225,150$ | -1,289,069 | $-1,352,988$ | -1,416,907 | -1,480,826 |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 294,163 | 284,581 | 275,000 | 265,418 | 255,836 | 246,254 | 236,672 | 227,080 | 217,283 | 207,486 | 197,689 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 782,971 | 763,917 | 744,862 | 725,808 | 706,754 | 687,700 | 668,645 | 649,591 | 630,537 | 611,482 | 592,428 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 745,641 | 727,364 | 709,087 | 690,810 | 672,533 | 654,256 | 635,979 | 617,702 | 599,425 | 581,148 | 562,871 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 489,728 | 469,826 | 449,924 | 430,022 | 410,119 | 390,217 | 370,315 | 350,413 | 330,395 | 309,848 | 289,301 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 236,612 | 220,691 | 204,769 | 188,848 | 172,927 | 157,005 | 141,084 | 125,163 | 109,234 | 92,720 | 76,207 |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Viability } \\ \text { Threshold } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,746,423 | -1,796,661 | -1,846,900 | -1,897,138 | -1,947,376 | -1,997,614 | -2,047,853 | -2,098,091 | $-2,148,329$ | -2,198,568 | $-2,248,806$ |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 143,258 | 125,660 | 109,085 | 91,320 | 73,555 | 56,324 | 38,389 | 20,852 | 2,593 | -15,873 | -34,570 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 407,456 | 383,565 | 359,675 | 335,784 | 311,893 | 287,339 | 262,601 | 237,862 | 213,123 | 188,384 | 163,645 |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -1,018,107 | -1,078,475 | -1,138,843 | -1,199,211 | -1,259,579 | -1,319,946 | -1,380,314 | -1,440,682 | -1,501,050 | -1,561,418 | -1,621,786 |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 257,587 | 248,537 | 239,488 | 230,438 | 221,389 | 212,179 | 202,926 | 193,673 | 184,420 | 175,167 | 165,914 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 706,780 | 688,784 | 670,788 | 652,792 | 634,797 | 616,801 | 598,805 | 580,810 | 562,814 | 544,818 | 526,823 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 672,606 | 655,345 | 638,083 | 620,822 | 603,560 | 586,298 | 569,037 | 551,775 | 534,514 | 517,252 | 499,991 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 425,942 | 407,146 | 388,349 | 369,553 | 350,756 | 331,960 | 312,852 | 293,446 | 274,040 | 254,635 | 235,229 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 185,763 | 170,727 | 155,690 | 140,653 | 125,616 | 110,579 | 95,170 | 79,574 | 63,978 | 48,381 | 33,096 |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 300,000 | 360,000 | -1,907,223 | -1,954,506 | -2,001,789 | -2,049,072 | $-2,096,355$ | -2,143,638 | -2,190,921 | -2,238,204 | $-2,285,487$ | -2,332,770 | $-2,380,054$ |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 84,063 | 67,343 | 51,107 | 34,227 | 17,685 | 480 | -16,899 | -34,525 | -52,680 | -70,834 | -88,988 |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 240,000 | 319,042 | 296,556 | 273,307 | 250,023 | 226,740 | 203,456 | 180,172 | 156,889 | 133,605 | 110,322 | 87,863 |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -1,194,578 | -1,251,394 | -1,308,211 | -1,365,028 | -1,421,845 | -1,478,662 | -1,535,479 | -1,592,295 | -1,649,112 | -1,705,929 | -1,762,746 |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 221,010 | 212,493 | 203,809 | 195,101 | 186,392 | 177,683 | 168,975 | 160,266 | 151,558 | 142,849 | 134,140 |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 630,588 | 613,651 | 596,714 | 579,777 | 562,840 | 545,903 | 528,965 | 512,028 | 495,091 | 478,154 | 461,217 |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 25,000 | 330,000 | 599,572 | 583,326 | 567,079 | 550,833 | 534,587 | 518,341 | 502,095 | 485,849 | 469,603 | 453,356 | 437,110 |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 25,000 | 330,000 | 362,156 | 344,465 | 326,775 | 309,007 | 290,742 | 272,478 | 254,214 | 235,950 | 217,685 | 199,421 | 181,157 |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 25,000 | 330,000 | 134,915 | 120,763 | 106,610 | 92,115 | 77,436 | 62,757 | 48,079 | 33,716 | 19,079 | 4,242 | -11,160 |

10.24 The PDCS did not suggest differential rates for the larger sites, but did allude to the fact that this was an option if sufficient evidence with regard to the strategic infrastructure costs and mitigation costs was provided.
10.25 This further information on the costs in relation to the strategic sites (those in the Plan being larger than 150 units). This led to some sites being assessed as unviable (or only viable by a small margin) on the assumption that each site bears its full infrastructure costs.

Table 10.4b Residual Values - North East and East - FULL POLICY
Affordable Housing $0 \%$ to $20 \%$ and CIL from $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$

| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,620,848 | 1,595,670 | 1,570,493 | 1,545,315 | 1,520,137 | 1,494,959 | 1,469,782 | 1,444,604 | 1,419,426 | 1,394,248 | 1,369,070 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,250,839 | 1,226,004 | 1,201,169 | 1,176,334 | 1,151,499 | 1,126,664 | 1,101,830 | 1,076,995 | 1,052,160 | 1,027,325 | 1,002,490 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,343,685 | 1,322,734 | 1,301,783 | 1,280,831 | 1,259,880 | 1,238,929 | 1,217,978 | 1,197,026 | 1,176,075 | 1,155,124 | 1,134,173 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,468,596 | 1,441,300 | 1,414,004 | 1,386,707 | 1,359,411 | 1,332,115 | 1,304,819 | 1,277,523 | 1,250,226 | 1,222,930 | 1,195,634 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,480,368 | 1,456,264 | 1,432,160 | 1,408,056 | 1,383,953 | 1,359,849 | 1,335,745 | 1,311,641 | 1,287,538 | 1,263,434 | 1,239,330 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 490,747 | 471,438 | 452,129 | 432,821 | 413,512 | 394,203 | 374,895 | 355,586 | 336,278 | 316,969 | 297,660 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 938,129 | 912,130 | 894,531 | 868,286 | 842,040 | 815,795 | 789,550 | 763,305 | 737,060 | 710,814 | 684,569 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 829,324 | 804,750 | 780,176 | 755,602 | 731,028 | 706,454 | 681,880 | 657,305 | 632,731 | 608,157 | 583,583 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 414,997 | 392,979 | 370,960 | 348,942 | 326,923 | 304,904 | 282,886 | 260,867 | 238,849 | 216,830 | 194,811 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | 2,010,000 | 1,982,131 | 1,954,262 | 1,926,393 | 1,898,523 | 1,870,654 | 1,842,785 | 1,814,916 | 1,787,047 | 1,759,177 | 1,731,308 |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,505,553 | 1,481,634 | 1,457,715 | 1,433,796 | 1,409,877 | 1,385,959 | 1,362,040 | 1,338,121 | 1,314,202 | 1,290,283 | 1,266,364 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,155,608 | 1,132,015 | 1,108,422 | 1,084,828 | 1,061,235 | 1,037,642 | 1,014,049 | 990,456 | 966,863 | 943,270 | 919,677 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,250,530 | 1,230,627 | 1,210,723 | 1,190,819 | 1,170,916 | 1,151,012 | 1,131,108 | 1,111,204 | 1,091,301 | 1,071,397 | 1,051,493 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,357,198 | 1,331,267 | 1,305,335 | 1,279,404 | 1,253,473 | 1,227,541 | 1,201,610 | 1,175,678 | 1,149,747 | 1,123,816 | 1,097,884 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,374,686 | 1,351,787 | 1,328,889 | 1,305,990 | 1,283,091 | 1,260,193 | 1,237,294 | 1,214,396 | 1,191,497 | 1,168,599 | 1,145,700 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 452,798 | 434,455 | 416,111 | 397,768 | 379,425 | 361,082 | 342,739 | 324,395 | 306,052 | 287,709 | 269,366 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 855,058 | 830,125 | 805,192 | 780,259 | 755,326 | 730,393 | 705,460 | 680,527 | 655,594 | 630,661 | 605,728 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 744,385 | 721,040 | 697,695 | 674,349 | 651,004 | 627,659 | 604,313 | 580,968 | 557,623 | 534,277 | 510,932 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 380,836 | 359,918 | 339,001 | 318,083 | 297,165 | 276,248 | 255,330 | 234,412 | 213,495 | 192,577 | 171,659 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,889,815 | 1,863,339 | 1,836,864 | 1,810,388 | 1,783,912 | 1,757,436 | 1,730,961 | 1,704,485 | 1,678,009 | 1,651,533 | 1,625,058 |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,390,258 | 1,367,598 | 1,344,938 | 1,322,278 | 1,299,618 | 1,276,958 | 1,254,298 | 1,231,638 | 1,208,978 | 1,186,318 | 1,163,658 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,060,377 | 1,038,026 | 1,015,674 | 993,323 | 970,971 | 948,620 | 926,269 | 903,917 | 881,566 | 859,215 | 836,863 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,157,375 | 1,138,519 | 1,119,663 | 1,100,807 | 1,081,951 | 1,063,095 | 1,044,239 | 1,025,382 | 1,006,526 | 987,670 | 968,814 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,245,800 | 1,221,234 | 1,196,667 | 1,172,100 | 1,147,534 | 1,122,967 | 1,098,401 | 1,073,834 | 1,049,267 | 1,024,701 | 1,000,134 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,269,004 | 1,247,310 | 1,225,617 | 1,203,923 | 1,182,230 | 1,160,537 | 1,138,843 | 1,117,150 | 1,095,457 | 1,073,763 | 1,052,070 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 414,849 | 397,471 | 380,093 | 362,716 | 345,338 | 327,960 | 310,582 | 293,205 | 275,827 | 258,449 | 241,071 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 763,094 | 739,473 | 715,853 | 692,232 | 668,611 | 644,990 | 621,370 | 597,749 | 574,128 | 550,508 | 526,887 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 659,447 | 637,330 | 615,214 | 593,097 | 570,980 | 548,864 | 526,747 | 504,630 | 482,514 | 460,397 | 438,280 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 346,675 | 326,858 | 307,041 | 287,224 | 267,408 | 247,591 | 227,774 | 207,957 | 188,141 | 168,324 | 148,507 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,769,630 | 1,744,548 | 1,719,465 | 1,694,383 | 1,669,301 | 1,644,219 | 1,619,136 | 1,594,054 | 1,568,972 | 1,543,889 | 1,518,807 |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25000 | 330000 | 1,274,962 | 1,253,561 | 1,232,160 | 1,210,759 | 1,189,358 | 1,167,957 | 1,146,556 | 1,125,155 | 1,103,754 | 1,082,352 | 1,060,951 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25000 | 330000 | 965,146 | 944,036 | 922,927 | 901,817 | 880,708 | 859,598 | 838,488 | 817,379 | 796,269 | 775,159 | 754,050 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25000 | 330000 | 1,064,220 | 1,046,412 | 1,028,603 | 1,010,795 | 992,986 | 975,178 | 957,369 | 939,560 | 921,752 | 903,943 | 886,135 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50000 | 360000 | 1,134,402 | 1,111,200 | 1,087,999 | 1,064,797 | 1,041,595 | 1,018,393 | 1,000,000 | 981,291 | 957,867 | 934,444 | 911,020 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50000 | 360000 | 1,163,321 | 1,142,833 | 1,122,345 | 1,101,857 | 1,081,369 | 1,060,881 | 1,040,392 | 1,019,904 | 999,416 | 978,928 | 958,440 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250000 | 300000 | 376,900 | 360,488 | 344,075 | 327,663 | 311,251 | 294,838 | 278,426 | 262,014 | 245,601 | 229,189 | 212,777 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380000 | 456000 | 671,130 | 648,822 | 626,513 | 604,205 | 581,896 | 559,588 | 537,280 | 514,971 | 492,663 | 470,354 | 450,450 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380000 | 456000 | 574,508 | 553,620 | 532,732 | 511,845 | 490,957 | 470,069 | 449,181 | 428,293 | 411,419 | 390,325 | 369,231 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380000 | 456000 | 312,513 | 293,797 | 275,082 | 256,366 | 237,650 | 218,934 | 200,218 | 181,502 | 162,787 | 144,071 | 125,355 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200000 | 200000 | 1,649,445 | 1,625,756 | 1,602,067 | 1,578,378 | 1,554,690 | 1,531,001 | 1,507,312 | 1,483,623 | 1,459,934 | 1,436,246 | 1,412,557 |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CL |  |  |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,159,667 | 1,139,525 | 1,119,383 | 1,099,241 | 1,079,098 | 1,058,956 | 1,038,814 | 1,018,672 | 998,529 | 978,387 | 958,245 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 869,915 | 850,047 | 830,179 | 810,312 | 790,444 | 770,576 | 750,708 | 730,840 | 710,972 | 691,104 | 671,236 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 25,000 | 330,000 | 971,065 | 954,304 | 937,543 | 920,782 | 904,021 | 887,260 | 870,499 | 853,738 | 836,977 | 820,216 | 803,455 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,023,004 | 1,001,167 | 988,702 | 966,656 | 944,610 | 922,564 | 900,518 | 878,472 | 856,426 | 834,380 | 812,334 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,057,639 | 1,038,356 | 1,019,073 | 999,790 | 980,507 | 961,224 | 941,941 | 922,658 | 903,375 | 884,092 | 864,809 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 250,000 | 300,000 | 338,951 | 323,504 | 308,057 | 292,610 | 277,164 | 261,717 | 246,270 | 230,823 | 215,376 | 199,929 | 184,482 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 579,167 | 558,170 | 537,174 | 516,178 | 495,182 | 474,186 | 453,189 | 436,329 | 415,132 | 393,935 | 372,738 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 489,570 | 469,911 | 450,251 | 430,592 | 414,981 | 395,129 | 375,276 | 355,423 | 335,570 | 315,717 | 295,864 |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 380,000 | 456,000 | 278,352 | 260,737 | 243,122 | 225,507 | 207,892 | 190,277 | 172,662 | 155,048 | 137,433 | 119,818 | 102,203 |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,529,260 | 1,506,964 | 1,484,669 | 1,462,374 | 1,440,078 | 1,417,783 | 1,395,488 | 1,373,192 | 1,350,897 | 1,328,602 | 1,306,306 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.4c Residual Values - West and South - FULL POLICY
Affordable Housing $0 \%$ to $20 \%$ and CIL from $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$

| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ClL |  |  |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 951,520 | 926,342 | 901,164 | 875,987 | 850,809 | 825,631 | 800,453 | 775,275 | 750,098 | 724,920 | 699,742 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 1,086,694 | 1,061,859 | 1,037,025 | 1,012,190 | 987,355 | 962,520 | 937,685 | 912,850 | 888,016 | 863,181 | 838,346 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 858,874 | 837,923 | 816,972 | 796,020 | 775,069 | 754,118 | 733,167 | 714,286 | 697,816 | 676,667 | 655,517 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,107,646 | 1,080,350 | 1,053,054 | 1,025,758 | 1,000,000 | 980,459 | 952,901 | 925,344 | 897,787 | 870,229 | 842,672 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 923,600 | 899,496 | 875,392 | 851,289 | 833,333 | 818,751 | 794,177 | 769,603 | 745,029 | 720,455 | 695,881 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 108,486 | 89,177 | 69,869 | 50,560 | 31,251 | 11,943 | -7,366 | -26,675 | -45,983 | -65,292 | -84,601 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 255,369 | 228,873 | 206,325 | 179,312 | 152,299 | 125,285 | 99,240 | 71,961 | 44,681 | 17,402 | -9,878 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -145,175 | -169,992 | -194,808 | -219,624 | -245,062 | -270,712 | -296,361 | -322,011 | -347,660 | -373,309 | -398,959 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -238,870 | -260,888 | -282,907 | -304,926 | -326,989 | -349,747 | -372,505 | -395,264 | -418,022 | -440,780 | -463,539 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,081,113 | 1,053,244 | 1,025,375 | 997,505 | 969,636 | 941,767 | 913,898 | 886,029 | 858,160 | 830,290 | 802,421 |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability <br> Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ClL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 864,907 | 840,989 | 817,070 | 793,151 | 769,232 | 745,313 | 721,394 | 697,475 | 673,556 | 649,637 | 625,719 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 998,551 | 974,958 | 951,364 | 927,771 | 904,178 | 880,585 | 856,992 | 833,399 | 809,806 | 786,213 | 762,620 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 786,559 | 766,656 | 746,752 | 726,848 | 713,646 | 693,553 | 673,461 | 653,368 | 633,276 | 613,184 | 593,091 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,011,401 | 994,900 | 968,720 | 942,541 | 916,361 | 890,182 | 864,002 | 837,822 | 811,643 | 785,463 | 759,284 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 842,319 | 833,333 | 812,064 | 788,719 | 765,374 | 742,028 | 718,683 | 695,337 | 671,992 | 648,647 | 625,301 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 89,650 | 71,307 | 52,964 | 34,620 | 16,277 | -2,066 | -20,409 | -38,752 | -57,096 | -75,439 | -93,782 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 196,324 | 170,661 | 144,998 | 119,335 | 94,596 | 68,680 | 42,765 | 16,849 | -9,067 | -34,982 | -60,898 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -187,883 | -211,458 | -235,513 | -259,880 | -284,247 | -308,614 | -332,981 | -357,348 | -381,715 | -406,082 | -430,448 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -240,338 | -261,255 | -282,173 | -303,091 | -324,203 | -345,823 | -367,444 | -389,064 | -410,685 | -432,305 | -453,926 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,007,372 | 980,897 | 954,421 | 927,945 | 901,469 | 874,994 | 848,518 | 822,042 | 795,566 | 769,091 | 742,615 |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 778,295 | 755,635 | 732,975 | 710,315 | 687,655 | 664,995 | 642,335 | 619,675 | 597,015 | 574,355 | 551,695 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 910,407 | 888,056 | 865,704 | 843,353 | 821,002 | 798,650 | 776,299 | 753,947 | 731,596 | 709,245 | 686,893 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 714,286 | 701,980 | 682,945 | 663,910 | 644,875 | 625,840 | 606,806 | 587,771 | 568,736 | 549,701 | 530,666 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 923,913 | 899,111 | 874,309 | 849,508 | 824,706 | 799,904 | 775,103 | 750,301 | 725,499 | 700,698 | 675,896 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 775,889 | 753,772 | 731,655 | 709,539 | 687,422 | 665,305 | 643,189 | 621,072 | 598,955 | 576,839 | 554,722 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 70,814 | 53,436 | 36,059 | 18,681 | 1,303 | -16,075 | -33,452 | -50,830 | -68,208 | -85,586 | -102,964 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 132,295 | 109,047 | 84,495 | 59,944 | 35,392 | 10,840 | -13,711 | -38,263 | -62,814 | -87,366 | -111,917 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -231,094 | -254,178 | -277,263 | -300,347 | -323,432 | $-346,516$ | -369,600 | -392,685 | -415,769 | -438,854 | -461,938 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -241,806 | -261,623 | -281,439 | -301,256 | -321,417 | -341,900 | -362,382 | -382,865 | -403,347 | -423,830 | -444,312 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 933,632 | 908,549 | 883,467 | 858,385 | 833,303 | 808,220 | 783,138 | 758,056 | 732,973 | 707,891 | 682,809 |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 691,683 | 670,282 | 648,880 | 627,479 | 606,078 | 584,677 | 563,276 | 541,875 | 520,474 | 499,073 | 477,672 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 822,263 | 801,154 | 780,044 | 758,934 | 737,825 | 716,715 | 695,606 | 674,496 | 653,386 | 638,270 | 616,960 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 648,015 | 630,037 | 612,060 | 594,082 | 576,105 | 558,128 | 540,150 | 522,173 | 504,196 | 486,218 | 468,241 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 826,746 | 803,322 | 779,898 | 756,475 | 733,051 | 709,627 | 686,203 | 662,779 | 639,356 | 615,932 | 592,508 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 693,022 | 672,135 | 651,247 | 630,359 | 609,471 | 588,583 | 567,695 | 546,807 | 525,919 | 505,031 | 484,143 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 51,978 | 35,566 | 19,154 | 2,741 | -13,671 | -30,083 | -46,496 | -62,908 | -79,320 | -95,733 | -112,145 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 68,939 | 45,751 | 22,564 | -624 | -23,811 | -46,999 | -70,187 | -93,374 | -116,562 | -139,749 | -162,937 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -275,408 | -297,210 | -319,012 | -340,814 | -362,616 | -384,418 | -406,220 | -428,022 | -449,824 | -471,626 | -493,428 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -243,274 | -261,990 | -280,706 | -299,421 | -318,632 | -337,976 | -357,321 | -376,666 | -396,010 | -415,355 | -434,699 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 859,891 | 836,202 | 812,513 | 788,824 | 765,136 | 741,447 | 717,758 | 694,069 | 670,380 | 646,692 | 623,003 |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative <br> Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CLL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 605,070 | 584,928 | 564,786 | 544,644 | 524,501 | 504,359 | 484,217 | 464,075 | 443,932 | 423,790 | 403,648 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 734,120 | 714,252 | 694,384 | 674,516 | 654,648 | 640,797 | 620,741 | 600,685 | 580,629 | 560,572 | 540,516 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 25,000 | 330,000 | 575,014 | 558,095 | 541,175 | 524,255 | 507,335 | 490,415 | 473,495 | 456,575 | 439,655 | 422,736 | 405,816 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 729,579 | 707,533 | 685,487 | 663,441 | 641,396 | 619,350 | 597,304 | 575,258 | 553,212 | 531,166 | 509,120 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 50,000 | 360,000 | 610,156 | 590,497 | 570,838 | 551,178 | 531,519 | 511,860 | 492,201 | 472,541 | 452,882 | 433,223 | 416,667 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 250,000 | 300,000 | 33,142 | 17,696 | 2,249 | -13,198 | -28,645 | -44,092 | -59,539 | -74,986 | -90,433 | -105,880 | -121,327 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | 4,279 | -17,544 | -39,368 | -61,191 | -83,015 | -104,839 | -126,662 | -148,486 | -170,309 | -192,163 | -214,719 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -319,723 | -340,242 | -360,762 | -381,281 | -401,801 | -422,320 | -442,840 | -463,359 | -483,879 | -504,398 | -524,918 |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 380,000 | 456,000 | -244,742 | -262,357 | -279,972 | -297,640 | -315,846 | -334,053 | -352,260 | -370,466 | -388,673 | -406,880 | -425,086 |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 200,000 | 200,000 | 786,150 | 763,855 | 741,559 | 719,264 | 696,969 | 674,673 | 652,378 | 630,083 | 607,787 | 585,492 | 563,197 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.4d Residual Values - King's Lynn Area - FULL POLICY
Affordable Housing $0 \%$ to $20 \%$ and CIL from $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ to $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$

| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | $£ 40$ | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 700,522 | 675,344 | 650,166 | 624,988 | 599,811 | 574,633 | 549,455 | 524,277 | 499,099 | 473,922 | 448,744 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 758,406 | 733,571 | 708,736 | 683,901 | 659,066 | 640,243 | 615,173 | 590,103 | 565,032 | 539,962 | 514,892 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 858,874 | 837,923 | 816,972 | 796,020 | 775,069 | 754,118 | 733,167 | 714,286 | 697,816 | 676,667 | 655,517 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,107,646 | 1,080,350 | 1,053,054 | 1,025,758 | 1,000,000 | 980,459 | 952,901 | 925,344 | 897,787 | 870,229 | 842,672 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 779,441 | 754,867 | 730,293 | 705,719 | 681,144 | 656,570 | 631,996 | 607,422 | 582,848 | 558,274 | 533,700 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | 44,776 | 25,467 | 6,158 | -13,150 | -32,459 | -51,767 | -71,076 | -90,385 | -109,693 | -129,002 | -148,311 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | 171,054 | 144,040 | 117,027 | 90,900 | 63,621 | 36,341 | 9,062 | -18,218 | -45,497 | -72,777 | -100,056 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -145,175 | -169,992 | -194,808 | -219,624 | -245,062 | -270,712 | -296,361 | -322,011 | -347,660 | -373,309 | -398,959 |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -386,389 | -409,148 | -431,906 | -454,664 | -477,423 | -500,181 | -522,939 | -545,698 | -568,456 | -591,214 | -613,973 |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,545,557 | 1,517,687 | 1,489,818 | 1,461,949 | 1,434,080 | 1,406,211 | 1,378,341 | 1,350,472 | 1,322,603 | 1,294,734 | 1,266,865 |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 624,665 | 600,746 | 576,828 | 552,909 | 528,990 | 505,071 | 481,152 | 457,233 | 433,314 | 409,395 | 385,477 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 684,436 | 660,843 | 643,290 | 619,474 | 595,657 | 571,840 | 548,023 | 524,207 | 500,390 | 476,573 | 452,757 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 786,559 | 766,656 | 746,752 | 726,848 | 713,646 | 693,553 | 673,461 | 653,368 | 633,276 | 613,184 | 593,091 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 1,011,401 | 994,900 | 968,720 | 942,541 | 916,361 | 890,182 | 864,002 | 837,822 | 811,643 | 785,463 | 759,284 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 703,682 | 680,337 | 656,992 | 633,646 | 610,301 | 586,956 | 563,610 | 540,265 | 516,920 | 493,574 | 470,229 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | 29,125 | 10,782 | -7,561 | -25,904 | -44,247 | -62,591 | -80,934 | -99,277 | -117,620 | -135,963 | -154,307 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | 111,946 | 86,030 | 60,115 | 34,199 | 8,283 | -17,632 | -43,548 | -69,463 | -95,379 | -121,294 | -147,210 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -187,883 | -211,458 | -235,513 | -259,880 | -284,247 | -308,614 | -332,981 | -357,348 | -381,715 | -406,082 | -430,448 |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -380,634 | -402,254 | -423,874 | -445,495 | -467,115 | -488,736 | -510,356 | -531,977 | -553,597 | -575,217 | -596,838 |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,448,594 | 1,422,118 | 1,395,642 | 1,369,167 | 1,342,691 | 1,316,215 | 1,289,739 | 1,263,264 | 1,236,788 | 1,210,312 | 1,183,836 |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Viability } \\ \text { Threshold } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Residual Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | $£ 40$ | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 548,809 | 526,149 | 503,489 | 480,829 | 458,169 | 435,509 | 412,849 | 390,189 | 367,529 | 344,869 | 322,209 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 616,253 | 593,690 | 571,127 | 548,564 | 526,001 | 503,437 | 480,874 | 458,311 | 435,748 | 413,184 | 390,621 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 714,286 | 701,980 | 682,945 | 663,910 | 644,875 | 625,840 | 606,806 | 587,771 | 568,736 | 549,701 | 530,666 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 923,913 | 899,111 | 874,309 | 849,508 | 824,706 | 799,904 | 775,103 | 750,301 | 725,499 | 700,698 | 675,896 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 627,924 | 605,808 | 583,691 | 561,574 | 539,458 | 517,341 | 495,224 | 473,108 | 450,991 | 428,874 | 410,765 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | 13,475 | -3,903 | -21,281 | -38,658 | -56,036 | -73,414 | -90,792 | -108,169 | -125,547 | -142,925 | -160,303 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | 51,152 | 26,601 | 2,049 | -22,502 | -47,054 | -71,606 | -96,157 | -120,709 | -145,260 | -169,812 | -194,363 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -231,094 | -254,178 | -277,263 | -300,347 | -323,432 | -346,516 | -369,600 | -392,685 | -415,769 | -438,854 | -461,938 |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -374,878 | -395,361 | -415,843 | -436,326 | -456,808 | -477,290 | -497,773 | -518,255 | -538,738 | -559,220 | -579,703 |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,351,631 | 1,326,549 | 1,301,466 | 1,276,384 | 1,251,302 | 1,226,219 | 1,201,137 | 1,176,055 | 1,150,973 | 1,125,890 | 1,100,808 |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | Viability Threshold | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 472,953 | 451,552 | 430,151 | 408,749 | 387,348 | 365,947 | 344,546 | 323,145 | 301,744 | 280,343 | 261,396 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 541,583 | 520,273 | 498,964 | 477,654 | 456,344 | 435,034 | 413,725 | 392,415 | 371, 105 | 349,796 | 328,486 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 648,015 | 630,037 | 612,060 | 594,082 | 576,105 | 558,128 | 540,150 | 522,173 | 504,196 | 486,218 | 468,241 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 826,746 | 803,322 | 779,898 | 756,475 | 733,051 | 709,627 | 686,203 | 662,779 | 639,356 | 615,932 | 592,508 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 552,166 | 531,278 | 510,390 | 489,502 | 468,614 | 447,726 | 426,838 | 409,950 | 388,856 | 367,762 | 346,668 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | -2,175 | -18,588 | -35,000 | -51,412 | -67,825 | -84,237 | -100,649 | -117,062 | -133,474 | -149,886 | -166,299 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -9,641 | -32,829 | -56,016 | -79,204 | -102,391 | -125,579 | -148,767 | -171,954 | -195,221 | -219,186 | -243,152 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -275,408 | -297,210 | -319,012 | -340,814 | -362,616 | -384,418 | -406,220 | -428,022 | -449,824 | -471,626 | -493,428 |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -369,122 | -388,467 | -407,812 | -427,156 | -446,501 | -465,845 | -485,190 | -504,534 | -523,879 | -543,224 | -562,568 |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,254,668 | 1,230,979 | 1,207,290 | 1,183,601 | 1,159,913 | 1,136,224 | 1,112,535 | 1,088,846 | 1,065,157 | 1,041,469 | 1,017,780 |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Alternative Use Value | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { Viability } \\ \text { Threshold } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { Residual } \\ \text { Value } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  |  |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | $£ 40$ | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 397,096 | 376,954 | 356,812 | 336,670 | 316,528 | 296,385 | 276,243 | 258,528 | 238,195 | 217,862 | 197,529 |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 466,913 | 446,856 | 426,800 | 406,744 | 386,688 | 366,632 | 346,575 | 326,519 | 309,396 | 289,147 | 268,899 |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 25,000 | 330,000 | 575,014 | 558,095 | 541,175 | 524,255 | 507,335 | 490,415 | 473,495 | 456,575 | 439,655 | 422,736 | 405,816 |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 729,579 | 707,533 | 685,487 | 663,441 | 641,396 | 619,350 | 597,304 | 575,258 | 553,212 | 531,166 | 509,120 |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 50,000 | 360,000 | 476,408 | 456,748 | 437,089 | 417,430 | 401,690 | 381,837 | 361,984 | 342,131 | 322,278 | 302,425 | 282,572 |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 250,000 | 300,000 | -17,826 | -33,273 | -48,719 | -64,166 | -79,613 | -95,060 | -110,507 | -125,954 | -141,401 | -156,848 | -172,295 |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -70,435 | -92,258 | -114,082 | -135,905 | -157,729 | -179,553 | -201,848 | -224,403 | -246,959 | -269,515 | -292,071 |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | $-319,723$ | -340,242 | -360,762 | -381,281 | -401,801 | -422,320 | -442,840 | -463,359 | -483,879 | -504,398 | -524,918 |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 380,000 | 456,000 | -363,367 | -381,573 | -399,780 | -417,987 | -436,193 | -454,400 | -472,607 | -490,813 | -509,020 | -527,227 | -545,433 |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,157,705 | 1,135,410 | 1,113,114 | 1,090,819 | 1,068,524 | 1,046,228 | 1,023,933 | 1,001,637 | 979,342 | 957,047 | 934,751 |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.26 The ability to contribute CIL over and above the identified strategic infrastructure and mitigation costs on the larger sites, or to contribute the £2,000 per unit s106 payment included in the model, varies substantially across the Borough and will have an impact on the level of CIL set.

## CIL as a proportion of Land Value and Gross Development Value

10.27 To further inform the CIL rate setting process, we have calculated CIL as a proportion of the Residual Value and the Gross Development Value under the two affordable housing scenarios.
10.28 CIL as the proportion of the Residual Value, in approximate terms, represents the percentage fall in land value that a landowner may receive in the event of CIL being introduced. It is inevitable that CIL will depress land prices. This is recognised in the RICS Guidance and was considered at the Greater Norwich CIL examination ${ }^{49}$. In Greater Norwich it was suggested that landowners may accept a $25 \%$ fall in land prices following the introduction of CIL saying:
'22. Thirdly the work done by the Councils to demonstrate what funds are likely to be available for CIL (Appendix 1 of the Note following Day 1) relies on the full $25 \%$ of the benchmark land value being available for the CIL "pot". While this may sometimes be the case it is unlikely that it will always apply. Even if some landowners may be prepared to accept less than 75\% of the benchmark value, the $25 \%$ figure should be treated as a maximum and not an average. Using $25 \%$ to try to establish what the theoretical maximum amount in a CIL "pot" may be is reasonable, but when thinking about setting a CIL charge in the real world it would be prudent to treat it as a maximum that will only apply on some occasions in some circumstances.'
10.29 It is important to note that a wide ranging debate took place at that CIL Examination and on the specific local circumstances. It would however be prudent to set CIL at a rate that does not result in a fall in land prices of greater than $25 \%$ or so.
10.30 The following tables show CIL, at a range of rates, as a percentage of the Residual Value. Firstly the results are presented for the full policy requirements and then where the affordable housing is provided as shared equity at $80 \%$ of OMV.
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| Larger Sites - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -4.1\% | -7.9\% | -11.4\% | -14.5\% | -17.5\% | -20.2\% | -22.8\% | -25.1\% | -27.3\% | -29.4\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 7.8\% | 16.7\% | 27.1\% | 39.2\% | 53.6\% | 71.0\% | 92.5\% | 119.5\% | 154.8\% | 202.7\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 5.2\% | 10.8\% | 16.9\% | 23.7\% | 31.2\% | 39.5\% | 48.8\% | 59.3\% | 71.2\% | 84.8\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -11.1\% | -20.0\% | -27.3\% | -33.3\% | -38.3\% | -42.7\% | -46.4\% | -49.6\% | -52.3\% | -54.7\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 11.7\% | 18.1\% | 24.9\% | 32.1\% | 39.9\% | 48.3\% | 57.3\% | 66.9\% | 77.4\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 9.4\% | 12.9\% | 16.5\% | 20.3\% | 24.4\% | 28.6\% | 33.1\% | 37.9\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.2\% | 9.5\% | 13.0\% | 16.7\% | 20.5\% | 24.6\% | 28.9\% | 33.4\% | 38.2\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 4.6\% | 9.5\% | 14.8\% | 20.6\% | 26.8\% | 33.7\% | 41.2\% | 49.4\% | 58.5\% | 68.6\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 14.6\% | 23.2\% | 33.0\% | 44.2\% | 57.0\% | 72.0\% | 89.7\% | 110.9\% | 136.7\% |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -3.5\% | -6.7\% | -9.8\% | -12.6\% | -15.2\% | -17.6\% | -20.0\% | -22.1\% | -24.2\% | -26.1\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 9.2\% | 20.0\% | 32.9\% | 48.5\% | 67.8\% | 92.4\% | 124.7\% | 167.4\% | 231.4\% | 333.0\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 11.9\% | 18.8\% | 26.4\% | 35.0\% | 44.6\% | 55.6\% | 68.1\% | 82.5\% | 99.6\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -8.3\% | -15.3\% | -21.3\% | -26.5\% | -31.1\% | -34.9\% | -38.3\% | -41.3\% | -44.0\% | -46.5\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 6.0\% | 12.4\% | 19.2\% | 26.4\% | 34.2\% | 42.6\% | 51.7\% | 61.4\% | 72.0\% | 83.6\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.4\% | 9.8\% | 13.4\% | 17.2\% | 21.2\% | 25.4\% | 29.8\% | 34.5\% | 39.6\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.4\% | 9.9\% | 13.5\% | 17.3\% | 21.3\% | 25.6\% | 30.1\% | 34.9\% | 40.0\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 4.9\% | 10.1\% | 15.8\% | 22.0\% | 28.8\% | 36.3\% | 44.5\% | 53.6\% | 63.8\% | 75.2\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 7.7\% | 16.5\% | 26.5\% | 38.1\% | 51.5\% | 67.4\% | 86.4\% | 109.6\% | 138.5\% | 175.6\% |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -3.0\% | -5.8\% | -8.4\% | -10.9\% | -13.3\% | -15.5\% | -17.5\% | -19.5\% | -21.4\% | -23.2\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 11.5\% | 25.5\% | 43.2\% | 65.9\% | 95.4\% | 137.8\% | 201.8\% | 307.1\% | 526.6\% | 1206.5\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 6.4\% | 13.4\% | 21.3\% | 30.3\% | 40.5\% | 52.1\% | 65.6\% | 81.7\% | 100.9\% | 124.4\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -6.5\% | -12.2\% | -17.1\% | -21.5\% | -25.4\% | -28.9\% | -32.0\% | -34.9\% | -37.5\% | -39.8\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 6.4\% | 13.2\% | 20.5\% | 28.4\% | 36.9\% | 46.1\% | 56.0\% | 66.9\% | 78.8\% | 91.9\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 6.6\% | 10.2\% | 14.0\% | 17.9\% | 22.1\% | 26.6\% | 31.3\% | 36.3\% | 41.6\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.7\% | 10.3\% | 14.1\% | 18.1\% | 22.3\% | 26.8\% | 31.6\% | 36.7\% | 42.1\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 5.2\% | 10.9\% | 17.1\% | 23.9\% | 31.4\% | 39.7\% | 48.9\% | 59.3\% | 71.1\% | 84.6\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 9.0\% | 19.4\% | 31.5\% | 45.9\% | 63.2\% | 84.5\% | 111.1\% | 145.4\% | 192.8\% | 260.6\% |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | $£ 60$ | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -2.6\% | -5.0\% | -7.3\% | -9.5\% | -11.6\% | -13.6\% | -15.5\% | -17.3\% | -19.0\% | -20.6\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 15.9\% | 36.7\% | 65.8\% | 108.8\% | 177.7\% | 312.8\% | 671.9\% | 6176.3\% | -1134.9\% | -579.0\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 7.4\% | 15.7\% | 25.2\% | 36.2\% | 49.1\% | 64.5\% | 83.1\% | 105.9\% | 134.8\% | 172.5\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -5.2\% | -9.8\% | -13.9\% | -17.7\% | -21.1\% | -24.2\% | -27.1\% | -29.7\% | -32.1\% | -34.3\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 14.3\% | 22.3\% | 31.0\% | 40.4\% | 50.8\% | 62.0\% | 74.5\% | 88.2\% | 103.5\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 6.9\% | 10.7\% | 14.7\% | 18.9\% | 23.3\% | 28.1\% | 33.1\% | 38.5\% | 44.2\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 7.0\% | 10.8\% | 14.8\% | 19.1\% | 23.6\% | 28.4\% | 33.5\% | 38.9\% | 44.7\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 11.9\% | 18.8\% | 26.4\% | 34.8\% | 44.3\% | 55.1\% | 67.5\% | 81.7\% | 98.3\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 11.0\% | 24.1\% | 40.0\% | 59.7\% | 84.8\% | 118.2\% | 165.0\% | 234.5\% | 348.9\% | 566.7\% |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -2.2\% | -4.4\% | -6.4\% | -8.3\% | -10.2\% | -11.9\% | -13.6\% | -15.3\% | -16.8\% | -18.3\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 28.0\% | 73.7\% | 165.1\% | 426.1\% | \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\# | -668.9\% | -381.9\% | -286.1\% | -239.4\% | -211.7\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 9.0\% | 19.4\% | 31.9\% | 46.9\% | 65.3\% | 88.5\% | 118.5\% | 159.1\% | 216.7\% | 302.3\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -4.2\% | -8.0\% | -11.5\% | -14.7\% | -17.7\% | -20.5\% | -23.0\% | -25.4\% | -27.7\% | -29.7\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 7.6\% | 15.9\% | 24.8\% | 34.7\% | 45.5\% | 57.4\% | 70.6\% | 85.3\% | 101.8\% | 120.4\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.3\% | 11.3\% | 15.6\% | 20.1\% | 24.9\% | 30.0\% | 35.4\% | 41.3\% | 47.5\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.4\% | 11.5\% | 15.8\% | 20.3\% | 25.2\% | 30.3\% | 35.9\% | 41.8\% | 48.2\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 13.3\% | 21.1\% | 29.9\% | 39.9\% | 51.3\% | 64.5\% | 79.9\% | 98.2\% | 120.1\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 14.6\% | 33.1\% | 57.5\% | 91.2\% | 140.6\% | 220.3\% | 366.5\% | 740.2\% | 3745.6\% | -1581.7\% |
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| North East and East - FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \% Affordable Hou | sing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | $£ 90$ | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 3.5\% | 5.3\% | 7.2\% | 9.2\% | 11.2\% | 13.3\% | 15.5\% | 17.7\% | 20.0\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 4.4\% | 6.7\% | 9.2\% | 11.7\% | 14.4\% | 17.2\% | 20.1\% | 23.1\% | 26.3\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 3.4\% | 5.2\% | 7.0\% | 8.9\% | 10.9\% | 12.9\% | 15.1\% | 17.3\% | 19.5\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 4.0\% | 6.1\% | 8.4\% | 10.7\% | 13.1\% | 15.6\% | 18.2\% | 20.9\% | 23.8\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 3.4\% | 5.3\% | 7.1\% | 9.1\% | 11.1\% | 13.2\% | 15.3\% | 17.6\% | 19.9\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 8.4\% | 13.2\% | 18.4\% | 24.1\% | 30.4\% | 37.4\% | 45.2\% | 53.9\% | 63.8\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 9.5\% | 13.1\% | 16.8\% | 20.9\% | 25.2\% | 29.8\% | 34.8\% | 40.1\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.3\% | 9.8\% | 13.5\% | 17.5\% | 21.7\% | 26.3\% | 31.2\% | 36.5\% | 42.3\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 5.5\% | 11.7\% | 18.6\% | 26.5\% | 35.5\% | 46.0\% | 58.1\% | 72.6\% | 89.9\% | 111.2\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.8\% | 4.2\% | 5.7\% | 7.2\% | 8.8\% | 10.4\% | 12.1\% | 13.8\% | 15.6\% |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.6\% | 5.5\% | 7.4\% | 9.4\% | 11.5\% | 13.6\% | 15.9\% | 18.2\% | 20.6\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 4.5\% | 6.9\% | 9.5\% | 12.1\% | 14.8\% | 17.7\% | 20.8\% | 23.9\% | 27.3\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 3.5\% | 5.3\% | 7.2\% | 9.1\% | 11.2\% | 13.3\% | 15.4\% | 17.7\% | 20.0\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 4.1\% | 6.3\% | 8.6\% | 11.0\% | 13.5\% | 16.1\% | 18.8\% | 21.6\% | 24.6\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 3.5\% | 5.4\% | 7.3\% | 9.3\% | 11.4\% | 13.5\% | 15.8\% | 18.1\% | 20.5\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 8.7\% | 13.6\% | 19.0\% | 25.0\% | 31.6\% | 38.9\% | 47.2\% | 56.5\% | 67.0\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.5\% | 10.0\% | 13.8\% | 17.9\% | 22.2\% | 26.9\% | 31.9\% | 37.3\% | 43.1\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.7\% | 10.4\% | 14.4\% | 18.7\% | 23.3\% | 28.3\% | 33.7\% | 39.5\% | 45.9\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 5.7\% | 12.1\% | 19.4\% | 27.7\% | 37.3\% | 48.4\% | 61.5\% | 77.1\% | 96.2\% | 119.9\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.8\% | 4.3\% | 5.8\% | 7.3\% | 8.9\% | 10.5\% | 12.2\% | 14.0\% | 15.8\% |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 7.6\% | 9.7\% | 11.8\% | 14.0\% | 16.3\% | 18.7\% | 21.2\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 7.2\% | 9.8\% | 12.5\% | 15.4\% | 18.4\% | 21.6\% | 24.9\% | 28.4\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.6\% | 5.4\% | 7.4\% | 9.4\% | 11.5\% | 13.6\% | 15.8\% | 18.2\% | 20.6\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 2.1\% | 4.3\% | 6.5\% | 8.9\% | 11.4\% | 14.0\% | 16.7\% | 19.5\% | 22.5\% | 25.6\% |
|  | Small Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.6\% | 5.5\% | 7.5\% | 9.6\% | 11.7\% | 13.9\% | 16.2\% | 18.6\% | 21.1\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 9.0\% | 14.1\% | 19.8\% | 26.1\% | 33.0\% | 40.8\% | 49.6\% | 59.5\% | 70.9\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.9\% | 10.7\% | 14.8\% | 19.2\% | 23.9\% | 29.0\% | 34.5\% | 40.4\% | 46.9\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 7.2\% | 11.2\% | 15.6\% | 20.2\% | 25.3\% | 30.8\% | 36.8\% | 43.4\% | 50.7\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 6.0\% | 12.7\% | 20.4\% | 29.2\% | 39.4\% | 51.4\% | 65.6\% | 82.9\% | 104.3\% | 131.3\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.8\% | 4.3\% | 5.8\% | 7.4\% | 9.0\% | 10.7\% | 12.4\% | 14.2\% | 16.0\% |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.8\% | 5.8\% | 7.8\% | 10.0\% | 12.2\% | 14.5\% | 16.9\% | 19.4\% | 22.0\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 2.4\% | 4.9\% | 7.5\% | 10.2\% | 13.1\% | 16.1\% | 19.2\% | 22.6\% | 26.1\% | 29.8\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 7.6\% | 9.7\% | 11.8\% | 14.0\% | 16.3\% | 18.7\% | 21.2\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 2.2\% | 4.4\% | 6.8\% | 9.3\% | 11.9\% | 14.5\% | 17.2\% | 20.2\% | 23.3\% | 26.5\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.7\% | 7.8\% | 9.9\% | 12.1\% | 14.4\% | 16.8\% | 19.3\% | 21.9\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.5\% | 9.4\% | 14.8\% | 20.8\% | 27.4\% | 34.8\% | 43.1\% | 52.6\% | 63.4\% | 75.9\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.5\% | 11.6\% | 16.1\% | 27.9\% | 26.1\% | 31.7\% | 37.9\% | 44.7\% | 51.8\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 7.9\% | 12.3\% | 17.1\% | 22.3\% | 28.0\% | 34.3\% | 40.8\% | 48.4\% | 56.8\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 13.4\% | 21.6\% | 31.0\% | 42.1\% | 55.2\% | 71.0\% | 90.5\% | 115.0\% | 146.9\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.9\% | 4.4\% | 5.9\% | 7.5\% | 9.1\% | 10.8\% | 12.6\% | 14.4\% | 16.2\% |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | $£ 90$ | £100 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.9\% | 6.0\% | 8.1\% | 10.4\% | 12.7\% | 15.1\% | 17.6\% | 20.2\% | 22.9\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.1\% | 7.8\% | 10.7\% | 13.7\% | 16.9\% | 20.2\% | 23.8\% | 27.5\% | 31.5\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.8\% | 5.8\% | 7.8\% | 10.0\% | 12.2\% | 14.5\% | 16.9\% | 19.4\% | 22.0\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | North East | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 4.6\% | 7.1\% | 9.6\% | 12.3\% | 15.1\% | 18.1\% | 21.2\% | 24.5\% | 28.0\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | North East | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.9\% | 5.9\% | 8.1\% | 10.3\% | 12.6\% | 15.0\% | 17.5\% | 20.1\% | 22.8\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.7\% | 9.9\% | 15.6\% | 21.9\% | 29.0\% | 37.0\% | 46.1\% | 56.5\% | 68.4\% | 82.4\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | North East | 0.0\% | 3.9\% | 8.2\% | 12.8\% | 17.8\% | 23.2\% | 29.1\% | 35.3\% | 42.4\% | 50.2\% | 59.0\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 8.8\% | 13.8\% | 19.0\% | 25.0\% | 31.6\% | 38.9\% | 47.1\% | 56.3\% | 66.8\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | North East | 0.0\% | 6.6\% | 14.3\% | 23.1\% | 33.4\% | 45.5\% | 60.2\% | 78.3\% | 100.9\% | 130.2\% | 169.6\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | North East | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.9\% | 4.4\% | 6.0\% | 7.6\% | 9.3\% | 11.0\% | 12.8\% | 14.6\% | 16.5\% |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
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| Table 10.5c CIL as Percentage of Residual Value <br> West and South- FULL POLICY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 9.4\% | 12.9\% | 16.6\% | 20.6\% | 24.8\% | 29.3\% | 34.1\% | 39.2\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.5\% | 5.1\% | 7.8\% | 10.7\% | 13.7\% | 16.9\% | 20.3\% | 23.8\% | 27.5\% | 31.5\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.4\% | 14.7\% | 18.1\% | 21.7\% | 25.4\% | 29.5\% | 33.8\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.4\% | 14.5\% | 17.9\% | 21.5\% | 25.3\% | 29.4\% | 33.7\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.7\% | 11.9\% | 15.1\% | 18.7\% | 22.5\% | 26.5\% | 30.8\% | 35.5\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | 21.3\% | 54.4\% | 112.7\% | 243.2\% | 795.5\% | -1547.7\% | -498.6\% | -330.6\% | -261.9\% | -224.6\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 0.0\% | 12.0\% | 26.6\% | 46.0\% | 72.2\% | 109.7\% | 166.1\% | 267.3\% | 492.0\% | 1421.1\% | -2781.7\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -14.5\% | -25.4\% | -33.7\% | -40.3\% | -45.6\% | -50.0\% | -53.7\% | -56.8\% | -59.5\% | -61.9\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -8.3\% | -15.3\% | -21.3\% | -26.5\% | -31.0\% | -34.9\% | -38.4\% | -41.5\% | -44.2\% | -46.7\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.3\% | 8.1\% | 11.1\% | 14.3\% | 17.7\% | 21.3\% | 25.2\% | 29.3\% | 33.6\% |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.4\% | 9.9\% | 13.6\% | 17.5\% | 21.7\% | 26.2\% | 31.0\% | 36.1\% | 41.6\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.3\% | 8.1\% | 11.1\% | 14.2\% | 17.6\% | 21.1\% | 24.8\% | 28.7\% | 32.9\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.7\% | 11.8\% | 15.2\% | 18.7\% | 22.5\% | 26.6\% | 30.9\% | 35.5\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.6\% | 11.8\% | 15.2\% | 18.7\% | 22.6\% | 26.6\% | 30.9\% | 35.6\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.8\% | 8.9\% | 12.3\% | 15.8\% | 19.6\% | 23.6\% | 27.9\% | 32.6\% | 37.5\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | 25.3\% | 68.2\% | 156.4\% | 443.6\% | -4368.3\% | -530.6\% | -326.0\% | -252.9\% | -215.3\% | -192.5\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 0.0\% | 15.3\% | 36.0\% | 65.6\% | 110.4\% | 190.0\% | 366.2\% | 1084.5\% | -2303.3\% | -671.6\% | -428.6\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -11.1\% | -19.9\% | -27.1\% | -33.0\% | -38.0\% | -42.3\% | -46.0\% | -49.2\% | -52.0\% | -54.5\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -7.9\% | -14.6\% | -20.4\% | -25.4\% | -29.8\% | -33.6\% | -37.0\% | -40.1\% | -42.9\% | -45.3\% |
| 0 | Single Plot | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.4\% | 14.7\% | 18.1\% | 21.8\% | 25.8\% | 30.0\% | 34.5\% |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.7\% | 10.4\% | 14.4\% | 18.6\% | 23.1\% | 27.9\% | 33.1\% | 38.7\% | 44.8\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.5\% | 8.5\% | 11.6\% | 14.9\% | 18.4\% | 22.1\% | 26.0\% | 30.2\% | 34.6\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.8\% | 9.0\% | 12.4\% | 15.9\% | 19.7\% | 23.7\% | 28.0\% | 32.6\% | 37.6\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.9\% | 9.0\% | 12.4\% | 16.0\% | 19.8\% | 23.9\% | 28.2\% | 32.9\% | 37.8\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 6.1\% | 9.4\% | 12.9\% | 16.7\% | 20.7\% | 25.0\% | 29.7\% | 34.7\% | 40.1\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | 32.0\% | 94.8\% | 274.6\% | 5249.2\% | -531.9\% | -306.7\% | -235.5\% | -200.6\% | -179.8\% | -166.1\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 0.0\% | 22.7\% | 58.5\% | 123.8\% | 279.5\% | 1140.6\% | -1082.2\% | -452.4\% | -315.0\% | -254.8\% | -221.0\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -8.7\% | -16.0\% | -22.2\% | -27.5\% | -32.1\% | -36.1\% | -39.6\% | -42.8\% | -45.6\% | -48.1\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -7.5\% | -13.9\% | -19.4\% | -24.3\% | -28.5\% | -32.3\% | -35.7\% | -38.7\% | -41.4\% | -43.9\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.5\% | 8.5\% | 11.7\% | 15.0\% | 18.6\% | 22.4\% | 26.5\% | 30.9\% | 35.6\% |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £ 70 | £80 | $£ 90$ | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 7.2\% | 11.1\% | 15.4\% | 19.9\% | 24.8\% | 30.1\% | 35.8\% | 42.0\% | 48.8\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.8\% | 8.9\% | 12.2\% | 15.7\% | 19.4\% | 23.3\% | 27.5\% | 31.7\% | 36.4\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.2\% | 9.5\% | 13.1\% | 16.9\% | 20.9\% | 25.2\% | 29.9\% | 34.8\% | 40.2\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.2\% | 9.6\% | 13.2\% | 17.0\% | 21.1\% | 25.5\% | 30.2\% | 35.3\% | 40.8\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.4\% | 10.0\% | 13.8\% | 17.8\% | 22.2\% | 26.9\% | 31.9\% | 37.4\% | 43.4\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | 45.4\% | 168.6\% | 1767.4\% | -472.5\% | -268.4\% | -208.4\% | -179.7\% | -162.9\% | -151.8\% | -144.0\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 0.0\% | 51.0\% | 207.0\% | \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\# | -392.3\% | -248.5\% | -199.7\% | -175.1\% | -160.3\% | -150.4\% | -143.3\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -7.1\% | -13.2\% | -18.5\% | -23.2\% | -27.3\% | -31.0\% | -34.3\% | -37.3\% | -40.1\% | -42.5\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -7.0\% | -13.1\% | -18.5\% | -23.1\% | -27.2\% | -30.9\% | -34.2\% | -37.2\% | -39.9\% | -42.4\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.7\% | 12.0\% | 15.5\% | 19.2\% | 23.1\% | 27.4\% | 31.9\% | 36.8\% |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | $£ 50$ | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | $£ 90$ | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 7.8\% | 12.1\% | 16.7\% | 21.8\% | 27.2\% | 33.1\% | 39.5\% | 46.6\% | 54.4\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 9.4\% | 12.9\% | 16.5\% | 20.4\% | 24.6\% | 29.1\% | 33.9\% | 39.1\% |
| - | Large Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 6.5\% | 10.1\% | 14.0\% | 18.1\% | 22.4\% | 27.2\% | 32.2\% | 37.7\% | 43.7\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 6.6\% | 10.3\% | 14.2\% | 18.4\% | 22.8\% | 27.7\% | 32.9\% | 38.5\% | 44.7\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | West \& South | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.9\% | 10.8\% | 14.9\% | 19.3\% | 24.1\% | 29.3\% | 34.9\% | 41.0\% | 47.4\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | 85.9\% | 1351.9\% | -345.5\% | -212.3\% | -172.4\% | -153.2\% | -141.9\% | -134.5\% | -129.2\% | -125.3\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | West \& South | 0.0\% | -125.3\% | -111.7\% | -107.8\% | -105.9\% | -104.8\% | -104.1\% | -103.6\% | -103.3\% | -103.0\% | -102.4\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -5.8\% | -11.0\% | -15.5\% | -19.7\% | -23.4\% | -26.8\% | -29.8\% | -32.7\% | -35.2\% | -37.6\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | West \& South | 0.0\% | -6.6\% | -12.4\% | -17.5\% | -22.0\% | -25.9\% | -29.5\% | -32.8\% | -35.7\% | -38.3\% | -40.8\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | West \& South | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.8\% | 9.0\% | 12.4\% | 16.0\% | 19.9\% | 24.0\% | 28.4\% | 33.2\% | 38.4\% |
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Table 10.5d CIL as Percentage of Residual Value
King's Lynn Area- FULL POLICY

| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.1\% | 8.4\% | 13.2\% | 18.3\% | 23.9\% | 30.0\% | 36.6\% | 44.0\% | 52.1\% | 61.1\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.6\% | 7.5\% | 11.6\% | 16.0\% | 20.6\% | 25.8\% | 31.3\% | 37.4\% | 44.0\% | 51.3\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.4\% | 14.7\% | 18.1\% | 21.7\% | 25.4\% | 29.5\% | 33.8\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 5.4\% | 8.3\% | 11.4\% | 14.5\% | 17.9\% | 21.5\% | 25.3\% | 29.4\% | 33.7\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 6.8\% | 10.5\% | 14.5\% | 18.8\% | 23.4\% | 28.5\% | 33.9\% | 39.8\% | 46.3\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 74.6\% | 617.0\% | -433.5\% | -234.1\% | -183.5\% | -160.4\% | -147.1\% | -138.6\% | -132.6\% | -128.1\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 19.1\% | 47.0\% | 90.7\% | 172.8\% | 378.0\% | 1819.3\% | -1055.8\% | -483.2\% | -339.8\% | -274.6\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -14.5\% | -25.4\% | -33.7\% | -40.3\% | -45.6\% | -50.0\% | -53.7\% | -56.8\% | -59.5\% | -61.9\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -5.3\% | -10.0\% | -14.3\% | -18.2\% | -21.7\% | -24.9\% | -27.8\% | -30.5\% | -33.0\% | -35.3\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.6\% | 5.5\% | 7.5\% | 9.6\% | 11.8\% | 14.0\% | 16.3\% | 18.8\% | 21.3\% |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 9.0\% | 14.1\% | 19.7\% | 25.8\% | 32.5\% | 39.9\% | 48.1\% | 57.3\% | 67.6\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.8\% | 7.8\% | 12.2\% | 16.8\% | 21.9\% | 27.5\% | 33.5\% | 40.1\% | 47.4\% | 55.4\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.7\% | 11.8\% | 15.2\% | 18.7\% | 22.5\% | 26.6\% | 30.9\% | 35.5\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 5.6\% | 8.6\% | 11.8\% | 15.2\% | 18.7\% | 22.6\% | 26.6\% | 30.9\% | 35.6\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.4\% | 7.1\% | 11.1\% | 15.4\% | 20.0\% | 25.0\% | 30.4\% | 36.3\% | 42.8\% | 49.9\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 167.4\% | -477.4\% | -209.0\% | -163.2\% | -144.2\% | -133.8\% | -127.3\% | -122.8\% | -119.5\% | -117.0\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 30.3\% | 86.8\% | 229.0\% | 1260.5\% | -740.2\% | -359.7\% | -263.1\% | -218.9\% | -193.7\% | -177.3\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -11.1\% | -19.9\% | -27.1\% | -33.0\% | -38.0\% | -42.3\% | -46.0\% | -49.2\% | -52.0\% | -54.5\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -5.1\% | -9.7\% | -13.9\% | -17.6\% | -21.1\% | -24.2\% | -27.1\% | -29.7\% | -32.2\% | -34.5\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 7.6\% | 9.7\% | 11.9\% | 14.2\% | 16.6\% | 19.1\% | 21.7\% |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | $£ 10$ | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | $£ 70$ | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.7\% | 9.8\% | 15.4\% | 21.6\% | 28.3\% | 35.9\% | 44.3\% | 53.7\% | 64.4\% | 76.6\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 8.3\% | 13.0\% | 18.1\% | 23.6\% | 29.7\% | 36.3\% | 43.6\% | 51.8\% | 60.9\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.8\% | 9.0\% | 12.4\% | 15.9\% | 19.7\% | 23.7\% | 28.0\% | 32.6\% | 37.6\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.9\% | 9.0\% | 12.4\% | 16.0\% | 19.8\% | 23.9\% | 28.2\% | 32.9\% | 37.8\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 7.6\% | 11.9\% | 16.5\% | 21.5\% | 26.9\% | 32.9\% | 39.4\% | 46.6\% | 54.1\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -438.2\% | -160.7\% | -132.7\% | -122.1\% | -116.5\% | -113.0\% | -110.7\% | -109.0\% | -107.7\% | -106.7\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 93.0\% | 2413.7\% | -329.7\% | -210.2\% | -172.7\% | -154.3\% | -143.4\% | -136.2\% | -131.1\% | -127.2\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -8.7\% | -16.0\% | -22.2\% | -27.5\% | -32.1\% | -36.1\% | -39.6\% | -42.8\% | -45.6\% | -48.1\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -4.9\% | -9.4\% | -13.4\% | -17.1\% | -20.4\% | -23.5\% | -26.3\% | -29.0\% | -31.4\% | -33.6\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.7\% | 5.7\% | 7.8\% | 9.9\% | 12.1\% | 14.5\% | 16.9\% | 19.4\% | 22.1\% |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% R |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 5.2\% | 10.8\% | 17.1\% | 24.1\% | 31.9\% | 40.6\% | 50.5\% | 61.8\% | 74.9\% | 89.2\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 9.0\% | 14.1\% | 19.7\% | 25.8\% | 32.6\% | 40.0\% | 48.4\% | 57.8\% | 68.3\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.2\% | 9.5\% | 13.1\% | 16.9\% | 20.9\% | 25.2\% | 29.9\% | 34.8\% | 40.2\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.2\% | 9.6\% | 13.2\% | 17.0\% | 21.1\% | 25.5\% | 30.2\% | 35.3\% | 40.8\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 8.2\% | 12.9\% | 17.9\% | 23.4\% | 29.5\% | 35.8\% | 43.2\% | 51.4\% | 60.5\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -86.9\% | -92.3\% | -94.2\% | -95.2\% | -95.9\% | -96.3\% | -96.6\% | -96.8\% | -97.0\% | -97.1\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -71.1\% | -83.4\% | -88.5\% | -91.2\% | -93.0\% | -94.2\% | -95.1\% | -95.7\% | -95.9\% | -96.1\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -7.1\% | -13.2\% | -18.5\% | -23.2\% | -27.3\% | -31.0\% | -34.3\% | -37.3\% | -40.1\% | -42.5\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -4.7\% | -9.0\% | -12.9\% | -16.5\% | -19.8\% | -22.8\% | -25.6\% | -28.1\% | -30.5\% | -32.7\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.8\% | 5.8\% | 7.9\% | 10.1\% | 12.4\% | 14.8\% | 17.2\% | 19.8\% | 22.5\% |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% RV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 1 | Large Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 5.8\% | 12.3\% | 19.6\% | 27.7\% | 37.0\% | 47.7\% | 59.4\% | 73.7\% | 90.7\% | 111.1\% |
| 2 | Medium Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.7\% | 9.9\% | 15.6\% | 21.9\% | 28.8\% | 36.6\% | 45.3\% | 54.6\% | 65.8\% | 78.6\% |
| 3 | Large Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 6.5\% | 10.1\% | 14.0\% | 18.1\% | 22.4\% | 27.2\% | 32.2\% | 37.7\% | 43.7\% |
| 4 | Settlement Edge | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 6.6\% | 10.3\% | 14.2\% | 18.4\% | 22.8\% | 27.7\% | 32.9\% | 38.5\% | 44.7\% |
| 5 | Small Greenfield | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 9.0\% | 14.2\% | 19.7\% | 25.9\% | 32.7\% | 40.4\% | 49.0\% | 58.8\% | 69.9\% |
| 6 | Smaller Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -45.7\% | -62.4\% | -71.1\% | -76.4\% | -79.9\% | -82.5\% | -84.5\% | -86.0\% | -87.2\% | -88.2\% |
| 7 | Larger Urban | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -23.8\% | -38.5\% | -48.5\% | -55.7\% | -61.2\% | -65.3\% | -68.6\% | -71.2\% | -73.4\% | -75.3\% |
| 8 | Urban Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -5.8\% | -11.0\% | -15.5\% | -19.7\% | -23.4\% | -26.8\% | -29.8\% | -32.7\% | -35.2\% | -37.6\% |
| 9 | Small Infill | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | -4.5\% | -8.7\% | -12.4\% | -15.9\% | -19.1\% | -22.0\% | -24.7\% | -27.2\% | -29.6\% | -31.8\% |
| 10 | Single Plot | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 1.9\% | 3.9\% | 5.9\% | 8.1\% | 10.3\% | 12.7\% | 15.1\% | 17.6\% | 20.3\% | 23.1\% |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.31 Plan-wide viability testing is not an exact science. The process is based on high level modelling and assumptions, and development costs and assumptions. The process adopted by many developers is similar, hence the use of contingency sums, the competitive return assumptions and the generally cautious approach.
10.32 In the following tables we have set out CIL, at a range of rates, as a proportion of the Gross Development Value.

Table 10.6a CIL as Percentage of GDV
Larger Sites - FULL POLICY

| 0\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | £100 |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% | 5.1\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% | 5.0\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.1\% | 4.5\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% | 5.0\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.8\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.8\% |
| 5\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% | 5.0\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% | 4.9\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% | 4.9\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 10\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.5\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% | 4.9\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.7\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.4\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% | 4.8\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% |
| 15\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.8\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 4.1\% | 4.6\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.4\% | 3.8\% | 4.3\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% | 2.8\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% | 4.7\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 20\% Affordable Housing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | CIL as \% GDV |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CIL |  | £0 | £10 | £20 | £30 | £40 | £50 | £60 | £70 | £80 | £90 | $£ 100$ |
| 1 | Boal Quay | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.1\% | 4.5\% |
| 2 | South of Parkway | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.6\% | 4.0\% | 4.5\% |
| 3 | Lynn Sport | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% | 3.7\% | 4.2\% |
| 4 | Bankside | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.9\% | 1.4\% | 1.8\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 4.1\% | 4.5\% |
| 5 | West Winch | Kings Lynn | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 6 | Hall Lane | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 7 | Knights Hill | South Wootton | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 1.6\% | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 2.7\% | 3.1\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% |
| 8 | East of Lynn Rd | Downham Market | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% |
| 9 | Wisbech Fringe | Wisbech | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.0\% | 3.5\% | 3.9\% | 4.3\% |

Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016

Table 10.6b CIL as Percentage of GDV
North East and East - FULL POLICY


Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016

Table 10.6c CIL as Percentage of GDV
West and South - FULL POLICY


Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015

Table 10.6d CIL as Percentage of GDV
King's Lynn Area - FULL POLICY


Source: Post PDCS Update - November 2015
10.33 These findings are related to the proposed rates of CIL towards the end of this report.

## Impact of a national affordable housing threshold

10.34 It is not necessary to undertake separate analysis of the impact of the reintroduction of the national affordable housing threshold of 10 as the above analysis includes a zero affordable housing scenario.

## Older People's Housing

10.35 As well as mainstream housing, we have considered the retirement and extracare sectors separately. In the earlier work appraisals were run for a range of affordable housing requirements. In this update the analysis is based on the affordable housing requirements as set out in the amended CS09 - Housing Distribution. The results of these are set out in Appendix 7 and summarised as follows.

Table 10.7a Older People's Housing, Appraisal Results
King's Lynn - Affordable Housing as Affordable Rent


Source: Post PDCS Update - September 2015

Table 10.7b Older People's Housing, Appraisal Results
Downham Market - Affordable Housing as Affordable Rent


Source: Post PDCS Update - September 2015

Table 10.7c Older People's Housing, Appraisal Results
Hunstanton - Affordable Housing as Affordable Rent


Source: Post PDCS Update - September 2015
10.36 Based on the revised analysis older people's housing is generally unable to bear CIL.

## 11. Non-Residential Appraisal Results

11.1 In the preceding chapters we set out the assumptions for the non-residential development appraisals and concluded - at least initially - that the main cost and income assumptions apply across the Borough. Based on the assumptions set out previously, we have run a set of development financial appraisals for the non-residential development types. The detailed appraisal results are set out in Appendix 8 and summarised in the tables below.
11.2 As with the residential appraisals, we have used the residual valuation approach - that is, they are designed to assess the site value after taking into account the costs of development, the likely income from sales and / or rents and an appropriate amount of developer's profit. The payment would represent the sum paid in a single tranche on the acquisition of a site. In order for the proposed development to be described as viable, it is necessary for this value to exceed the value from an alternative use. To assess viability we have used exactly the same methodology with regard to the Viability Thresholds (EUV plus uplift).
11.3 The appraisals have been run for a range of levels of CIL.

## Employment Uses

11.4 Through the consultation process it was suggested that the appraisals should be updated to reflect increases in build costs. The following appraisals have been run using the up to date BCIS costs (July 2015), but also have updated value assumptions.


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015

Table 11.3 Appraisal Results showing Approximate Residual Value Large Office


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015
11.5 The above results confirm that previous findings that there is not scope to introduce CIL on the main employment uses.

## Retail development

11.6 Through the consultation process it was suggested that the appraisals should be updated to reflect increases in build costs. It was also suggested that the analysis did not properly cover the smaller formats that are likely to be brought forward by the discount and non 'big four' operators. The following appraisals have been run using the up to date BCIS costs (July 2015), but also have updated value assumptions.

Table 11.5 Appraisal Results showing Approximate Residual Value Supermarkets


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015
11.7 When considering the results for the larger format retail uses it is important to consider where such development may come forward over the plan period. Little larger format
supermarket development is anticipated as the area is generally well provided for, and there has been a recent expansion in the sector to the south of King's Lynn in the last few years. The smaller format supermarkets could come forward more widely, on both greenfield and brownfield sites in the Main Towns of Downham Market and Hunstanton. On this basis we confirm the advice at the PDCS stage, of a CIL rate of $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for supermarkets.
11.8 Little large format retail warehouse is anticipated. Substantial growth in this sector has taken place in recent years to the south of King's Lynn and there is limited scope for further development. Having said this, if such development was to come forward it is only likely to occur in and around King's Lynn. On this basis we confirm the advice at the PDCS stage, of a CIL rate of $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for supermarkets. The analysis does show that retail warehousing is unlikely to be viable in the south of the Borough or on brownfield sites in the north - however little, if any, such development is anticipated in those areas.


Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update September 2015
11.9 Shop development is only likely to come forward on brownfield sites. In all areas this is shown as unviable.

## Conclusions

11.10 It is clear that non-residential development is challenging in the current market, but it is improving.
11.11 Supermarkets and retail warehouses are both shown as viable in the areas where they are likely to come forward, with the Residual Value exceeding the Viability Threshold by a substantial margin.
11.12 The rates of CIL are discussed in the final chapter below.

## 12. Setting CIL

12.1 In setting CIL there are a wide range of factors to be drawn on. Alongside this report, the Council has continued to work on the details of infrastructure required to support the Plan and the various funding options. This chapter considers the appropriate rates of CIL in the context of the CIL Regulations, the CIL Guidance that is contained within the PPG, and the adopted Core Strategy. It is important to note that the findings of this report do not determine the rates of CIL, but are one of a number of factors that the Council may consider when setting CIL. Whilst viability is an important element of the CIL setting process, it is just one of a number of elements. In setting CIL there are three main elements that need to be brought together:
a. Evidence of the infrastructure requirements
b. Viability evidence
c. The input of stakeholders.
12.2 Outside this report, the Council has carried out a substantial amount of work looking at the infrastructure requirements of the area. The Council has drawn on three principle sources of information to inform the decision making process:
a. The viability evidence set out in this report and the earlier viability studies.
b. Information about the requirements for infrastructure and, in relation to the larger sites, what of that infrastructure can be funded under s106, bearing in mind CIL Regulations 122 and 123.
c. Projections of expected CIL receipts through considering the amount and types of development planned for and anticipated in different parts of the Borough.
12.3 In striking a balance between the different rates of CIL, the Council has considered a range of other factors including the following.

## Regulations and Guidance

12.4 CIL Regulation 14 (as amended) sets out the core principle for setting CIL:

In setting rates (including differential rates) in a charging schedule, a charging authority must strike an appropriate balance between- (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.....'
12.5 Viability testing in the context of CIL concerns the 'effects' on development viability of the imposition of CIL. In striking an appropriate balance, the Council has taken into account the importance of the provision of infrastructure on the ability of the Council to deliver its Development Plan.
12.6 The test that will be applied to the proposed rates of CIL is set out in the CIL Guidance (within the PPG), putting greater emphasis on demonstrating how CIL will be used to deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.
'The levy is expected to have a positive economic effect on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.

This balance is at the centre of the charge-setting process. In meeting the regulatory requirements (see Regulation 14(1)), charging authorities should be able to show and explain how their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area.
As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in England (paragraphs 173 - 177), the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. The same principle applies in Wales.'

PPG ID: 25-009-20140612
12.7 The test is whether the sites and the scale of development identified in the Plan are subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens (when considered together) that their ability to be developed viably is threatened by CIL. The viability evidence has considered the full range of the Council's policy requirements, including the need for infrastructure funding and based on the mix of sites anticipated to come forward under the adopted Core Strategy and the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan that is currently subject to the examination into its soundness. The test is whether CIL threatens the Development Plan(s) as a whole. It is important to note that the CIL Regulation 14 is clear that the purpose of the viability testing is to establish 'the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area' rather than on specific sites.
12.8 This report has been prepared under the CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance contained within the PPG at the time of this report (November 2015). It will be necessary for the Council to continue to monitor any changes in the Regulations and Guidance as the CIL setting process continues to develop.

## CIL v s106

12.9 In Chapter 2 above, we have set out the restrictions on the use of s106 agreements. Whilst preparing the information about the infrastructure requirements for the larger sites the Council has taken this into consideration. Those infrastructure costs that could be met through s106 (as set out in Table 7.3 above) have been included in the modelling and viability appraisals . The strategic sites may put significant pressure on existing infrastructure, and improvements may be required which will not be sufficiently site specific to pass the tests for payments to be required through s106. These items will be funded through a range of other sources, including CIL.

## Infrastructure Delivery

12.10 Since the project started, the Council has continued to work with the County Council in its capacity as the Highways and Education Authority. Generally there is a preference for site
specific infrastructure, or infrastructure not constrained through the pooling restrictions set out in CIL Regulation 123, to be delivered through the s106 regime where appropriate. It is recognised that this may allow greater control over the timing of delivery, thus giving greater certainty to both the Council and the developer.

## Uncertain Market

12.11 Chapter 4 above includes a commentary on the residential property market and Chapter 5 a commentary on the non-residential markets. It was noted, that the current direction and state of the housing market has improved markedly over the life of this project but the future is uncertain.


Source: Table 4.1 above (Land Registry data)
12.12 Whilst the housing market has seen a recovery and there is considerable optimism in the non-residential sectors, there remain a number of uncertainties around the UK's relationship with Europe and the wider world economies. It is therefore appropriate to take a cautious approach when setting CIL and to ensure that the cumulative impact of policies does not result in a total policy burden that is close to the limit of viability.

## Neighbouring Authorities

12.13 There is no requirement to keep CIL rates consistent across Charging Authority boundaries, however it is a relevant factor to consider. It is also necessary to consider other neighbouring councils' approaches to s106 payments, infrastructure requirements and affordable housing (the affordable housing target in King's Lynn is less than most of its neighbours).

| Table 12.1 CIL rates of nearby authorities |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Residential CIL rate | Affordable Housing Threshold | Affordable housing requirement | Comments |
| Norwich | £75 <br> £65 Blocks of flats <br> 6 or more units | Sites of 5-9 dwellings <br> Sites of 10-15 <br> Sites of 16 or more | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 30 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ | NB Norwich still require social rent and not affordable rent which has a lower capitalised value. |
| South Norfolk | $\begin{aligned} & \text { £75 Zone A } \\ & £ 50 \text { Zone B } \end{aligned}$ | Sites of 5-9 dwellings Sites of 10-15 Sites of 16 or more | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 30 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Broadland | $\begin{aligned} & \text { £75 Zone A } \\ & £ 50 \text { Zone B } \end{aligned}$ | Sites of 5-9 dwellings Sites of 10-15 Sites of 16 or more | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 30 \% \\ & 33 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |
| North Norfolk | NO CIL | Principal and secondary settlements - 10 or more or .33ha <br> Service Villages -on schemes of 2 or more or 1ha. | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \% \\ & 50 \% \end{aligned}$ | Threshold temporary increased to 10 \% temp reduced to $20 \%$ for certain areas in the borough. |
| Breckland | No CIL | Thresholds of 5 rural areas Thresholds of 10 urban areas | 40\% |  |
| Gt Yarmouth | No CIL | Caister-on-Sea, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth North and Northern Rural - on 5 or more <br> Bradwell, Great Yarmouth South and South Quay, Gorleston West and South West Rural - on 5 or more Great Yarmouth Town Centre - on 15 or more | 20\% <br> $10 \%$ <br> $10 \%$ |  |
| Fenland | No CIL | Threshold of 5 across Borough on sites of 5-9 on sites of 10 or more | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & 25 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| South Holland | No CIL | On sites of 3 or more | 33\% |  |
| Waveney | £O Zone 1 Inner Lothing Flood zone <br> £45 Zone 2 Inner Lowestoft <br> £60 Zone 3 Outer Lowestoft, Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and surrounding rural areas) | Sites of 5-14 dwellings <br> 15 dwellings | 20\% until end of 2014 rising to 35\% from 2015 $35 \%$ unless inside the Lake Lothing Area Action Plan where $20 \%$ is sought. | From 2015 a 35\% provision will be sought on sites of 5 or more dwellings. |


|  | £150 Zone 4 <br> Reydon and <br> Southwold and <br> surrounding rural <br> areas) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| East Cambs | $£ 40$ Zone A <br>  <br> Soham <br> $£ 70$ Zone B Ely <br> $£ 90$ Zone c Rest <br> of district | Sites of 3 or more dwellings | Sites in south <br> of district <br> $40 \%$ <br> Sites in north <br> of district <br> $30 \%$ |  |
| Peterborough | $£ 110$ on sites <br> where no AH is <br> secured <br> $£ 75$ sites up to <br> 799 units where <br> AH being <br> provided <br> $£ 30$ on strategic <br> development sites <br> of 800 plus units <br> $£ 10$ on flat sites <br> with affordable <br> housing <br> $£ 50$ on flat sites <br> without affordable <br> housing | Sites of 15 or more <br> dwellings | $30 \%$ | NB Peterborough <br> still require social <br> rent and not <br> affordable rent <br> which has a lower <br> capitalised value. |

Source: KLWNBC

## S106 History

12.14 The Council has set out its past track record of collecting developer contributions (affordable housing and financial) under s106 separately to this report.

## Instalment Policy

12.15 At the start of this process the Council organised a consultation event (January 2013) with members of the development industry. The importance of allowing CIL to be paid through the life of a project was raised. The CIL Guidance sets out:

Regulation 70 (as amended by the 2012 and 2013 Regulations) provides for payment by instalment where an instalment policy is in place. Where no instalment policy is in place, payment is due in full at the end of 60 days after development commenced (see Regulation 7, and section 56(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, for the definition of 'commencement of development').

PPG Reference ID: 25-055-20140612
12.16 If an Instalment Policy is not adopted then payment is due in full at the end of 60 days after commencement. To require payment, particularly on large schemes in line with the above, could have a dramatic and serious impact on the delivery of projects. It is our firm recommendation that the Council introduces an Instalment Policy. Not to do so could put the Development Plan at serious risk.
12.17 The modelling in this study is on the basis that the Council does introduce an Instalment Policy that enables CIL to be paid, through the life of a project, in equal instalments. There are a range of alternative instalment policy structures that could be adopted such as the one set out below as an example. In any event any instalment policy should have a provision whereby, in all cases, the full balance is payable on occupation / opening of the development if this is earlier than the instalment dates set out in the table.

Table 12.2 Potential Instalment Policy

| CIL in £ | Number of Instalments | Total Timescale for Instalments | Payment Amounts | Payment Periods |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| up to $£ 6,000$ | 2 | 270 days (9 months) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 90\% | 270 days from commencement. |
| £6,001 to £30,000 | 3 | 365 days (1 year) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 45\% | 270 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 45\% | 365 days from commencement. |
| £30,001 to £150,000 | 3 | 548 days (18 months) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 45\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 45\% | 548 days from commencement. |
| £150,001 to £300,000 | 4 | 730 days (2 years) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 30\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 30\% | 548 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 30\% | 730 days from commencement. |
| £300,001 to £600,000 | 5 | 1095 days (3 years) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 23\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 23\% | 548 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 23\% | 730 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 21\% | 1095 days from commencement. |
| £600,001 to £1,200,000 | 6 | 1460 days (4 years) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 18\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 18\% | 548 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 18\% | 730 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 18\% | 1095 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 18\% | 1460 days from commencement. |
| £1,200,001 to £1,800,000 | 7 | 1825 days (5 years) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 548 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 730 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 1095 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 1460 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 15\% | 1825 days from commencement. |
| £1,800,001 and over | 8 | 2190 days (6 years) | 10\% | 60 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 365 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 548 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 730 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 1095 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 1460 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 13\% | 1825 days from commencement. |
|  |  |  | 12\% | 2190 days from commencement. |

Source: HDH 2015

## Viability Evidence - Rates and Zones

12.18 The PDCS included the following rates of CIL:

| Table 12.3 KLWN - PDCS rates of CIL |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Development Type | CIL |
| Residential - All areas excluding the un-parished area of King's Lynn | $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Residential - For the un-parished area of King's Lynn only | $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Sheltered / Retirement Housing (C3) - All areas excluding the un-parished <br> area of King's Lynn | $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Supermarkets, Retail Warehouse and Hotels | $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| All other chargeable development | $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |

Source: Document A - Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation - Schedule of rates (January 2015)
12.19 In this post-PDCS update we have drawn on the viability evidence set out in Chapters 10 and 11 above being based on the Detailed Policies and Sites Plan and adopted Core Strategy. This evidence has been prepared in line with the viability sections of the PPG, with the Harman Guidance and the RICS Guidance and having taken the comments of consultees into account. It is therefore an appropriate evidence base for the setting of CIL.
12.20 Through the CIL process, and taking into account all the matters set out above and engagement with elected members, it was decided that:
a. CIL is required to fund infrastructure. Having taken into account the other sources of finance there is a 'funding gap', and CIL could make a useful contribution to fund the infrastructure required to support the development set out in the adopted Core Strategy and emerging Detailed Policies and Sites Plan.
b. Affordable housing remains a Council priority but the Council also puts weight on the delivery of infrastructure.
c. The Council has been successful in securing capital funding for infrastructure but, in part due to the challenging levels of development proposed, there remains a significant 'funding gap'.
d. It would be preferable, if supported by evidence, to 'keep things simple' and not have multiple rates of CIL - although it was recognised that it was appropriate to have differential rates. It was agreed that a fine grained approach was not desirable.
e. CIL setting is a qualitative and a quantitative process. CIL is not calculated through a predetermined formula. The Council is required to 'strike' the balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL ... the ... cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, ... and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.

## Residential Development

12.21 Across the Borough there is a significant variance in viability and it is therefore appropriate to consider differential rates (in earlier work and policy development this has been recognised in the different affordable housing targets). In considering the rates we have considered four 'tests'.
a. The Residual Value compared with the 'EUV plus'. Does the Residual Value, having taken into account all the Council's policy requirements, exceed the viability threshold by an adequate margin?
b. The Additional Profit. What is the capacity to bear CIL?
c. $\quad$ CIL as a proportion of the Residual Value. By how much would land values fall as a result of the introduction of CIL?
d. CIL as a proportion of the total project value (or GDV). As a proportion of the overall project how much would CIL be?
12.22 When considering differential rates it is imperative that these are based on viability evidence. We have considered the larger sites individually due to their importance in delivering the Plan, and the remainder by the three residential price areas.

Core Strategy Full Policy Requirements
12.23 It is necessary to set CIL relative to the full national and local policy requirements. This is considered below, although it is important to note that the Government has made announcements with regard to the type of affordable housing developers may be asked to deliver and the thresholds for affordable housing. Both of these changes will have an impact on development viability and therefore the levels of CIL. In the following analysis it is assumed that affordable housing will be provided at $15 \%$ in King's Lynn (in the un-parished area) and $20 \%$ elsewhere and that it will be delivered as $70 \%$ Affordable Rent and $30 \%$ intermediate housing - on sites of 10 and over in King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton and sites of 5 or more elsewhere.
12.24 We recommend a zero rate of CIL for Boal Quay, South of Parkway, Bankside, West Winch and Wisbech Fringe as, when assessed against the requirements of the Plan and having taken the s106 costs into account, the Residual Value, without additional CIL, does not exceed the Viability Threshold (see Table 10.4a).
12.25 We also recommend a zero rate for the, East of Lynn Rd site. Whilst the Residual Value does exceed the Viability Threshold it is only by a very small margin.
12.26 On the Lynn Sport site the Residual Value exceeds the Viability Threshold by 35\%. The Additional Profit assessment (Table 10.3a) indicates a maximum capacity to bear CIL of about $£ 74 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. This site is viable when subject to CIL at the rates put forward in the PDCS ( $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) so it would not be appropriate to set a differential rate.
12.27 On the Hall Lane site the Residual Value exceeds the Viability Threshold by $60 \%$. The Additional Profit assessment (Table 10.3a) indicates a maximum capacity to bear CIL of about $£ 177 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. This site is viable when subject to CIL at the rates put forward in the PDCS ( $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) so it would not be appropriate to set a differential rate.
12.28 The remaining strategic site to consider is Knights Hill. This lies within the proposed $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ zone. When modelled with CIL at this level the Residual Value is about $50 \%$ above the Viability Threshold. The Additional Profit assessment (Table 10.3a) indicates a maximum
capacity to bear CIL of about $£ 170 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. This site is viable when subject to CIL at the rates put forward in the PDCS $\left(£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$ so it would not be appropriate to set a differential rate.
12.29 Across the remaining areas the common characteristic of the analysis is that the brownfield sites are less viable than greenfield sites having substantially lower Residual Values. Having said this it is important to set this in context, outside the unparished area of King's Lynn, the vast majority of the land supply is greenfield land.
12.30 Across the higher value areas of the North East and East area of the Borough, and in the West and South of the Borough the Residual Value is well in excess of the Residual Value (at least $30 \%$ ) at the proposed CIL rate of $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$. Within the North East and East area of the Borough, CIL set at this level is likely to result in a fall in land values of between $9 \%$ and $17 \%$ which we believe is reasonable, however in the lower value South and West area the fall would be in the range of $19 \%$ to $27 \%$ (Table 10.5b) which could (if the precedent of the GNDP CIL is followed) cause landowners to be hold back from making land available for development. In this area we suggest a lower rate of $£ 40 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ which would result in a fall in land values in the $12 \%$ to $16 \%$ range (Table 10.5c) - and very much in line with higher value area.
12.31 CIL set at $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ and $£ 40 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in the North East and East area and the South and West area, respectively would represent less than $2.5 \%$ (Tables 10.6 b \& 10.6c) of the total development value. This is a small proportion and unlikely to impact on the flow of development coming forward.
12.32 The PDCS put forward a rate of $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ in the remaining unparished area of King's Lynn. Leaving aside the larger sites considered above the majority of development in this area will be on brownfield sites. The viability evidence indicates that these are unlikely to be viable, even without affordable housing. These findings are different to the Council's experience through the Development Management process where officers report that brownfield sites are delivering affordable housing. This is probably as a result of the generally cautious set of assumptions used in this report, and the fact that different landowners and developers will take different approaches to competitive return and when they will (and will not) release land (for example it may have a lower 'book' value than the viability threshold).
12.33 When setting CIL the judgement is whether or not introduction of the Levy would threaten development. CIL at $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ would be less than $0.5 \%$ of a scheme's value and it is unlikely to be a significant factor in determining whether or not a scheme may or may not come forward, although it may, on occasion, be 'the straw that breaks the camel's back' in terms of viability. On balance, we recommend CIL at this rate is maintained in this area.
12.34 Earlier in this report we have discussed the introduction of a national affordable housing threshold. The threshold that was cancelled as a result of the Reading and the West Berkshire judicial review. Affordable housing was only to be asked for on sites over 10 units (ie only on sites of 11 units and over), although a commuted sum in lieu of affordable housing was to be permitted on sites of 6 to 10 units. The analysis includes several smaller sites (typologies 5 and 8 are 7 units, typologies 6 and 9 are two units and typology 10 is a
single plot). It is necessary to consider whether or not a higher rate of CIL should be introduced for these sites in the event of these thresholds being re-introduced.
12.35 Tables $10.4 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b} \& \mathrm{c}$ include the analysis without affordable housing. As would be expected the results are improved, but as the Council's affordable housing requirement is relatively low ( $15 \%$ and $20 \%$ ) when considered against the requirements of other councils the difference is relatively modest. We do not recommended a deferential rates for the smaller sites in the event of the national thresholds being reinstated.
12.36 Towards the end of Chapter 10, the viability of Older People's Housing was considered. Bearing in mind the Council's affordable housing policy, there is not scope to introduce CIL in this sector. We recommend a zero rate.
12.37 In summary, the following rates of CIL are recommended for residential development under the scenario where the affordable housing policies set out in the adopted Core Strategy apply.

Table 12.4 Residential Development, Recommended rates of CIL
Affordable Housing requirements of 15\% in King's Lynn (in the un-parished area) and 20\% elsewhere and that it will be delivered as 70\% Affordable Rent and 30\% intermediate housing - on sites of 10 and over in King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton, and sites of 5 or more elsewhere

December 2015

|  | CIL |
| :--- | :---: |
| North East and East areas of the Borough <br> (East of the Great Ouse and north of A1122/A134) | $£ 60 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| South and West of the Borough <br> (West of the Great Ouse and south of A1122/A134, including Downham <br> Market) | $£ 40 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| King's Lynn unparished area | $£ 10 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Sheltered / Retirement Housing (C3) - All areas | $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Strategic sites at Boal Quay, South of Parkway, Bankside, West <br> Winch, East of Lynn Rd, Wisbech Fringe, (all others should have the <br> rate that applies to the area in which it is situated) | $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |

Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update December 2015

## Affordable Housing as Shared Equity

12.38 The emerging changes to national affordable housing policy (including Starter Homes) are set out and discussed in Chapter 2 above. These changes will impact on viability; however, the impact is going to be positive rather than negative. In KLWN, CIL is being set against the current policy framework (rather than one that may apply in the future). It is therefore not appropriate (or necessary) to test the impact of these changes.

## Non-Residential Development

12.39 The evidence does not support the introduction of CIL on the principle employment uses of office and industrial uses (Tables 11.1 to 11.4 above). It is therefore not appropriate to include these uses within CIL.
12.40 In the retail sector, the viability evidence does support the introduction of CIL for supermarket uses (including the discount format) and retail warehousing but not for town centre shops.
12.41 As set out in Chapter 11 above, when considering the results for the larger format retail uses it is important to consider where such development may come forward over the plan period. Little larger format supermarket development is anticipated as the area is generally well provided for and there has been a recent expansion in the sector to the south of King's Lynn in the last few years. The smaller format supermarkets could come forward more widely, on both greenfield and brownfield sites in the Main Towns of Downham Market and Hunstanton. On this basis we confirm the advice at the PDCS stage of a CIL rate of $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for supermarkets.
12.42 Little large format retail warehouse is anticipated. Substantial growth in this sector has taken place in recent years to the south of King's Lynn and there is limited scope for further development. Having said this if such development was to come forward it is only likely to occur in and around King's Lynn. On this basis we confirm the advice at the PDCS stage of a CIL rate of $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ for retail warehouse development. The analysis does show that retail warehousing is unlikely to be viable in the south of the Borough or on brownfield sites in the north - however little, if any such development is anticipated in those areas.
12.43 Through considering the requirements for infrastructure, and the Council's desire to see development coming forward, it is recommended that CIL should be set at the following rates.

| Table 12.6 Non-Residential Development, Recommended Rates of CIL |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| December 2015 |  |
| Retail Development |  |
| Supermarkets (including discount supermarkets) | $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Retail warehouses | $£ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| All other retail development | $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |

Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update December 2015
12.44 CIL would not be applied to other types of development.

## 13. Conclusions

13.1 As set out earlier in this report, the purpose of the viability evidence is not to set CIL, rather being to assess the effect of CIL on viability, so that an assessment can be made to ensure that CIL does not threaten delivery of the Core Strategy and the emerging Detailed Policies and Site Plan as a whole.
13.2 In the previous chapter we have set out the proposed rates of CIL. These are brought together below in the context of sites delivering affordable housing and other policy requirements within the Plan, as well as infrastructure provision. The recommendations are made based on the full policy requirements as set out in the adopted Core Strategy and the emerging Detailed Policies and Site Plan.

## Table 13.1 Recommended rates of CIL

Affordable Housing requirements of $15 \%$ in King's Lynn (in the un-parished area) and $20 \%$ elsewhere and that it will be delivered as $70 \%$ Affordable Rent and $30 \%$ intermediate housing - on sites of 10 and over in King's Lynn, Downham Market and Hunstanton and sites of 5 or more elsewhere

December 2015

|  | CIL |
| :---: | :---: |
| North East and East areas of the Borough (East of the Great Ouse and north of A1122/A134) | £60/m ${ }^{2}$ |
| South and West of the Borough <br> (West of the Great Ouse and south of A1122/A134, including Downham Market) | £40/m ${ }^{2}$ |
| King's Lynn unparished area | £10/m ${ }^{2}$ |
| Sheltered / Retirement Housing (C3) - All areas | £ $0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Strategic sites at: <br> - Boal Quay, Kings Lynn <br> - South of Parkway, Kings Lynn <br> - Bankside, West Lynn <br> - West Winch strategic growth area <br> - East of Lynn Rd, Downham Market. <br> - Wisbech Fringe, Walsoken <br> (all others should have the rate that applies to the area in which it is situated) | £ $0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |
| Retail Development <br> Supermarkets (including discount supermarkets) Retail warehouses <br> All other retail development | $\begin{gathered} £ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2} \\ £ 100 / \mathrm{m}^{2} \\ £ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2} \end{gathered}$ |
| All other Development | £ $0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ |

Source: KLWN Post PDCS CIL Viability Update November 2015
13.3 The areas are summarised on the following map and detailed in Appendix 9 below.

Figure 13.1 KLWN Proposed CIL Charging Zones


Community Infrastructure Levy
$£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ Charging Zone Maps are attached sepeartely following this map to illustrate these sites

## Charging Zone Maps



## Charging Zones

Strategic Site: Boal Quay (E1.5), King's Lynn


Strategic Site: South of Parkway, King's Lynn
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## Charging Zones

Strategic Site: East of Lynn Road, Downham Market
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Strategic Site: Wisbech Fringe, Walsoken
© Crown copyright and database rights 2015
Ordnance Survey 100024314
13.4 Based on the viability evidence set out in the earlier viability studies and in this CIL Viability Study, we confirm that CIL, when set at these rates, would not threaten delivery of the Plan as a whole.
13.5 Separately to this report the Council will set out how funds raised as CIL will be used to deliver the Plan, and how it will form an important source of funding for infrastructure.

## Appendix 1 - Newbuild Asking Prices

| Developer / Agent | Scheme | Place | Unit name / type | Beds | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline \text { Internal } \\ \text { Gargarge } \end{array}$ | Separate Gararge | $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline \text { number of } \\ \text { floors } \end{array}$ | House | Flat | Price | House | Flat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | m2 | m2 |  |  |  |
| William H Brown | Low er Farm | East Winch, Kings Lynn |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 450,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 435,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 399,000 |  |  |
|  | The Green | North Runcton, KL |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 375,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 310,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 325,000 |  |  |
|  | High Road | Tiliney cum Is lington |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 370,000 |  |  |
| Persimmon | Riverside Gardens | Wootton Rd KL | Charlbury X6 | 3 |  |  |  | 72.00 |  | 159,995 | £2,222 |  |
| Persimmon |  |  | Marlin | 2 |  |  |  | 49.00 |  | 135,995 | £2,775 |  |
| Persimmon |  |  | Monmouth X3 |  |  |  |  | 80.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Persimmon |  |  | MoretonX2 | 4 |  |  |  | 120.38 |  | 239,995 | £1,994 |  |
| persimmon | Martingales | John Davies Way, | Shetland | 2 |  |  |  |  | 71.10 | 135,000 |  | £1,899 |
| Taylor Wimpey | Kings Reach | KL | Aston | 3 | 1 |  |  | 119.25 |  | 159,995 | £1,342 |  |
| Taylor Wimpey |  |  | Delamere | 3 |  |  |  | 101.00 |  | 149,995 | £1,485 |  |
| Taylor Wimpey |  |  | Sherw ood | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 169,995 |  |  |
| Taylor Wimpey |  |  | Blackeney | 1 |  |  |  |  | 40.00 | 78,995 |  | £1,975 |
| Taylor Wimpey |  |  | Bure | 2 |  |  |  |  | 56.00 | 95,995 |  | £1,714 |
| Phoenix Agents | Magdalen Rd | Tiney St Law rence |  | 4 |  |  |  | 147.60 |  | 225,000 | £1,524 |  |
| Abbotts | Gayton Rd | Grimston |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 103.00 |  | 205,000 | £1,990 |  |
| William H Brown | Blackfriars Rd | King's Lynn | $\times 2$ | 3 |  |  |  |  | 79.30 | 169,950 |  | £2,143 |
| William H Brown |  | King's Lynn | $\times 4$ | 1 |  |  |  |  | 38.00 | 99,950 |  | £2,630 |
| William H Brown |  | King's Lynn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| William H Brown | Chapel Rd | Terrington St Clement   <br> Kings Lynn $12 \mathrm{~s} / \mathrm{d}$ coming soon  |  |  |  |  |  | 74.32 |  | 125,000 | £1,682 |  |
| Abbotts | Morleys Leet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| William H Brown | Willow Tree Close | Kings Lynn | $20 \mathrm{tand} \mathrm{s} / \mathrm{d}$ coming soon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| William H Brown | Nar Valley Park | Kings Lynn | coming soon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bennett Homes | Barleyfields | Watington | Henley | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 133.00 |  | 239,995 | £1,804 |  |
|  |  |  | Haughley | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 137.00 |  | 319,995 | £2,336 |  |
|  |  |  | Chelsw orthx ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 148.64 |  | 289,995 | £1,951 |  |
|  |  |  | Blingham | 3 |  |  | 2 | 95.69 |  | 179,995 | £1,881 |  |
|  |  |  | Langrick | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 174,995 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Langrick | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 164,995 |  |  |
| Bennett Homes | Hayfields phase 3 | Dow nham Market | Tuddenham | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 160.00 |  | 249,995 | £1,562 |  |
|  |  |  | Henley | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 133.00 |  | 234,995 | £1,767 |  |
|  |  |  | Langrick | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 77.00 |  | 174,995 | £2,273 |  |
|  |  |  | Fincham | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 70.00 |  | \#\#\#\#\#\#\#\# | £2,857 |  |
|  |  |  | Drayton | 2 |  |  | 1 | 60.00 |  | 189,995 | £3,167 |  |
|  |  |  | Thursford | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 224,995 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Risby | 2 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 225,995 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Boston | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 112.00 |  | 339,995 | £3,036 |  |
|  |  |  | Dersingham | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 117.06 |  | 324,995 | £2,776 |  |
|  |  |  | Burnham | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 136.00 |  | 264,995 | £1,948 |  |
|  |  |  | Kesw ick | 3 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 184,995 |  |  |
| Ben Bailey Homes | Willow Tree Park | Dow nham Market | Danbury | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 268,950 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Hanbury | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 100.00 |  | 249,950 | £2,500 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 249,995 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Hartlebury | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 249,995 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 3 | 150.00 |  | 236,995 | £1,580 |  |
|  |  |  | Dalton | 3 |  |  | 2 | 85.00 |  | 199,950 | £2,352 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 112.00 |  | 183,960 | £1,643 |  |
|  |  |  | carleton | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 182,950 |  |  |
| William H Brown | Southery | Dow nham Market | $\times 4$ | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 210,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 230,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 245,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 235,000 |  |  |
| William HBrown | Walpole Cross Key: | Kings Lynn |  | 4 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 225,000 |  |  |
|  | Walpole St Peter | Wisbech |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 250,000 |  |  |
|  | Honey Hill, Wimbots | Kings Lynn | $\times 7$ homes | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 280,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 285,000 |  |  |
| HC Moss / Abbotts | Carrstone Meadow | Dow nham Market | x97 | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 267,500 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 245,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 242,500 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 220,000 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 188,000 |  |  |
| Abbotts | Fen Lane | Marham | $\times 3$ | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 320,000 |  |  |
|  | Mill Lane | Marham | $\times 3$ | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 225,000 |  |  |
| Sow erby | Brancaster Staithe | Hunstanton | Lynw ood Hol | 5 |  | 1 | 2 | 418.06 |  | 2,695,000 | £6,446 |  |
|  |  | Thornham | Eden House | 5 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1,595,000 |  |  |
| William H Brown | Wiggenhall St Mary | Kings Lynn |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 600,000 |  |  |
|  | Tilney Cum Islington | Kings Lynn |  | 4 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 500,000 |  |  |
|  |  | Kings Lynn |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 425,000 |  |  |
|  |  | Kings Lynn |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 375,000 |  |  |
| House Tree | Margaretta Close, C | Kings Lynn |  | 3 | 1 |  | 1.5 |  |  | 219,950 |  |  |
| Willaim H Brown | Clenchw arton | Kings Lynn |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 155,000 |  |  |
| Sow erby | Foundry Field | Burnham Market | $\times 27$ homes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Docking | Brancaster |  | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 385,000 |  |  |
|  |  | Brancaster | Coach House | 4 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 370,000 |  |  |
| Chilterns | High St | Northw old | $\times 2$ | 4 | 1 |  | 2 | 195.38 |  | 350,000 | £1,791 |  |
| William HBrown | South Creake | Fakenham |  | 3 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 325,000 |  |  |
| William H Brown | Terrington St Cleme | Kings Lynn |  | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 133.00 |  | 310,000 | £2,331 |  |
|  |  | Kings Lynn |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 239,950 |  |  |
| Wilson \& Betts | Estuary Rd | Kings Lynn | $\times 6$ | 3 |  |  | 1.5 |  |  | 209,995 |  |  |
| William H Brown | Wootton Rd | Kings Lynn | $\times 3$ | 3 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 189,950 |  |  |

## Appendix 2 - Price Paid Data and EPC Floor areas

| Price paid | Deed date | Postcode | Property type |  | Street | Town | m2 | £/m2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £340,000 | 10/02/2015 | PE38 9WF | D | 61 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 125 | £2,720 |
| £225,000 | 30/03/2015 | PE38 9WF | D | 69 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET |  |  |
| £219,000 | 25/07/2014 | PE38 9WF | D | 92 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 115 | £1,904 |
| £250,000 | 19/12/2014 | PE38 9TQ | D | 28 | TINKERS WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 110 | £2,273 |
| £250,000 | 26/02/2015 | PE38 9TQ | D | 30 | TINKERS WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 93 | £2,688 |
| £250,000 | 22/12/2014 | PE38 9TQ | D | 33 | TINKERS WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 110 | £2,273 |
| £274,995 | 11/06/2014 | PE38 9TQ | D | 40 | TINKERS WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 102 | £2,696 |
| £220,000 | 10/04/2015 | PE38 9ST | D | 10 | WIMBLEDON WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 75 | £2,933 |
| £220,000 | 27/02/2015 | PE38 9ST | D | 3 | WIMBLEDON WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 75 | £2,933 |
| £240,000 | 27/02/2015 | PE38 9ST | D | 5 | WIMBLEDON WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 83 | £2,892 |
| £195,000 | 17/12/2014 | PE38 9ST | D | 8 | WIMBLEDON WAY | DOWNHAM MARKET | 56 | £3,482 |
| £243,000 | 18/06/2015 | PE38 9GW | D | 4 | FOXGLOVE COURT | DOWNHAM MARKET | 118 | £2,059 |
| £195,000 | 22/05/2015 | PE38 9GW | D | 6 | FOXGLOVE COURT | DOWNHAM MARKET | 96 | £2,031 |
| £209,995 | 24/03/2015 | PE38 9GU | D | 1 | FOAL LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET |  |  |
| £249,995 | 01/09/2014 | PE38 9GL | D | 1 | STALLION CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 131 | £1,908 |
| £266,000 | 17/04/2014 | PE38 9GL | D | 2 | STALLION CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 149 | £1,785 |
| £250,000 | 26/08/2014 | PE38 9GL | D | 3 | STALLION CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 125 | £2,000 |
| £270,000 | 28/05/2014 | PE38 9GL | D | 5 | STALLION CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 149 | £1,812 |
| £234,995 | 23/07/2014 | PE38 9GH | D | 160 | BENNETT STREET | DOWNHAM MARKET | 121 | £1,942 |
| £229,000 | 03/03/2014 | PE38 9GH | D | 162 | BENNETT STREET | DOWNHAM MARKET | 121 | £1,893 |
| £174,995 | 20/08/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 10 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 76 | £2,303 |
| £250,000 | 10/10/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 12 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 138 | £1,812 |
| £185,995 | 02/09/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 2 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 96 | £1,937 |
| £247,500 | 15/12/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 3 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 121 | £2,045 |
| £246,000 | 20/02/2015 | PE38 9GG | D | 5 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 138 | £1,783 |
| £215,000 | 07/03/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 8 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 115 | £1,870 |
| £169,995 | 26/09/2014 | PE38 9GG | D | 9 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 76 | £2,237 |
| £244,995 | 27/06/2014 | PE38 9ES | D | 7 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 118 | £2,076 |
| £150,000 | 09/05/2014 | PE38 0ED | D | 3 | NARROW BROOK | DOWNHAM MARKET | 124 | £1,210 |
| £252,000 | 17/04/2015 | PE38 0DX | D | COLLEGE FARM BARNS | WHIN COMMON ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET |  |  |
| £245,000 | 22/08/2014 | PE38 0BA | D | KING MILL HOUSE | DOWNHAM ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 139 | £1,763 |
| £210,000 | 25/07/2014 | PE38 0BA | D | POST MILL HOUSE | DOWNHAM ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 119 | £1,765 |
| £318,000 | 06/06/2014 | PE36 6HS | D | 40 | OLD HUNSTANTON ROAD | HUNSTANTON | 106 | £3,000 |
| £630,000 | 08/08/2014 | PE36 6GA | D | 9 | SANDRINGHAM GROVE | HUNSTANTON |  |  |
| £660,000 | 25/02/2015 | PE36 5LB | D | 10 | BURNHAM ROAD | HUNSTANTON | 219 | £3,014 |
| £625,000 | 25/02/2015 | PE36 5LB | D | 12 | BURNHAM ROAD | HUNSTANTON | 190 | £3,289 |
| £582,500 | 19/03/2015 | PE36 5LB | D | 14 | BURNHAM ROAD | HUNSTANTON | 193 | £3,018 |
| £630,000 | 24/06/2014 | PE36 5LB | D | 8 | BURNHAM ROAD | HUNSTANTON | 206 | £3,058 |
| £249,000 | 25/06/2014 | PE34 4QB | D | 1 | SCOTTGATE CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 103 | £2,417 |


| £249,000 | 30/01/2014 | PE34 4QB | D | 4 | SCOTTGATE CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 103 | £2,417 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £250,000 | 14/11/2014 | PE34 4ND | D | 28 | CHAPEL ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 151 | £1,656 |
| £325,000 | 26/03/2015 | PE34 4AT | D | 82 | HALL ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 205 | £1,585 |
| £320,000 | 27/03/2015 | PE34 4AT | D | 84 | HALL ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 205 | £1,561 |
| £362,500 | 14/11/2014 | PE33 9JG | D | 9 | FEN LANE | KING'S LYNN | 145 | £2,500 |
| £165,000 | 06/03/2015 | PE33 9HZ | D | 3 | CHURCH LANE | KING'S LYNN | 90 | £1,833 |
| £425,000 | 14/11/2014 | PE33 9ET | D | PLOT 2 FAIRSWELL MANOR | MAIN ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £499,995 | 05/05/2015 | PE33 0QR | D | 59 | NEW ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 309 | £1,618 |
| £290,000 | 28/05/2015 | PE33 0JR | D | 1 | WILLOW CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 201 | £1,443 |
| £289,995 | 05/02/2015 | PE33 0JD | D | 5 | BARLEY CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 149 | £1,946 |
| £333,445 | 16/12/2014 | PE33 OJD | D | 7 | BARLEY CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 158 | £2,110 |
| £207,000 | 18/07/2014 | PE33 0BF | D | 2 | IVY CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 143 | £1,448 |
| £300,000 | 26/02/2015 | PE32 2ET | D | 1 THE ORCHARD | THE STREET | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £165,000 | 28/08/2014 | PE32 2EA | D | PLOT 7 HIGH VIEW | THE STREET | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £130,000 | 30/10/2014 | PE32 2EA | D | PLOT 9 HIGH VIEW | THE STREET | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £470,000 | 09/04/2014 | PE32 2AE | D | BOUTELL HOUSE | STOCKS GREEN | KING'S LYNN | 172 | £2,733 |
| £585,000 | 30/04/2015 | PE31 8BT | D | SKYLARK | TOWN LANE | KING'S LYNN | 183 | £3,197 |
| £312,000 | 07/11/2014 | PE31 8AY | D | FOUNDRY COTTAGE | CHOSELEY ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 85 | £3,671 |
| £345,000 | 03/12/2014 | PE31 7JB | D | 2A | CHURCH FARM ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 158 | £2,184 |
| £249,995 | 15/08/2014 | PE31 7FA | D | LAVENDER BARN KING'S GARDEN, 28 | STATION ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £270,000 | 21/11/2014 | PE31 6TN | D | HALL VIEW | NETHERGATE STREET | KING'S LYNN | 106 | £2,547 |
| £230,000 | 05/12/2014 | PE316QH | D | 9B | ONEDIN CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 95 | £2,421 |
| £220,000 | 01/04/2015 | PE316QH | D | 9C | ONEDIN CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 95 | £2,316 |
| £225,000 | 26/11/2014 | PE316QH | D | 9D | ONEDIN CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 95 | £2,368 |
| £203,750 | 06/08/2014 | PE30 3PQ | D | 25 | CROFTERS CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 120 | £1,698 |
| £205,000 | 22/05/2015 | PE30 3EE | D | 2B | REFFLEY LANE | KING'S LYNN | 61 | £3,361 |
| £139,000 | 31/07/2014 | PE38 9ES | F | 15 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 78 | £1,782 |
| £142,950 | 31/01/2014 | PE38 9ES | F | 5 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 78 | £1,833 |
| £182,000 | 09/03/2015 | PE36 6AP | F | FLAT 4, 28 | NORTHGATE | HUNSTANTON | 78 | £2,333 |
| £84,000 | 01/08/2014 | PE30 4WL | F | 3 | BRIDGE PLACE | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £98,000 | 07/05/2014 | PE30 4WL | F | 4 | BRIDGE PLACE | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £109,000 | 09/04/2014 | PE30 4WJ | F | 1 | BRIDGE PLACE | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £79,995 | 19/05/2014 | PE30 4EJ | F | 13 | CLEMENT ATTLEE WAY | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £97,995 | 19/05/2014 | PE30 4EJ | F | 13 | CLEMENT ATTLEE WAY | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £104,995 | 21/05/2014 | PE30 4EJ | F | 13 | CLEMENT ATTLEE WAY | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £169,995 | 19/12/2014 | PE38 9WF | S | 79 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,429 |
| £183,490 | 28/11/2014 | PE38 9WF | S | 85 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,621 |
| £169,995 | 15/12/2014 | PE38 9WF | S | 87 | GRIMSHOE ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,429 |
| £210,000 | 16/07/2014 | PE38 9TY | S | 1 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 109 | £1,927 |
| £215,000 | 20/02/2015 | PE38 9TY | S | 2 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 123 | £1,748 |
| £215,000 | 19/08/2014 | PE38 9TY | S | 4 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 123 | £1,748 |
| £208,000 | 13/03/2015 | PE38 9TY | S | 5 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 123 | £1,691 |
| £210,000 | 23/07/2014 | PE38 9TY | S | 6 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 109 | £1,927 |
| £202,500 | 24/01/2014 | PE38 9RN | S | 2A | PARK LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 111 | £1,824 |
| £210,000 | 31/01/2014 | PE38 9RN | S | 2B | PARK LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 111 | £1,892 |


| £164,950 | 17/10/2014 | PE38 9GG | S | 11 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,356 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £164,995 | 29/08/2014 | PE38 9GG | S | 13 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,357 |
| £160,000 | 25/04/2014 | PE38 9GG | S | 4 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 70 | £2,286 |
| £179,995 | 19/12/2014 | PE38 9EY | S | 2 | HEATHER COURT | DOWNHAM MARKET | 93 | £1,935 |
| £220,000 | 29/08/2014 | PE38 9EU | S | 18 | PRIMROSE AVENUE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 121 | £1,818 |
| £250,000 | 12/12/2014 | PE38 9EU | S | 30 | PRIMROSE AVENUE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 138 | £1,812 |
| £250,000 | 22/05/2014 | PE38 9EU | S | 36 | PRIMROSE AVENUE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 138 | £1,812 |
| £224,995 | 30/05/2014 | PE38 9EU | S | 38 | PRIMROSE AVENUE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 114 | £1,974 |
| £179,995 | 26/09/2014 | PE38 9ES | S | 19 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 87 | £2,069 |
| £170,996 | 10/10/2014 | PE38 9ES | S | 21 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 87 | £1,965 |
| £170,000 | 27/06/2014 | PE38 9EF | S | 12 | BRICKFIELDS LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 87 | £1,954 |
| £170,000 | 27/06/2014 | PE38 9EF | S | 14 | BRICKFIELDS LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 87 | £1,954 |
| £145,000 | 17/04/2014 | PE33 9HP | S | 6 | PRIORY TERRACE | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £160,000 | 30/01/2015 | PE33 0JR | S | 2 | WILLOW CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 101 | £1,584 |
| £163,000 | 25/03/2015 | PE33 0JR | S | 3 | WILLOW CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 101 | £1,614 |
| £165,000 | 08/05/2015 | PE33 0JR | S | 5 | WILLOW CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 101 | £1,634 |
| £239,995 | 18/08/2014 | PE33 0JD | S | 1 | BARLEY CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 115 | £2,087 |
| £184,995 | 19/12/2014 | PE33 0HW | S | 16 | GLEBE AVENUE | KING'S LYNN | 96 | £1,927 |
| £184,995 | 30/04/2015 | PE33 0HW | S | 18 | GLEBE AVENUE | KING'S LYNN | 96 | £1,927 |
| £268,000 | 29/07/2014 | PE32 1RB | S | 2 | HALL FARM ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 139 | £1,928 |
| £260,000 | 24/01/2014 | PE31 8SN | S | THE LINNETS | COMMON END | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £750,000 | 22/04/2014 | PE31 8GG | S | MANOR FARM BARNS | MAIN ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £810,000 | 10/07/2014 | PE31 8FN | S | 10 | POWELLS YARD | KING'S LYNN | 221 | £3,665 |
| £375,000 | 23/06/2014 | PE31 7NG | S | PARK FARM BARNS | BIRCHAM ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £370,000 | 27/02/2014 | PE31 7NG | S | PARK FARM BARNS | BIRCHAM ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £235,000 | 03/03/2014 | PE31 7JT | S | 33 | HALL CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 117 | £2,009 |
| £180,000 | 31/10/2014 | PE31 6LA | S | 68C | LYNN ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £125,000 | 11/04/2014 | PE30 5NQ | S | 1A | SILFIELD TERRACE | KING'S LYNN | 75 | £1,667 |
| £122,500 | 07/04/2014 | PE30 5NQ | S | 1B | SILFIELD TERRACE | KING'S LYNN | 75 | £1,633 |
| £131,000 | 11/07/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 62 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,899 |
| £125,000 | 04/03/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 64 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,812 |
| £122,000 | 01/07/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 72 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,768 |
| £121,000 | 19/05/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 75 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,754 |
| £127,000 | 17/10/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 77 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,841 |
| £127,500 | 20/05/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 83 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,848 |
| £127,500 | 20/05/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 85 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,848 |
| £127,500 | 07/07/2014 | PE30 5GE | S | 87 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,848 |
| £147,500 | 27/01/2014 | PE30 5GD | S | 1 | WHALERS FARROW | KING'S LYNN | 90 | £1,639 |
| £160,000 | 30/03/2015 | PE30 5DN | S | 85 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 90 | £1,778 |
| £175,000 | 13/02/2015 | PE30 5DH | S | 78 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 136 | £1,287 |
| £190,000 | 03/10/2014 | PE30 4AT | S | 2A | KENSINGTON ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 105 | £1,810 |
| £164,000 | 13/06/2014 | PE30 3DP | S | 49 | SPENSER ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 86 | £1,907 |
| £495,000 | 29/09/2014 | PE30 1ET | S | 15 | KING STREET | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £206,000 | 16/01/2015 | PE38 9TY | T | 3 | RUSSELL CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 123 | £1,675 |
| £169,500 | 01/04/2015 | PE38 9GU | T | 2 | FOAL LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 76 | £2,230 |


| £168,000 | 10/04/2015 | PE38 9GU | T | 6 | FOAL LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 76 | £2,211 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £128,000 | 09/05/2014 | PE38 9GR | T | 13 | PIEBALD CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 59 | £2,169 |
| £125,000 | 07/03/2014 | PE38 9GR | T | 15 | PIEBALD CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 59 | £2,119 |
| £125,000 | 14/02/2014 | PE38 9GR | T | 3 | PIEBALD CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 59 | £2,119 |
| £125,000 | 10/01/2014 | PE38 9GR | T | 7 | PIEBALD CLOSE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 59 | £2,119 |
| £160,000 | 12/02/2015 | PE38 9GG | T | 19 | PALOMINO DRIVE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 76 | £2,105 |
| £216,000 | 13/06/2014 | PE38 9EU | T | 16 | PRIMROSE AVENUE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 121 | £1,785 |
| £190,000 | 21/11/2014 | PE38 9ET | T | RIVERSIDE VIEWS | FAIRFIELD ROAD | DOWNHAM MARKET |  |  |
| £143,995 | 29/08/2014 | PE38 9ES | T | 13 | DAISY LANE | DOWNHAM MARKET | 78 | £1,846 |
| £127,500 | 31/10/2014 | PE38 0BL | T | CHURCH COTTAGES | HIGH STREET | DOWNHAM MARKET |  |  |
| £410,000 | 11/07/2014 | PE36 6LZ | T | TEAL HOUSE | HIGH STREET | HUNSTANTON |  |  |
| £427,500 | 14/07/2014 | PE36 6LZ | T | TERN COTTAGE | HIGH STREET | HUNSTANTON | 116 | £3,685 |
| £62,500 | 29/08/2014 | PE34 3NQ | T | 5 | WALLFLOWER LANE | KING'S LYNN | 81 | £772 |
| £135,000 | 14/05/2014 | PE33 9JY | T | 3 | BELL CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 88 | £1,534 |
| £610,000 | 07/08/2014 | PE31 8FN | T | 5 | POWELLS YARD | KING'S LYNN | 178 | £3,427 |
| £762,500 | 21/07/2014 | PE31 8FN | T | 6 | POWELLS YARD | KING'S LYNN | 230 | £3,315 |
| £655,000 | 27/06/2014 | PE31 7NG | T | PARK FARM BARNS | BIRCHAM ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £193,000 | 13/08/2014 | PE31 7JX | T | COTTAGE 2 LAVENDER BARN | HUNSTANTON ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £193,000 | 19/08/2014 | PE31 7JX | T | COTTAGE 5 LAVENDER BARN | HUNSTANTON ROAD | KING'S LYNN |  |  |
| £198,000 | 12/05/2014 | PE31 7JT | T | 32 | HALL CLOSE | KING'S LYNN | 99 | £2,000 |
| £340,000 | 02/05/2014 | PE31 7FA | T | 1 | KING'S GARDENS | KING'S LYNN | 143 | £2,378 |
| £140,500 | 26/02/2014 | PE30 5GE | T | 60 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 90 | £1,561 |
| £130,000 | 28/02/2014 | PE30 5GE | T | 76 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,884 |
| £127,500 | 08/08/2014 | PE30 5GE | T | 81 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,848 |
| £135,000 | 04/08/2014 | PE30 5GE | T | 89 | MORLEYS LEET | KING'S LYNN | 69 | £1,957 |
| £172,000 | 15/05/2015 | PE30 5EA | T | 3 | HERON LANE | KING'S LYNN | 142 | £1,211 |
| £173,000 | 04/03/2015 | PE30 5EA | T | 9 | HERON LANE | KING'S LYNN | 139 | £1,245 |
| £145,000 | 06/03/2015 | PE30 5DN | T | 91 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 94 | £1,543 |
| £143,000 | 11/03/2015 | PE30 5DN | T | 93 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 94 | £1,521 |
| £145,000 | 07/05/2015 | PE30 5DN | T | 95 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 94 | £1,543 |
| £172,500 | 08/05/2015 | PE30 5DH | T | 60 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 139 | £1,241 |
| £167,500 | 20/05/2015 | PE30 5DH | T | 62 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 142 | £1,180 |
| £170,000 | 01/05/2015 | PE30 5DH | T | 64 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 142 | £1,197 |
| £155,000 | 01/04/2015 | PE30 5DH | T | 98 | SANDPIPER WAY | KING'S LYNN | 94 | £1,649 |
| £174,995 | 14/03/2014 | PE30 4HB | T | 1 | WILSON CRESCENT | KING'S LYNN | 128 | £1,367 |
| £162,995 | 20/03/2014 | PE30 4HB | T | 2 | WILSON CRESCENT | KING'S LYNN | 128 | £1,273 |
| £156,000 | 28/03/2014 | PE30 4HB | T | 3 | WILSON CRESCENT | KING'S LYNN | 128 | £1,219 |
| £169,995 | 25/07/2014 | PE30 4HB | T | 5 | WILSON CRESCENT | KING'S LYNN | 128 | £1,328 |
| £160,000 | 10/04/2014 | PE30 4HB | T | 6 | WILSON CRESCENT | KING'S LYNN | 128 | £1,250 |
| £130,000 | 27/06/2014 | PE30 4GU | T | 107 | ANTHONY NOLAN ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 70 | £1,857 |
| £149,995 | 19/05/2014 | PE30 4GJ | T | 212 | ANTHONY NOLAN ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 102 | £1,471 |
| £159,995 | 20/06/2014 | PE30 4GJ | T | 218 | ANTHONY NOLAN ROAD | KING'S LYNN | 107 | £1,495 |

## Appendix 3 - CoStar Non-Residential Data

Deals Asking Rent Per SF Achieved Rent Per SF Avg. Months On Market

## LEASE COMPARABLES



## SUMMARY STATISTICS

| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 46 | $£ 0.73$ | $£ 3.62$ | $£ 5.01$ | $£ 40.72$ |
| Achieved Rent Per SF | 21 | $£ 2.77$ | $£ 4.28$ | $£ 5.00$ | $£ 7.14$ |
| Net Effective Rent Per SF | 2 | $£ 5.33$ | $£ 5.55$ | $£ 5.75$ | $£ 6.16$ |
| Asking Rent Discount | 19 | $-6.6 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $33.4 \%$ |
| Rent Free Months | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 44 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 31 |
| Deal Size | 48 | 221 | 5,690 | 2,919 | 52,169 |
| Lease Deal in Years | 30 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 10.0 |
| Floor Number | 35 | GRND | GRND | GRND | MEZZ |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

| Property Name - Address |  | Rating | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| 1 | Hardwick Industrial Estate Rollesby Rd |  | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 4,688 | GRND,M | 01/06/2015 | New | £3.41 | Asking |
| 2 | Wallington Hall Lynn Road | $t * * * *$ | 221 | GRND | 01/05/2015 | New | £40.72 | Asking |
| 3 | 31 Wanton Ln | $t * * * *$ | 3,083 | GRND | 02/04/2015 | New | $£ 5.83$ | Asking |
| 4 | Roys Farm Winch Road | $t * * * *$ | 2,100 | GRND | 06/03/2015 | New | $£ 7.14$ | Achieved |
| (5) | Barn 5 <br> Park Farm | $t * * * *$ | 1,250 | GRND | 01/03/2015 | New | £1.60 | Asking |
| (6) | Barn 2 <br> Park Farm | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 5,632 | GRND | 01/03/2015 | New | £1.59 | Asking |
| 7 | Car Shop ARM Garage Ln | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,434 | GRND | 17/02/2015 | New | $£ 5.17$ | Asking |
| 8 | Park Farm | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 5,470 | GRND | 01/12/2014 | New | $£ 0.73$ | Asking |
| 9 | Park Farm | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 3,015 | GRND | 01/12/2014 | New | £1.74 | Asking |
| 10 | 38 Scania Way | $\star * * * *$ | 9,540 | GRND | 01/11/2014 | New | £5.66/fri | Achieved |
| 3 | 31 Wanton Ln | $\star * * * *$ | 3,083 | GRND | 01/11/2014 | New | £5.84/fri | Asking |
| 11 | New Hamlin Way @ Hamli... | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,932 | GRND,1 | 30/09/2014 | New | £3.41/fri | Achieved |
| 12 | 47a Bergen Way | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,747 | GRND | 26/08/2014 | New | £5.46/fri | Asking |
| 43 | 15 Common Rd | $\star * * * *$ | 15,488 | GRND | 28/05/2014 | New | £2.00 | Asking |
| 44 | The Vehicle Workshop \& Tr... Bergen Way | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,368 | GRND,1 | 14/04/2014 | New | £3.51 | Asking |
| 15 | Sovereign Way | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,500 | GRND | 04/11/2013 | New | £5.33/fri | Effective |
| 16 | Former Hyundai Premises Bergen Way | $t * * * *$ | 5,911 | GRND | 03/11/2013 | New | £4.22 | Asking |
| 17 | The Old Dairy Units Austin Fields | $t * * * *$ | 1,115 | GRND | 02/10/2013 | New | $£ 5.56$ | Achieved |
| 17 | The Old Dairy Units Austin Fields | $t * * * *$ | 1,216 | GRND | 01/10/2013 | New | $£ 5.75$ | Asking |
| 18 | Factory/Warehouse Oldmeadow Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 52,169 | GRND,1 | 01/08/2013 | New | £2.11/fri | Asking |
| 17 | The Old Dairy Units Austin Fields | $t * * * *$ | 536 | GRND | 17/12/2012 | New | $£ 6.16$ | Effective |

CoStar

|  |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Name - Address |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| $19$ | Jaeger <br> Bergen Way | $t * * t *$ | 43,649 | GRND,1 | 26/11/2012 | Renewal | £3.47 | Achieved |
| $20$ | 1 Westgate St | $t * t * *$ | 3,820 | GRND | 27/09/2012 | New | £3.23/fri | Asking |
| 20 | 1 Westgate St | $t * t * *$ | 658 | 1st | 27/09/2012 | New | £3.23/fri | Asking |
| 21 | Bergen Way | $t * * * *$ | 5,463 | GRND | 14/06/2012 | New | £4.57/fri | Achieved |
| $22$ | 24 Hamlin Way | $t * * * *$ | 4,632 | GRND,M $\ldots$ | 02/05/2012 | New | £3.89 | Asking |
| 15 | Sovereign Way | $t * * t *$ | 1,500 | GRND | 23/03/2012 | New | £5.00/fri | Achieved |
| (23) | Acer Rd | $t * * * *$ | 2,490 | Unkwn | 01/03/2012 | New | £4.82/fri | Achieved |
| 24 | Bergen Way | $t * * * *$ | 2,654 | Unkwn | 09/11/2011 | New | £4.52 | Achieved |
| (25) | Bergen Way | $t * * * *$ | 4,367 | Unkwn | 09/11/2011 | New | £4.81 | Achieved |
| $26$ | Sovereign Way | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 3,943 | GRND | 01/07/2011 | New | £3.33 | Achieved |
| 15 | Sovereign Way | $\star * * * *$ | 1,000 | GRND | 11/03/2011 | New | $£ 6.00$ | Achieved |
| $27$ | Denney Rd | $t * * * *$ | 4,351 | Unkwn | 01/02/2011 | New | £4.60/fri | Asking |
| 28 | Utility Savings Centre Choseley Rd | $t * * t *$ | 1,082 | Unkwn | 01/12/2010 | New | £2.77 | Achieved |
| (29) | last building on the left side Larch Rd | $t * * * *$ | 29,230 | Unkwn | 26/11/2010 | New | £2.65/fri | Asking |
| 15 | Sovereign Way | $t * * * *$ | 1,500 | Unkwn | 01/11/2010 | New | $£ 5.33$ | Achieved |
| 30 | Enterprise Way | $\star * * * *$ | 4,200 | Unkwn | 01/10/2010 | New | £5.95/fri | Asking |
| $17$ | The Old Dairy Units Austin Fields | $t * * t *$ | 717 | Unkwn | 01/09/2010 | New | £5.58/fri | Asking |
| (31) | Victory Court <br> Bryggen Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,660 | GRND,M | 01/09/2010 | New | £6.02/fri | Asking |
| $(31$ | Victory Court Bryggen Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,660 | GRND,M | 01/09/2010 | New | £6.02/fri | Asking |
| (31) | Victory Court <br> Bryggen Rd | $t \rightarrow t * *$ | 1,660 | GRND,M | 01/09/2010 | New | £6.02/fri | Asking |
| 32 | 19 Denney Rd | $t * * * *$ | 6,376 | GRND,1, | 01/09/2010 | New | £4.31/fri | Asking |

CoStar ${ }^{\text {² }}$

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

| Property Name - Address |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| $33$ | Clenchwarton Rd | $\star * * * *$ | 1,395 | Unkwn | 26/08/2010 | New | £5.16/iro | Asking |
| 15 | Sovereign Way | $t * * * *$ | 1,500 | Unkwn | 30/06/2010 | New | £4.00 | Achieved |
| 34 | East Coast Business Park Clenchwarton Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 3,875 | Unkwn | 01/06/2010 | New | £5.25/iri | Achieved |
| $34$ | East Coast Business Park Clenchwarton Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,906 | GRND,M | 01/06/2010 | New | £5.50/iri | Achieved |
| $34$ | East Coast Business Park Clenchwarton Rd | $t * * t *$ | 4,840 | GRND,M | 01/06/2010 | New | £5.00/iri | Achieved |
| $35$ | Nelson Business Centre <br> Edward Benefer Way | $t * * t *$ | 6,496 | Unkwn | 01/06/2010 | New | £4.23 | Achieved |

## Lease Comparables

Rollesby Rd - Hardwick Industrial Estate

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.3\% | $\downarrow$ 2.3\% |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | \ 4.1\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | £3.41 |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.23 | $\downarrow$ 5.0\% |
| Market Overall | £3.50 | 4 10.4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 55,059 | $\downarrow 11.1 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 19.4 | 410.5 |

## LEASE

| SF Leased: | 4,688 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, MEZZ Floor |


| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Jun 2015 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 5 May 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 25 Jun 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 1 Mo |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574
Barker Storey Matthews
150 High St
Huntingdon, PE29 3HT
Matthew Hunt 01480451578

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 16,780 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Oct 2008 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 15,056 SF |
| Construction: | Reinforced Concrete | Ceiling Height: | 16'4" |
| Parking: | 20 Surface Spaces ar... | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,688 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(435.5 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground floor industrial/warehouse space within Unit 4. Barker Storey Matthews and Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. Deal confirmed by Barker Storey Matthews.

## Lease Comparables

Lynn Rd - Wallington Hall<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.3\% | † $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | - $4.1 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 40.72$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.23 | $\downarrow 5.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.50 | $410.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 55,059 | - 11.1\% |
| Months On Market | 19.4 | 410.5 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 221 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

LEASE TERM
Start Date: May 2015

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Apr 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 10 Jun 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 221 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Status: | Suilt 1860 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 221 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $221 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(20.53 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of retail space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 8,999.12$ pa equating to $£ 40.72$ psf ( $£ 438.33 \mathrm{psf}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 40.72 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Mar 2015 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 May 2015 |
| Months Vacant: | 2 Months |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 31 Wanton Ln

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - $100 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.3\% | - $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | - $4.1 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.83$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.23 | - 5.0\% |
| Market Overall | £3.50 | 4 10.4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 55,059 | - $11.1 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 19.4 | 410.5 |


| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF Leased: | 3,083 SF | Asking Rent: £5.83/SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2015 |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |
| Start Date: | Apr 2015 |  |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 1 Apr 2015 |
| Date Off Market: | 6 May 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 1 Mo |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 2 Apr 2015

## LEASING REP

Geoffrey Collings \& Co
50 Marshland St
Terrington St Clement, PE34 4NE
Yvonne Hart 01553828012

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 3,083 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Dec 2011 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 3,083 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Land Acres: 0.30 |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $3,083 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(286.42 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 17,973.89$ pa equating to $£ 5.83 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 62.75 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Winch Rd - Roys Farm<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



## MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 100\% | A 100\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 4.1\% | - $0.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | - $4.9 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £8.33 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.24 | $\downarrow 3.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.45 | 4 6.8\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43,643 | - $29.5 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 16.3 | 47.3 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Ultimate Workforce Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Business Services |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,100 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 8.33 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 7.14 / \mathrm{SF}$ |


| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| :--- |
| Asking Discount: $14.29 \%$ |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Mar 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Feb 2018 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 9 Feb 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 2 Apr 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jan 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 6 Mar 2015 |
| Months Vacant: | 2 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |
| :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built 1950 |
| Tenancy: | Single |
| Construction: | Steel |


| NIA: | $2,100 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stories: | 1 |
| Floor Size: | $2,100 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Vacancy at Lease: | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

LEASE NOTES
Ultimate Workforce Ltd has taken $2,100 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(195} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m)} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{industrial} \mathrm{space} \mathrm{from} \mathrm{TW} \mathrm{Suiter} \mathrm{and}$ Son Limited on a three year lease at $£ 15,000$ pa. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 17,493$ pa equating to $£ 8.33$ psf ( $£ 89.70 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Michelle Jackson at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Park Farm - Barn 5
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


LEASE

| SF Leased: | 1,250 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Mar 2015

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 20 Jan 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 2 Apr 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 3 Mos |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566
MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 100\% | A 100\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 4.1\% | - $0.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | - $4.9 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £1.60 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.24 | $\downarrow 3.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.45 | 4 $6.8 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43,643 | $\downarrow$ 29.5\% |
| Months On Market | 16.3 | 47.3 |

## LEASE NOTES

 by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 1.60 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 1,250 SF |
| Status: | Built 1960 | Stories: | 1 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 1,250 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $100 \%$ |

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,250 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(116 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting price was $£ 2,000$ pa equating to $£ 1.60 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 17.24 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed

## Lease Comparables

## Park Farm - Barn 2

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


## MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 100\% | A 100\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 4.1\% | - $0.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.8\% | - $4.9 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £1.59 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.24 | - $3.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.45 | 4 $6.8 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43,643 | - $29.5 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 16.3 | 47.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 5,632 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £1.59/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Mar 2015

| TIME ON MARKET |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 20 Jan 2015 | Date Vacated: | 1 Jan 2014 |
| Date Off Market: | 2 Apr 2015 | Date Occupied: | 1 Mar 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 3 Mos | Months Vacant: | 14 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 5,632 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built 1900 | Stories: | 1 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 5,632 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $100 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $5,632 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(523 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting price was $£ 8,954.88$ pa equating to $£ 1.59$ psf ( $£ 17.22 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## Garage Ln - Car Shop ARM

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $100 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $4.2 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.8 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.9 \%$ |
|  | 2015 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.17$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.18$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.45$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2015 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23.643 | $\searrow$ | $29.5 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 16.3 | $\uparrow$ | 7.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,434 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2015 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | Garage/Workshop, S... |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £5.17/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: No
Business Rates: £0.83/SF
Start Date: $\quad$ Feb 2015

| TIME ON MARKET |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 2 Oct 2013 | Date Vacated: | 1 Oct 2013 |
| Date Off Market: | 9 Mar 2015 | Date Occupied: | 17 Feb 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 17 Mos | Months Vacant: | 16 Months |

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 2,434 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 2,434 SF |
| Vacancy at Lease: 0.0\% |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,434 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(226 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of ground floor industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 12,583.78$ equating to $£ 5.17 \mathrm{psf}(£ 55.68 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Park Farm
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $100 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | $5.2 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.8 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 0.73$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.10$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | $£ 3.30$ | $\downarrow$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2.277 | $\downarrow$ | $66.5 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 32,277 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 14.6 | $\uparrow$ | 6.4 |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 5,470 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £0.73/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Dec 2014 |

Service Charge: No

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Date On Market: | 24 Oct 2012 |  | Dacated: | 1 Apr 2009 |
| Date Off Market: | 16 Jan 2015 |  | Date Occupied: | 1 Dec 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 27 Mos |  | Months Vacant: | 68 Months |

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 5,470 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 5,470 SF |
| Vacancy at Lease: 100\% |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $5,470 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(508.18 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from Fuller Consultancy Limited with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 3,993.10$ pa equating to $£ 0.73 \mathrm{psf}(£ 7.85 \mathrm{psm})$. Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Park Farm
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


## MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $100 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | $5.2 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.8 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 1.74$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.10$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | $£ 3.30$ | $\downarrow$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 22,277 | $\downarrow$ | $66.5 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 3.6 | $\uparrow$ | 6.4 |
| Months On Market | 14.6 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,015 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $\quad £ 1.74 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: } \quad \text { Dec } 2014}$

Service Charge: No

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 24 Oct 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 16 Jan 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 27 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Apr 2009 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Dec 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 68 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 3,015 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 3,015 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 100\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $3,015 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(280.10 \mathrm{sqm})$ of industrial space from Fuller Consultancy Limited with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 5,246.10$ pa equating to $£ 1.74$ psf ( $£ 18.72 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 38 Scania Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 4.2\% | 4 0.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.8\% | † $4.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.66$ | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.20 | $\downarrow$ 9.1\% |
| Market Overall | £3.30 | $\downarrow 3.8 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 32,277 | $\downarrow$ 66.5\% |
| Months On Market | 14.6 | 46.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 9,540 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

## LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2016 |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 27 Apr 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 16 Dec 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 32 Mos |

LEASING REP
Roche Chartered Surveyors
56-56A Thorpe Rd
Norwich, NR1 1RY
Graham Jones 01603756340

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 9,540 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 1970 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 9,540 SF |  |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $9,540 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(886.30 \mathrm{sqm}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Roche Chartered Surveyors acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 53,996.40$ pa equating to $£ 5.66$ psf ( $£ 60.92 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Roche Chartered Surveyors. The EPC is rated as: C.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 31 Wanton Ln

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 100\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 4.0\% | 4 0.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.8\% | - $4.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.84$ |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.25 | - 10.7\% |
| Market Overall | £3.30 | - $3.8 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2014 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 32,277 | - 66.5\% |
| Months On Market | 14.6 | 46.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,083 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Dec 2014 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 24 Oct 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 9 Mar 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 29 Mos |

PROPERTY


## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 3,083 sq ft ( 286.42 sq m ) of ground floor industrial space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was £18,004.72 equating to $£ 5.84 \mathrm{psf}(£ 62.86 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

New Hamlin Way @ Hamlin Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $84.3 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $4.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $5.9 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.9 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.24$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.27$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 28,767 | $\uparrow$ | $44.6 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 78.3 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 13.3 | $\uparrow$ | 2.2 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,932 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Sep 2014 |
| Expiry Date: | Sep 2017 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 4.35 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 3.41 / \mathrm{SF}$ |


| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Discount: | $21.61 \%$ |
| Rent Free Months: | 0 Months |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Aug 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 30 Sep 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 13 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 3,476 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 2,156 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 84.3\% |
| Parking: | 20 free Surface Space.. |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 2,932 sq ft (272.39 sq m) of ground and first-floor industrial space from Alan Mitchell Plasterers Ltd on a three-year FRI lease at $£ 10,000$ pa, equating to $£ 3.41$ psf ( $£ 36.71$ psm). There is no break or rent review agreed. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of Alan Mitchell Plasterers Ltd. No rent-free period was agreed. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 12,754.20$ pa, equating to $£ 4.35 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 46.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co. EPC Rating confirmed as D.

## Lease Comparables

47a Bergen Way
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Engage Norfolk Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Personal Services |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,747 SF |
| Sign Date: | Aug 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: $£ 5.46 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Buildout Status: $\quad$ Full Build-Out |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Sep 2014 |

Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 23 Oct 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 26 Aug 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Oct 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 25 Sep 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 11 Months |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market Pl
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 2,747 SF |  |
| Status: | Built Apr 2013 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 2,747 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

$\frac{\text { LEASE NOTES }}{\text { Engage Norfolk Ltd have taken } 2,747 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \text { of industrial accommodation at 47a Bergen Way from }}$ an unknown landlord on confidential lease terms. Alison Richardson at Brown \& co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 15,000$ per annum, equating to $£ 5.46 \mathrm{psf}$.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 15 Common Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.9 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $1.6 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 2.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.32$ | $\uparrow$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.17$ | $\downarrow$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21,911 | $\downarrow$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 61 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 8.9 | $\uparrow$ | 0.8 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Kings Lynn Storage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Agri/Mining/Utilities |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 15,488 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: $£ 2.00 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Buildout Status: $\quad$ Full Build-Out |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: } \quad \text { Aug } 2014}$

Service Charge: No
Business Rates: £0.66/SF

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 26 Aug 2014

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 27 Jan 2014 |
| Date Off Market: | 26 Aug 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

## LEASING REP

Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 15,488 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built 1980 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 15,488 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Kings Lynn Storage have taken 15,488 sq ft of industrial accommodation at 15 Common Road from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Alison Richardson at Brown \& co confirmed the deal. The quoting rent was $£ 30,976$ per annum, equating to $£ 2.00 \mathrm{psf}$.

Bergen Way - The Vehicle Workshop \& Training Centre
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $85.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.9 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.6 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 3.51$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.32$ | $\uparrow$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.17$ | $\downarrow$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21,911 | $\downarrow$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | $\mathbf{6 1}$ |  |  |
| Months On Market | 8.9 | $\uparrow$ | 0.8 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,368 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £3.51/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ May 2014 |

Service Charge: Withheld

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 6 Nov 2013 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 14 May 2014

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 7,017 SF |
| Status: | Built 1970 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 6,019 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken $1,368 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of industrial accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 4,800$ per annum equating to 3.51 psf. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow 19.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 4.0\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Market Overall | 9.0\% | † 0.6\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.00$ | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.52 | \ 0.8\% |
| Market Overall | £3.43 | $\downarrow 1.7 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 96,354 | A 115.0\% |
| Months On Market | 8.2 | 40.1 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | D\&H Signs Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Manufacturing |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,500 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2013 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 5.00 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 5.33 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Net Effective Rent: | $£ 5.33 / \mathrm{SF}$ |


| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| :--- |
| Asking Discount: $-6.60 \%$ |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | $£ 0.68 /$ SF |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 23 Dec 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 4 Dec 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 24 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Jul 2012 |
| Date Occupied: | 4 Nov 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 16 Months |

$\qquad$
Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partnership
42 Upper Berkeley St
London, W1H 5EP
Dan Roberts 02074087005

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 7,666 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 1995 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 7,440 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
D\&H Signs Ltd has taken $1,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 139 sq m ) of ground floor industrial space at Unit 1F from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partnership on a one-year lease at $£ 8,000$ pa, equating to $£ 5.33$ psf ( $£ 57.37 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partnership acted on their own behalf. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 5 \mathrm{psf}(£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Dan Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partnership.

## Lease Comparables

Bergen Way - Former Hyundai Premises
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $3.8 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $9.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 4.22$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.64$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.43$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.354 | $\uparrow$ | $115.0 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | $96,0.2$ | $\uparrow$ | 0.1 |
| Months On Market | 8.2 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 5,911 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2013 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Jan 2014 |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 31 Jul 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 11 Mar 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 2 Jan 2014

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 5,911 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Nov 2003 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 5,911 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 76 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |

An undisclosed tenant has taken $5,911 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(549.1 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of ground-floor showroom/workshop space on confidential terms. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 25,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 4.23$ psf ( $£ 45.53 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

Austin Fields - The Old Dairy Units

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 36.5\% | $\downarrow$ 8.4\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.8\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 9.0\% | - $0.6 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.66$ | - 6.6\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.64 | - 2.9\% |
| Market Overall | £3.43 | $\downarrow 1.7 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 96,354 | A 115.0\% |
| Months On Market | 8.2 | 40.1 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Pole Perfect Fitness |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Personal Services |  |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,115 SF | Asking Rent: | £5.56/SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2013 | Achieved Rent: | £5.56/SF |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | Asking Discount: | 0.00\% |
| Suite: | 2 | Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service Charge: | Withheld |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 2.62 /$ SF |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 30 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Nov 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 24 Months |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 6,387 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built May 1988 |  | Stories: | 1 |
|  | Fenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 6,387 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Pole Perfect Fitness has taken $1,115 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(103.59} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space (Unit 2) on a oneyear lease at $£ 6,200$ pa, equating to $£ 5.56 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 59.85 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to no rent reviews nor options to break (if the tenant did not obtain planning permission, there was an option for her to leave). Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 6,200$ pa, equating to $£ 5.56$ psf ( $£ 59.85 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Jane Cole at Pole Perfect Fitness.

## Lease Comparables

Austin Fields - The Old Dairy Units<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



| LEASE |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,216 SF |  |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2013 |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | GRND Floor |
| Floor: |  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |
| Start Date: | Nov 2013 |  |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: £5.75/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service Charge: | Withheld |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 2.71 /$ SF |



TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 30 Mos |


| Date Vacated: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Nov 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 24 Months |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574
MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 36.5\% | $\downarrow 8.4 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.8\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Market Overall | 9.0\% | † $0.6 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.66$ | † 6.6\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.64 | $\downarrow$ 2.9\% |
| Market Overall | £3.43 | $\downarrow 1.7 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 96,354 | A 115.0\% |
| Months On Market | 8.2 | 40.1 |


| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 6,387 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1988 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 6,387 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at | 36.5\% |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,216 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(112.97 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space (Unit 3) on a confidential lease. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 6,992 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.75 \mathrm{psf}(£ 61.89 \mathrm{psm})$. Confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

Oldmedow Rd - Factory/Warehouse
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $4.1 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.8 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.1 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 2.11$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.15$ | $\downarrow$ | $20.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.43$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 24,458 | $\uparrow$ | $26.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 54.1 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.7 |
| Months On Market | 11.1 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Jordan Fitness |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Personal Services |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 52,169 SF |
| Sign Date: | Aug 2013 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: $£ 2.11 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Buildout Status: $\quad$ Full Build-Out |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Aug 2013

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 0.82 /$ SF |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Date On Market: Vacated: | 28 Jan 2014 | 1 Dec 2012 |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 6 Aug 2014 |  | Date Occupied: | 1 Aug 2013 |
| Months on Market: 7 Mos |  | Months Vacant: | 8 Months |  |

LEASING REP
Roche Chartered Surveyors
56-56A Thorpe Rd
Norwich, NR1 1RY
Sam Kingston 01603756333

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 52,169 SF |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 49,852 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Ceiling Height: | 12'3" |
|  |  | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Land Acres: | 2.57 |

## LEASE NOTES

Jordan Fitness have taken $52,169 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(4,847 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of industrial space on confidential terms. Roche Chartered Surveyors acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 110,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to £2.11 psf (£22.69 psm).

## Lease Comparables

Austin Fields - The Old Dairy Units<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 44.9\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 3.8\% | - 0.7\% |
| Market Overall | 9.6\% | $40.7 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | £6.06 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.75 | A 10.0\% |
| Market Overall | £3.49 | - $4.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 44,813 | $\downarrow$ 8.1\% |
| Months On Market | 8.1 | † 5.1 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 536 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Expiry Date: | Dec 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Dec 2013 |

## RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 6.06 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 6.06 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Net Effective Rent: | $£ 6.16 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Escalations: | $£ 0.93$ Annual |

$\frac{\text { CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT }}{\text { Asking Discount } \quad 0.00 \%}$

Asking Discount: 0.00\%
Rent Free Months: 1 Month
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 15 Jan 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 14 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 14 Months |

## LEASING REP

## Russen \& Turner

17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 6,387 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1988 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 6,387 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 44.9\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 536 sqft ( 49.79 sqm ) of ground floor industrial space on a 3 year lease at $£ 3,250$ pa, equating to $£ 6.06 \mathrm{psf}$, subject to a tenant break option after year 1.1 month rent free period was agreed. Giles Stovold of Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was listed at $£ 3,250$ pa, equating to $£ 6.06$ psf. Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at $£ 3,250$ pa.

## Lease Comparables

Bergen Way - Jaeger
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


TENANT

| Tenant Name: | The Jaeger Company Limited |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF Leased: | 43,649 SF | Achieved Rent: | £3.47/SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2012 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  |  |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |  |  |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2022 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |
| Reviews: | Nov 2017 |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: $\quad 26$ Nov 2012

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 43,649 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 2000 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 37,096 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| - |  | Land Acres: | 4.50 |

LEASE NOTES
The space is let for 10 years from 26th November 2012 to The Jaeger Company's Shops Ltd at a passing rent of $£ 150,000$ pa ( $£ 3.47$ per sq ft) with a review in year five. The lease is guaranteed by Jaeger London Ltd and The Jaeger Company Ltd.

## Lease Comparables

## 1 Westgate St <br> Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - $15.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 4.3\% | $41.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 9.9\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £3.23 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.98 | A 19.2\% |
| Market Overall | £3.45 | $\downarrow 7.0 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 42,961 | $\downarrow$ 20.2\% |
| Months On Market | 10.4 | † 5.6 |

## LEASING REP

## Brown \& Co

27 King St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1ET

PROPERTY

## LEASE NOTES

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,820 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2012 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Oct 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £3.23/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 1.13 /$ SF |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 31 Jul 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 27 Sep 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 27 Oct 2012

Alison Richardson 01553770771

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 4,478 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Jul 1981 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 3,820 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,478 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(416.02 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord on confidential terms.

Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord.
The quoting rent was $£ 14,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 3.24 \mathrm{psf}(£ 34.85 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## 1 Westgate St <br> Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - $15.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 4.3\% | $41.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 9.9\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £3.23 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.98 | A 19.2\% |
| Market Overall | £3.45 | $\downarrow 7.0 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 42,961 | $\downarrow$ 20.2\% |
| Months On Market | 10.4 | † 5.6 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 658 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2012 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Sep 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Sep 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £3.23/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 6.54 /$ SF |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 31 Jul 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 27 Sep 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: $\quad 27$ Sep 2012

## LEASING REP

## Brown \& Co

27 King St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1ET
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 4,478 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Jul 1981 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 3,820 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,478 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(416.02 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord on confidential terms.

Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord.
The quoting rent was $£ 14,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 3.24 \mathrm{psf}(£ 34.85 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

Bergen Way
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $4.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $9.5 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.5 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 4.59$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.98$ | $\uparrow$ | $14.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.57$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 28,388 | $\searrow$ | $68.9 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 28.9 | $\downarrow$ | 4.2 |
| Months On Market | 10.9 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Norfolk Training Ser |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Business Services |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 5,463 SF | Asking Rent: £4.27/SF-£4.90/SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2012 | Achieved Rent: £4.57/SF |
| Space Use: | Industrial | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | Asking Discount: 0.33\% |

## LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Aug 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Aug 2017 |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 3 May 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 13 Jun 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 1 Mo |

Months on Market: 1 Mo

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 14,521 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1989 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 14,521 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
Norfolk Training Services Ltd has taken $5,463 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(507 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) within units 4 \& 5 from a private pension fund on a five year lease at $£ 25,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.57 \mathrm{psf}(£ 49.30 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. Norfolk Training Services were unrepresented. Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner.

## Lease Comparables

## 24 Hamlin Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


LEASE

| SF Leased: | 4,632 SF | Asking Rent: £3.89/SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sign Date: | May 2012 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Service Charge: No |
| Floor: | P GRND, P MEZZ Floor |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |
| Start Date: | Jun 2012 |  |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 24 Nov 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 18 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 24 Nov 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jun 2012 |
| Months Vacant: | 6 Months |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 4,632 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built May 1995 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 2,316 SF |  |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,632 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{( } 430 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of warehouse space on confidential terms. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord.

## Lease Comparables

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - 19.6\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 4.7\% | 4 1.6\% |
| Market Overall | 9.3\% | $41.7 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £5.00 | † 16.7\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.37 | $\downarrow$ 7.4\% |
| Market Overall | £3.54 | $\downarrow 7.3 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 24,271 | - 78.0\% |
| Months On Market | 12.0 | † 0.0 |


| Tenant Name: | Mat Smith Sports Cars |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,500 SF | Asking Rent: | £5.00/SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2012 | Achieved Rent: | £5.00/SF |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
|  |  | Asking Discount: | 0.00\% |
| LEASE TERM |  | Rent Free Months: | 2 Months |
| Start Date: | Mar 2012 |  |  |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2015 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years | Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Mar 2013, T... |  |  |
| TIME ON MARKET |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| Date On Market: | 1 Sep 2009 | Date Vacated: | 1 Apr 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 23 Mar 2012 | Date Occupied: | 23 Mar 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 30 Mos | Months Vacant: | 23 Months |

## LEASING REP

Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partner...
Waterside Dr, Suite 1A
Gateshead, NE11 9HU
Dan Roberts 02074087005

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 7,666 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built 1995 | Stories: | 1 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 7,440 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Mat Smith Sports Cars has taken 1,500 sq ft (139 sq m) industrial space from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership on a three year lease at $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 5.00$ psf ( $£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ), with an tenant only yearly option to break. Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership acted their own behalf. Two months rent-free period was agreed. Mat Smith Sports Cars were unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 5.00 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Dan Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership.

Energy Performance Certificate rating - F

## Lease Comparables

Acer Rd
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


LEASE

| SF Leased: | 2,490 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2012 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Mar 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Feb 2018 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Feb 2014, T... |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 10 Aug 2011 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Mar 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Mar 2012

## RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 5.02 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 4.82 / \mathrm{SF}$ |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 3.98\%

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 7,470 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Mar 1992 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 7,470 SF |  |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | $33.3 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

A private individual has taken $2,490 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(231.33 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space at Unit 1 on a sixyear lease at $£ 12,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.82 \mathrm{psf}(£ 51.87 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to a tenant option to break at the end of years two and three with six months prior notice. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 12,500$ pa, equating to $£ 5.02$ psf ( $£ 54.04 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Karen Appleton at Tawn Landles Estate Agents.

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $33.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $17.3 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $4.4 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $9.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.7 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.02$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.37$ | $\downarrow$ | $7.4 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.54$ | $\downarrow$ | $7.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 24,271 | $\downarrow$ | $78.0 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 24.0 | $\searrow$ | 0.0 |
| Months On Market | 12.0 |  |  |

## Lease Comparables

## Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 4.4\% | 4 2.9\% |
| Market Overall | 8.9\% | $41.6 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2011 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.65$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.41 | \ 6.8\% |
| Market Overall | £3.65 | $\downarrow 5.9 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2011 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 48,784 | $\downarrow 38.6 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 13.2 | 44.1 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Sharp Engineering |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 2,654 SF | Asking Rent: £5.65/SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2011 | Achieved Rent: £4.52/SF |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
|  |  | Asking Discount: 20.00\% |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2013 |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years |
| Breaks: | Mutual - Apr 2012 |


Date Off Market: 9 Nov 2011

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 10,543 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 2006 | Stories: | 1 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 10,543 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Sharp Engineering has taken 2,654 sq ft ( 246.56 sq m ) of industrial space in Unit 1 from an undisclosed landlord on a two year lease at $£ 12,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 4.52 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 48.67 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to an option to break after six months. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. Sharp Engineering was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 15,000$ pa, equating to $£ 5.65 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 60.84 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner.

## Lease Comparables

Bergen Way<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $4.4 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.9 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.6 \%$ |
|  | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.95$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.41$ | $\downarrow$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.65$ | $\downarrow$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20,784 | $\downarrow$ | $38.6 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 48,74 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 13.2 | $\mathbb{\uparrow}$ | 4.1 |

TENANT
Tenant Name: AMG Leisure

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 4,367 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2011 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: $\quad £ 5.95 / \mathrm{SF}$ |  |
| Achieved Rent: $\quad £ 4.81 / \mathrm{SF}$ |  |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $19.16 \%$ |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2017 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |
| Reviews: | Nov 2014 |


| TIME ON MARK |  | TIME VACANT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 24 Nov 2010 | Date Occupied: 9 Nov 2011 |

## Date Off Market: 9 Nov 2011

Months on Market: 12 Mos

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: |  |
| Status: | Built Jun 2008 |  |  |  |
| Tenancy: | Single | Stories: | 1 |  |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Floor Size: | 2,542 SF |
|  |  |  | Ceiling Height: | $19^{\prime}$ |

LEASE NOTES
AMG Leisure has taken $4,367 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(405.71 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space in Units 7\&8 from an undisclosed landlord on a six year lease at $£ 21,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.81 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 51.76 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to an option to break in year three. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord. AMG Leisure were unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 26,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.95 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 64.09 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner.

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $49.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $3.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $9.9 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.5 \%$ |
|  | 2011 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.34$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.71$ | $\downarrow$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2011 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23,831 | $\searrow$ | $18.4 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 53.0 | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ | 9.9 |
| Months On Market | 16.0 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Mr Richard Harvey |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LEASE |  |  |  |
| SF Leased: | 3,943 SF |  | RENTS |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2011 |  | Asking Rent: |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  | Achieved Rent: |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jul 2011 |
| Expiry Date: | Jun 2016 |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 29 Jul 2009 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jul 2011 |
| Months on Market: | 24 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 29 Jul 2010 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jul 2011 |
| Months Vacant: | 11 Months |

## LEASING REP

## Brown \& Co

Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 8,027 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Status: | Suilt 1995 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 8,027 SF |  |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |  |

LEASE NOTES
Mr Richard Harvey surrendered his lease in unit 2 B in order to take $3,943 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{( } 366 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space in units 2A-2B from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership on a five-year lease at $£ 13,143 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 3.33$. psf ( $£ 35.88 \mathrm{psm}$ ) in year one, rising to $£ 17,444 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 4.42 \mathrm{psf}(£ 47.62 \mathrm{psm}$ ) in year three, rising to $£ 19,715$ pa, equating to $£ 5.00 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ) in year four, rising to $£ 20,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.07 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 54.60 \mathrm{psm}$ ) in year five. No breaks or reviews were incorporated in the lease. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership. No rent-free period was agreed. Mr Richard Harvey was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 19,715$ pa, equating to $£ 5.00 \mathrm{psf}(£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Daniel Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership.

## Lease Comparables

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 19.6\% | A 19.6\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 3.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.6\% | $40.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2011 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £6.00 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £3.64 | $\downarrow$ 9.5\% |
| Market Overall | £3.82 | $\downarrow 5.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2011 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 110,114 | - |
| Months On Market | 12.1 | 410.5 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Electra-Mek Limited |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Agri/Mining/Utilities |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,000 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2011 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | Unit 1A |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 6.00 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 6.00 /$ SF |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Mar 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2012 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 11 Mar 2011

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market Pl
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 7,666 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 1995 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 7,440 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 19.6\% |

## LEASE NOTES

Electra-Mek Limited has taken $1,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(93 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space in Unit 1A from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership on a one-year lease at $£ 6,000$ pa, equating to $£ 6,00 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.58 \mathrm{psm})$. There were no rent reviews or breaks incorporated in the lease. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership. No rent-free period was agreed. Electra-Mek Limited was unrepresented. The quoting rent was 6,000 pa, equating to $£ 6,00 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.58 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Dan Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership.

## Lease Comparables

## Denney Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.7 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.6 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
|  | 2011 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 4.60$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.64$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.82$ | $\downarrow$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2011 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 210,114 | - |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 110.1 | $\uparrow$ | 10.5 |
| Months On Market | 12.1 |  |  |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 4,351 SF | Asking Rent: | £4.60/SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2011 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor | Service: | Fully Rep |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Feb 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Jan 2012 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |


| TIME ON MARKE |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 20 Jul 2010 | Date Occupied: | 1 Feb 2011 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Feb 2011 |  |  |
| Months on Marke | 7 Mos |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 14,157 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1991 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 8,000 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |
| Parking: | 20 free Surface Space.. |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,351 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(404 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord on a one-year lease under confidential terms. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 20,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.60$ psf ( $£ 49.48 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Choseley Rd - Utility Savings Centre
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ 32.6\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 1.6\% | - $4.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.4\% | † $0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.66 | $\downarrow$ 27.5\% |
| Market Overall | £3.88 | $\downarrow$ 4.9\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 79,477 | - |
| Months On Market | 9.1 | † 3.9 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Mr Paul Ramshaw |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Engineers/Architects |


| LEASE |  |  | RENTS |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,082 SF |  |  |  |  |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2010 |  |  |  |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |  |  |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |  |  |  |  |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Dec 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2011 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Dec 2010

PROPERTY


LEASE NOTES
Mr Paul Ramshaw trading as Rammy's Scaffolding has taken $1,082 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(100.52 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord on a one year licence at $£ 3,000$ pa, equating to £2.77 psf ( $£ 29.84 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

Larch Rd - last building on the left side
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


LEASE
RENTS


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ - ${ }^{\text {d }}$. $5 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 1.6\% | $\downarrow 4.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.4\% | † 0.8\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | £2.65 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.66 | $\downarrow$ 27.5\% |
| Market Overall | £3.88 | $\downarrow$ 4.9\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 79,477 | - |
| Months On Market | 9.1 | † 3.9 |


| SF Leased: | 29,230 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

Asking Rent: £2.65/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| SF Leased: | 29,230 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 19 Jul 2010 |  |  |  |
| Date Occupied: | 30 Nov 2010 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 4 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP

## Brown \& Co

Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 29,230 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Mar 1974 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 31,023 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 30 free Surface Space.. | Land Acres: | 1.30 |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 29,230 sq ft (2,716 sq m) of industrial space from an undisclosed landlord for an undisclosed rent. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 77,459.50$ pa, equating to $£ 2.65 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 28.52 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal information confirmed by Stuart Hemeter at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $19.6 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $19.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $1.6 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.33$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| Current Building | $£ 3.66$ | $\downarrow$ | $27.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.88$ | $\searrow$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 29,477 |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 79.1 | $\searrow$ | 3.9 |
| Months On Market | 9 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: Solar Vision Ltd |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| LEASE | RENTS |
| SF Leased: 1,500 SF | Asking Rent: £5.33/SF |
| Sign Date: Nov 2010 | Achieved Rent: £5.33/SF |
| Space Use: Industrial | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Floor: Unkwn Floor |  |
|  | Asking Discount: 0.00\% |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Nov 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2013 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 8 Sep 2010 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Nov 2010 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partner...
Waterside Dr, Suite 1A
Gateshead, NE11 9HU
Dan Roberts 02074087005

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 7,666 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 1995 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 7,440 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 19.6\% |

LEASE NOTES
Solar Vision Ltd has taken $1,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(139.35 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within Unit 1F from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership on a three-year lease at $£ 8,000$ pa, equating to $£ 5.33 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 57.41 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership represented themselves.
There was no rent-free period agreed. Solar Vision Ltd was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 8,000$ pa, equating to $£ 5.33 \mathrm{psf}(£ 57.41 \mathrm{psm})$. Achieved rent confirmed by Dan Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership.

## Lease Comparables

## Enterprise Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 4,200 SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: £5.95/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...
$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Lease Term: } \quad 3 \text { Years }}$

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 11 Feb 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Oct 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 8 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Dec 2008 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Oct 2010 |
| Months Vacant: | 22 Months |

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

MARKET AT LEASE

|  | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacancy Rate | $0.0 \%$ | $\rightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Current Building | $1.6 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $7.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
|  | $£ 5.95$ |  | - |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 3.66$ | $\downarrow$ | $27.5 \%$ |
| Current Building | $£ 3.88$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star |  |  |  |
| Market Overall | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
|  | 79,477 |  | - |
| Submarket Leasing Activity |  |  |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 9.1 | $\searrow$ | 3.9 |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 4,200 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Dec 2008 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 4,200 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,200 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(390.19 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within unit 1 on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 25,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.95 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.07 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

Austin Fields - The Old Dairy Units<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 2.0\% | † $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $40.3 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.58$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.70 | $\downarrow$ 26.7\% |
| Market Overall | £3.86 | $\downarrow 6.3 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66,009 | - |
| Months On Market | 6.1 | † 6.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 717 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: 10 Feb 2010 |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| Date Occupied: 1 Oct 2010 |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 6,387 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1988 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 6,387 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $717 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(66.61 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within unit 4 on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 4,000$ pa, equating to $£ 5.57 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 60.05 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

## Bryggen Rd - Victory Court

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,660 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | E GRND, E MEZZ Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 11 Feb 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Oct 2010

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $100 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $68.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 6.02$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.70$ | $\downarrow$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.86$ | $\downarrow$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,009 |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66 | 6.1 | $\searrow$ |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 2,880 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 2008 |  | Stories: | 2 |
|  | Floor Size: | 1,440 SF |  |  |
| Conancy: | Multi | Vacancy at Lease: | $100 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,660 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 154.21 sq m ) of industrial space within unit 3 on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 6.02 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.84 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## Bryggen Rd - Victory Court

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,660 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | E GRND, E MEZZ Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 11 Feb 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Oct 2010

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $100 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $68.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 6.02$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.70$ | $\downarrow$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.86$ | $\downarrow$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,009 |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66 | 6.1 | $\searrow$ |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 2,880 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 2008 |  | Stories: | 2 |
|  | Floor Size: | 1,440 SF |  |  |
| Conancy: | Multi | Vacancy at Lease: | $100 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,660 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(154.21 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within unit 4 on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 6.02 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.84 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## Bryggen Rd - Victory Court

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,660 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | E GRND, E MEZZ Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 11 Feb 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Oct 2010

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $100 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $68.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 6.02$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 3.70$ | $\downarrow$ | $26.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.86$ | $\downarrow$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,009 |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66 | 6.1 | $\searrow$ |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 2,880 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 2008 |  | Stories: | 2 |
|  | Floor Size: | 1,440 SF |  |  |
| Conancy: | Multi | Vacancy at Lease: | $100 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,660 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 154.21 sq m ) of industrial space within unit 5 on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agents acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 6.02 \mathrm{psf}(£ 64.84 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## 17 Denney Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 6,376 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | E GRND, E 1, E MEZ... |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £4.31/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 19 Apr 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos |

$\frac{\text { TIME VACANT }}{\text { Date Occupied: } \quad 1 \text { Oct } 2010}$

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 2.0\% | † $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $40.3 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £4.31 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.70 | $\downarrow$ 26.7\% |
| Market Overall | £3.86 | $\downarrow 6.3 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66,009 | - |
| Months On Market | 6.1 | † 6.3 |

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 25,160 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Mar 1998 | Stories: | 4 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 6,290 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 11 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |
| LEASE NOTES |  |  |  |
| An undisclosed confidential term rent was $£ 27,50$ | nt has taken $6,376 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ (5 Tawn Landles Estate Agent quating to $£ 4.31$ psf ( $£ 46.43$ | 34 sq m ) of Industri acted on behalf of the sm). | space with landlord. |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Clenchwarton Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 2.0\% | - $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $40.3 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.16$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £3.70 | $\downarrow$ 26.7\% |
| Market Overall | £3.86 | $\downarrow 6.3 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 66,009 | - |
| Months On Market | 6.1 | $\downarrow 6.3$ |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 1,395 SF | Asking Rent: | £5.16/SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sign Date: | Aug 2010 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor | Service: | Internal Repairing O... |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Aug 2010 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £5.16/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 26 Jul 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 26 Aug 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 1 Mo |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 26 Aug 2010

LEASING REP
East Coast Business Park

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial |  | NIA: | 13,945 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Dec 1996 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 13,945 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,395 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(130 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within unit 22 from East Coast Business Park on confidential deal terms. East Coast Business Park represented themselves. The quoting rent was $£ 7,200$ pa, equating to $£ 5.16 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 55.56 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Diana at East Coast Business Park.

## Lease Comparables

Sovereign Way
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $19.6 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $19.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $2.5 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.2 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 4.04$ | $\downarrow$ | $21.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 3.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - | - |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |  |
| Months On Market | 3.1 | $\searrow$ | 7.3 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Paul Hoskin Joinery |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 1,500 SF | Asking Rent: £5.00/SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2010 | Achieved Rent: £4.00/SF |
| Space Use: | Industrial | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |  |
|  |  | Asking Discount: 20.00\% |
| LEASE TERM |  | Rent Free Months: 2 Months |
| Start Date: | Jun 2010 |  |
| Expiry Date: | Jun 2011 |  |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |  |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 2 Sep 2009 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 30 Jun 2010 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 9 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partner...
Waterside Dr, Suite 1A
Gateshead, NE11 9HU
Dan Roberts 02074087005

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 7,666 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 1995 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 7,440 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at | 19.6\% |

LEASE NOTES
Paul Hoskin Joinery has taken $1,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(139.35 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space within Unit 1D from Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership on a one-year lease at $£ 6,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.00 \mathrm{psf}(£ 43.06 \mathrm{psm})$. There were no break options or rent reviews within the lease. Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership represented themselves. Two months rent-free period was agreed. The quoting rent was $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 5 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Dan Roberts at Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited Partnership.

## Lease Comparables

## Clenchwarton Rd - East Coast Business Park

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 67.1\% | $\downarrow$ 32.9\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 2.5\% | $\downarrow 1.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $41.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 5.16$ | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £4.04 | $\downarrow 21.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.85 | $\downarrow 9.0 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | 3.1 | † 7.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SF Leased: | 3,875 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 5.25 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 5.25 / \mathrm{SF}$ |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Internal Repairing \& ...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jun 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Oct 2008 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jul 2010 |
| Months Vacant: | 21 Months |

## LEASING REP

Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Goodman Property
56 The Lane
Cambridge, CB22 5HP
Johnny Goodman 01223873195

PROPERTY


## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $3,875 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(360 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space at Unit 39 East Coast Business Park at $£ 20,344$ per annum, equating to $£ 5.25$ psf ( $£ 56.51$ psm). East Coast Storage (Handling) Ltd pit through the transaction themselves. The quoting rent was £20,344 per annum, equating to $£ 5.25 \mathrm{psf}(£ 56.51 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

## Clenchwarton Rd - East Coast Business Park

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $67.1 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $32.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.5 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $1.2 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.16$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 4.04$ | $\downarrow$ | $21.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | $\searrow$ | 7.3 |
| Months On Market | 3.1 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,906 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | P GRND, P MEZZ Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 5.50 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 5.50 /$ SF |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $0.00 \%$ |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

Service: Internal Repairing \& ...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jun 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |

## LEASING REP

Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Goodman Property
56 The Lane
Cambridge, CB22 5HP
Johnny Goodman 01223873195

PROPERTY


## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,906 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(270 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space at Unit 37 East Coast Business Park at $£ 15,983$ per annum, equating to $£ 5.50$ psf ( $£ 59.20 \mathrm{psm}$ ). East Coast Storage (Handling) Ltd put through the transaction themselves. The quoting rent was $£ 15,983$ per annum, equating to $£ 5.50 \mathrm{psf}(£ 59.20 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## Clenchwarton Rd - East Coast Business Park

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $67.1 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $32.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $2.5 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.3 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $1.2 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 5.16$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 4.04$ | $\downarrow$ | $21.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 3.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | $\searrow$ | 7.3 |
| Months On Market | 3.1 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 4,840 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Space Use: | Industrial |
| Floor: | P GRND, P MEZZ Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 5.00 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 5.00 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $0.00 \%$ |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jun 2010 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

Service: Internal Repairing \& ...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jun 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |

## LEASING REP

Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Goodman Property
56 The Lane
Cambridge, CB22 5HP
Johnny Goodman 01223873195

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 17,324 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Oct 2008 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 15,304 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Ceiling Height: | 16'4"-19'8" |
| Vacancy at Lease: 67.1\% |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $4,840 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(450 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of industrial space at Unit 38 East Coast Business Park at $£ 24,200$ per annum, equating to $£ 5.00$ psf ( $£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm}$ ). East Coast Storage (Handling) Ltd put through the transaction themselves. The quoting rent was £24,200 per annum, equating to $£ 5.00 \mathrm{psf}(£ 53.82 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

Edward Benefer Way - Nelson Business Centre
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 6,496 SF |  |  |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2010 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Industrial |  |  |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |  |  |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 4.23 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 4.23 /$ SF |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%
$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: } \quad \text { Jun } 2010}$

Start Date: Jun 2010

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jun 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 16 Sep 2009 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jun 2010 |
| Months Vacant: | 8 Months |

LEASING REP
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - $78.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 2.5\% | - $1.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $41.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | £4.23 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £4.04 | - $21.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £3.85 | - 9.0\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | 3.1 | † 7.3 |

## PROPERTY



## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 6,496 sq ft ( 603 sq m ) of industrial space at Unit 41 North Lynn Industrial Estate at $£ 27,500$ per annum, equating to $£ 4.23$ psf ( $£ 45.57 \mathrm{psm}$ ). The landlord put through the transaction themselves. The quoting rent was $£ 27,500$ per annum, equating to £4.23 psf ( $£ 45.57 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

Rents



DEALS BY RENT FREE MONTHS
Lease Comparables

Lease Comparables

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent <br> Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $13$ | 47a Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Engage Norfolk Ltd | 2,747 <br> New Direct | Sep 2014 |  |  |  |
| $14$ | 15 Common Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3DL <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Kings Lynn Storage | 15,488 <br> New Direct | Aug 2014 |  | £0.66/SF |  |
|  | The Vehicle Workshop \& Training ... <br> Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | 1,368 <br> New Direct | May 2014 |  |  |  |


Lease Comparables


|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $25$ | Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Norfolk Training Services Ltd | $5,463$ <br> New Direct | Aug 2012 <br> 5 Years | £4.57/SF |  |  |
| $26$ | 24 Hamlin Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 4NG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | 4,632 <br> New Direct | Jun 2012 |  |  |  |


| $27 \square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sovereign Way <br> Downham Market, PE38 9SW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Mat Smith Sports Cars Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partn... | $\begin{aligned} & 1,500 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Mar 2012 <br> 3 Years | £5.00/SF | Spread Over T... Mar 2013... |
| $28$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Acer Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3HN <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,490 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Mar 2012 <br> 6 Years | £4.82/SF | Feb 2014... |
|  <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $30$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | AMG Leisure | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4,367 } \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Nov 2011 <br> 6 Years | £4.81/SF | Nov 2014 |
| Copyrighted report licensed to HDH Planning \& Development Ltd - 701359 . |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $31 \sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sovereign Way | Mr Richard Harvey | 3,943 | Jul 2011 | £3.33/SF |  |  |
|  | Downham Market, PE38 9SW King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Ashtenne Industrial Fund Limited ... | New | 5 Years |  |  |  |


| $32 \sim$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sovereign Way <br> Downham Market, PE38 9SW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Electra-Mek Limited <br> Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partn... | $1,000$ <br> New Direct | Mar 2011 <br> 1 Year | £6.00/SF |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Denney Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 4HG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | 4,351 <br> New | Feb 2011 <br> 1 Year |  |
| $34$ | Utility Savings Centre <br> Choseley Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE31 8LZ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Mr Paul Ramshaw | 1,082 <br> New | Dec 2010 <br> 1 Year | £2.77/SF |
| $35$ | last building on the left side <br> Larch Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3HW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $\begin{aligned} & 29,230 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| $36$ | Sovereign Way <br> Downham Market, PE38 9SW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Solar Vision Ltd <br> Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partn... | 1,500 <br> New | Nov 2010 <br> 3 Years | £5.33/SF |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant <br> Landlord | SF Leased <br> Type | StartDate <br> Term |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $43$ | Clenchwarton Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3LW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1,395 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Aug 2010 <br> 3 Years |  |  |  |
| $44$ | Sovereign Way <br> Downham Market, PE38 9SW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Paul Hoskin Joinery <br> Ashtenne Industrial Fund Ltd Partn... | 1,500 <br> New | Jun 2010 <br> 1 Year | £4.00/SF | Spread Over T... |  |
| $45$ | East Coast Business Park <br> Clenchwarton Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3LW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2,906 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Jun 2010 <br> 6 Years | £5.50/SF |  |  |
| $46$ | East Coast Business Park <br> Clenchwarton Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3LW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4,840 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Jun 2010 <br> 6 Years | £5.00/SF |  |  |


| 47 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | East Coast Business Park <br> Clenchwarton Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE34 3LW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | $\begin{aligned} & 3,875 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Jun 2010 <br> 6 Years | £5.25/SF |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Nelson Business Centre <br> Edward Benefer Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | $\begin{aligned} & 6,496 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Jun 2010 | £4.23/SF |

Deals Asking Rent Per SF Achieved Rent Per SF Avg. Months On Market

## LEASE COMPARABLES



## SUMMARY STATISTICS

| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 33 | $£ 4.34$ | $£ 9.44$ | $£ 10.00$ | $£ 15.00$ |
| Achieved Rent Per SF | 12 | $£ 2.50$ | $£ 4.80$ | $£ 7.98$ | $£ 12.59$ |
| Net Effective Rent Per SF | - | - | - | - | - |
| Asking Rent Discount | 9 | $-20.0 \%$ | $-0.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $62.7 \%$ |
| Rent Free Months | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 31 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 48 |
| Deal Size | 36 | 143 | 1,690 | 750 | 12,700 |
| Lease Deal in Years | 12 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 3.0 | 10.0 |
| Floor Number | 29 | GRND | GRND | GRND | 2 |


| Property Name - Address |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| 1 | 9-12 Bergen Way | $t \rightarrow t t *$ | 1,271 | GRND,1 | 01/04/2015 | New | £12.59/fri | Achieved |
| 2 | Nelson House <br> Edward Benefer Way | $t * * t *$ | 530 | 2nd | 01/09/2014 | New | £10.00 | Asking |
| 3 | St Nicholas Court 3 Church Ln | $t * * t *$ | 1,100 | GRND | 02/07/2014 | New | £12.50/fri | Asking |
| 4 | Offices Crossbank Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 146 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 10.00$ | Asking |
| $4$ | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd | $t * * t *$ | 143 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 10.00$ | Asking |
| 4 | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd | $t * * t$ | 324 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 10.00$ | Asking |
| 4. | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd | $t * * * *$ | 156 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 10.00$ | Asking |
| 5 | St Anns House St Anns St | $t * * t *$ | 475 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | £15.00 | Asking |
| $5$ | St Anns House St Anns St | $t \rightarrow t * *$ | 305 | 1st | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 13.11$ | Asking |
| 5 | St Anns House St Anns St | $t * * t *$ | 306 | 2nd | 14/04/2014 | New | £9.80 | Asking |
| 4 | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd | $t * * t *$ | 191 | GRND | 01/03/2014 | New | £10.00 | Asking |
| (6) | Bergen Way | $t * * t *$ | 666 | 1st | 18/02/2014 | New | £12.98 | Asking |
| 6 | Bergen Way | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 605 | GRND | 18/11/2013 | New | £12.98 | Asking |
| (7) | Bishops Lynn House 18 Tuesday Market PI | $t * * * *$ | 3,988 | 1st | 18/10/2013 | New | £8.27 | Achieved |
| (8) | Greyfriars Chambers 31A St James St | $t * * t *$ | 842 | 1st | 01/05/2013 | New | $£ 5.70$ | Asking |
| (9) | 2 King St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 848 | GRND,1 | 01/12/2012 | New | £14.74/fri | Asking |
| 10 | 21 Tuesday Market PI | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,662 | 2nd | 27/09/2012 | New | $£ 12.83$ | Asking |
| (11) | 4 Oldmedow Rd | $\star t \rightarrow t \rightarrow$ | 646 | 1st | 01/05/2012 | New | £9.29 | Achieved |
| 12 | 72 Westgate | $t * * t *$ | 586 | GRND | 18/04/2012 | New | £11.95/fri | Asking |
| (13) | 13 St James Ct | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 760 | 1st | 19/12/2011 | New | £3.68 | Achieved |
| 14 | 22-24 Blackfriars St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,151 | 1st | 14/10/2011 | New | £5.21/fri | Achieved |



## Lease Comparables

## 9-12 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $24.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $10.6 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $6.3 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.7 \%$ |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.55$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 9.80$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 5.025 | $\downarrow$ | $39.9 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | $5,0.1$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | 8.6 |
| Months On Market | 30.1 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Bourn Hall Limited |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Medical |  |  |  |
| LEASE |  |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,271 SF |  | Achieved Rent: | £12.59/SF |
|  | Sign Date: | Apr 2015 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Office/Medical |  | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |  |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |  | Service Charge: | £2.46/SF |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Jul 2015 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Jun 2025 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |
| Reviews: | Mar 2018, Mar 2021, $\ldots$ |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Jul 2015

## LEASING REP

Fifield Glyn Ltd
Gadbrook Rd
Northwich, CW9 7UD
Charles Fifield 01606351351

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 5,102 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Aug 2005 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 2,551 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 20 Surface Spac |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Bourn Hall Limited has taken 1,271 sq ft (118 sq m) of ground and first-floor office space from Osborne House Ltd on a 10 -year lease at $£ 16,000$ pa, equating to $£ 12.59$ psf ( $£ 135.59 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to thee-yearly rent reviews and an option to break in year five. Fifield Glyn Ltd acted on behalf of Osborne House Ltd. Achieved rent confirmed by Victoria Mead at Fifield Glyn Ltd. EPC Rating confirmed as: E .

## Lease Comparables

Edward Benefer Way - Nelson House
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 25.5\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 11.7\% | † 1.4\% |
| Market Overall | 7.5\% | $40.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2014 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £10.00 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £11.74 | A 11.2\% |
| Market Overall | $£ 9.55$ | $\downarrow 5.6 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2014 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo . Leased SF (Thous) | 10,911 | A 545.6\% |
| Months On Market | 23.1 | 43.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 530 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 2nd Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Sep 2014 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 12 Feb 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 30 Oct 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 15,214 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Jan 1976 | Stories: | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 5,071 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $25.5 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $530 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(49.23 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of second floor office space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Belton Duffey Limited acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 5,300$ pa equating to $£ 10$ psf ( $£ 107.65$ psm). Deal confirmed by Belton Duffey Limited. The EPC is rated as: C.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 3 Church Ln - St Nicholas Court

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.5 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 12.50$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.74$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.55$ | $\downarrow$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20,911 | $\uparrow$ | $545.6 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 10.1 | $\uparrow$ | 3.3 |
| Months On Market | 23.1 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,100 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £12.50/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Aug 2014 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 4.39 /$ SF |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Date On Market: 2 Aug 2012 |  | Date Occupied: 1 Aug 2014 |  |  |


| Date Off Market: | 2 Jul 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Months on Market: | 23 Mos |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 1,100 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Sep 1972 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 1,100 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 12 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |
| LEASE NOTES |  |  |  |
| An undisclosed from an unknow The quoting rent | nt has taken $1,100 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of ndlord on confidential term s $£ 13,750$, equating to $£ 12$ | ice accommodation Brown \& Co acted on psf. | t unit 3 S behalf of |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Crossbank Rd - Offices

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\searrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.358 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $301.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,35 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 146 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | 1 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.00/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 22 Dec 2011 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |  |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Ed Weightman 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1974 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,532 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 146 sq ft of office accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10.00 \mathrm{psf}$. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Crossbank Rd - Offices

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\searrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.358 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $301.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,35 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 143 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | 2 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.00/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 22 Dec 2011 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |  |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Ed Weightman 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1974 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,532 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 143 sq ft of office accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10.00 \mathrm{psf}$. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Crossbank Rd - Offices

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\searrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.358 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $301.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,35 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 324 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | $3 \& 4$ |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.00/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 22 Dec 2011 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |  |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Ed Weightman 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1974 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,532 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 324 sq ft of office accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10.00 \mathrm{psf}$. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Crossbank Rd - Offices

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\searrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.358 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $301.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,35 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 156 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | 6 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.00/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 22 Dec 2011 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |  |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Ed Weightman 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1974 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,532 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 156 sq ft of office accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey marketed the property on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 10.00 \mathrm{psf}$. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

## St Anns St - St Anns House

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $6.2 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $19.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 13.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,358 | $\mathbf{4} 301.8 \%$ |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 475 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | 5 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £15.00/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.60/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 12 Jun 2012 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 22 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 5,925 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 1,975 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $6.2 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 475 sq ft of office accommodation at unit 5 from a unknown landlord on confidential terms. Brown \& Co and Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 7,125$ per annum equating to $£ 15.00$ psf. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

## St Anns St - St Anns House

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $6.2 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $19.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 13.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,358 | $\mathbf{4} 301.8 \%$ |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 305 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |
| Suite: | 15 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 13.11 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.60/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 6 Nov 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 14 Apr 2014

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 5,925 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 1,975 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $6.2 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 305 sq ft of office accommodation at unit 16 from a unknown landlord on confidential terms. Brown \& Co and Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 4,000$ per annum equating to $£ 13.11$ psf. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

## St Anns St - St Anns House

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $6.2 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $19.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 13.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.77$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 9.85$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 1.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,358 | $\mathbf{4} 301.8 \%$ |  |
| Months On Market | 21.5 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 306 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 2nd Floor |
| Suite: | 16 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £9.80/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.60/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Apr 2014

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 12 Jun 2012 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 22 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 5,925 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 1,975 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $6.2 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An unknown tenant has taken 306 sq ft of office accommodation at unit 16 from a unknown landlord on confidential terms. Brown \& Co and Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 3,000$ per annum equating to $£ 9.80$ psf. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## Crossbank Rd - Offices

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.6 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.9 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.85$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.16$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.501 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $260.6 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 7,5 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 4.7 |
| Months On Market | 20.0 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 191 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2014 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | 5 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: £4.00/SF
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Mar 2014

| TIME ON MARKE |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 22 Dec 2011 | Date Occupied: | 12 May 2014 |
| Date Off Market: | 12 May 2014 |  |  |
| Months on Market | 29 Mos |  |  |

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Oct 1974 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,532 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $191 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(17.74 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on a confidential lease. Belton Duffey and Russen Turner acted on behalf of the landlord in the marketing of the property. The quoting rent was $£ 1,910$ pa, equating to $£ 10.00$ psf ( $£ 107.64$ psm). Confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

## 5-8 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $11.9 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.9 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 12.98$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 11.03$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 10.16$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.501 | $\mathbb{4}$ | $260.6 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | $7,20.0$ | $\mathbb{4}$ | 4.7 |
| Months On Market | 2 |  |  |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £12.98/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service Charge: | $£ 4.80 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 10.83 /$ SF |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Jul 2013 |
| Date Occupied: | 18 Feb 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Fifield Glyn Ltd
Gadbrook Rd
Northwich, CW9 7UD
Charles Fifield 01606351351

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 5,351 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Nov 1999 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 2,675 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |
| Parking: | 20 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $666 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(62 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of first floor office space within unit 5 on confidential terms. Fifield Glyn Ltd and Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 8,645 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 12.98 \mathrm{psf}(£ 139 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 5-8 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket

MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $23.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $23.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $11.1 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.8 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 12.98$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.76$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 10.21$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2.690 | $\searrow$ | $29.1 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 1,690 | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ | 9.9 |
| Months On Market | 22.1 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 605 SF |  |  |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2013 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Office |  |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | 5 |  |
| Suite: | 5 |  |  |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $\quad £ 12.98 /$ SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: } \quad \text { Nov } 2013}$

| Service Charge: | $£ 5.28 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 11.92 / \mathrm{SF}$ |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 2 Aug 2012 |  |  |  |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Jul 2013 |  |  |  |
| Month Market: | 18 Mar 2014 Market: | 19 Mos |  | Date Occupied: |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market Pl
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Fifield Glyn Ltd
Gadbrook Rd
Northwich, CW9 7UD
Charles Fifield 01606351351

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 5,351 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Nov 1999 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 2,675 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $23.8 \%$ |
| Parking: | 20 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $605 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(56 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground floor office space within unit 5 on confidential terms. Fifield Glyn Ltd and Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 7,853$ pa, equating to $£ 12.98$ psf ( $£ 140 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Deal confirmed by Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 18 Tuesday Market PI - Bishops Lynn House

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $4.1 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $19.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $10.9 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $7.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.8 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 7.00$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.57$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.21$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2.690 | $\searrow$ | $29.1 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 1,69 | $\uparrow$ | 9.9 |
| Months On Market | 22.1 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Seetec Ltd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Business Services |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 3,988 SF | Asking Rent: £7.00/SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2013 | Achieved Rent: £8.27/SF |
| Space Use: | Office |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Floor: | 1st Floor | Asking Discount: -18.14\% |
|  |  | Rent Free Months: 3 Months |
| LEASE TERM |  | Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |
| Start Date: | Oct 2013 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2018 |  |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years | Service Charge: £4.00/SF |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 3 May 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 16 Jan 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 16,910 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Mar 1849 | Stories: | 4 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 4,228 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 4.1\% |
| Parking: | 6 Surface Spaces are... |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Seetec Ltd has taken 3,988 sq ft ( 370.5 sq m ) of first-floor office space from Morston Assets Ltd on a five-year lease at $£ 33,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 8.27 \mathrm{psf}(£ 89.07 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to a tenant option to break in year three. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of Morston Assets Ltd. Three months rent-free period was agreed. Seetec Ltd was unrepresented. Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner. EPC Rating - E.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 31A St James St - Greyfriars Chambers

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 842 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2013 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £5.70/SF

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ May 2013

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service Charge: Withheld

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 26 Apr 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 7 Jun 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 14 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 May 2013

Months on Market: 14 Mos

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 3,046 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Sep 1931 |  | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 1,523 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $842 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{( } 78.22 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of first-floor office space on confidential terms. Tawn Landles were the marketing agents on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 5,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.70 \mathrm{psf}(£ 63.92 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

2 King St<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $18.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $8.1 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.2 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 14.74$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.60$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.11$ | $\searrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2,383 | $\searrow$ | $80.1 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 2.3 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 12.3 | $\searrow$ | 5.5 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Morris Armitage |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Real Estate |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 848 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad £ 14.74 / \mathrm{SF}$

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 10.26 /$ SF |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Nov 2018 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 10 Aug 2011 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Dec 2012 |  | Dacated: 2012 |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 16 Mos |  |  | 9 Dccupied: | 1 Dec 2012 |

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 848 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1901 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 424 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 2 Surface Spaces are... |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Morris Armitage have taken $848 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(79 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on confidential terms. Tawn Landles acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 12,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 14.74$ psf (£158.22 psm).

## Lease Comparables

## 21 Tuesday Market PI

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 20.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 7.0\% | $41.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 8.1\% | 4 4.0\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £12.71 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £16.42 | $41.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £18.38 | 4 6.6\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 107,141 | 4 293.3\% |
| Months On Market | 17.3 | 46.8 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,662 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2012 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | 2nd Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent:
£12.58/SF-£12.83/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Business Rates: £3.21/SF

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Oct 2012

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 18 Sep 2008 |
| Date Off Market: | 27 Sep 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 48 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 18 Sep 2009 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 27 Oct 2012 |
| Months Vacant: | 37 Months |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
27 King St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1ET
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 13,318 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Nov 1768 | Stories: | 4 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 3,330 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 20.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,662 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(247.31 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of second-floor office space from an undisclosed landlord on confidential terms.

Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord.
The quoting rent was $£ 33,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 12.58 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 135.41 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 4 Oldmedow Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - 13.5\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 18.5\% | 4 8.2\% |
| Market Overall | 8.3\% | $41.1 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | £10.84 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £10.05 | A 0.9\% |
| Market Overall | $£ 9.97$ | $\downarrow 1.0 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 6,200 | $\downarrow$ 18.9\% |
| Months On Market | 15.2 | 『 7.6 |

TENANT
Tenant Name: Berthoud Sprayers Ltd

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 646 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2012 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: | $£ 10.84 /$ SF |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 9.29 /$ SF |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: $14.30 \%$

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | May 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Apr 2018 |
| Lease Term: | 6 Years |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Apr 2015 |
| Reviews: | Apr 2015 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 9 Jun 2009 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2012 |

Months on Market: 35 Mos

LEASING REP
Collins \& Jarvis LLP
21 Stockers Ave
Winchester, SO22 5LB
Steven Collins 01962626060
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Ed Weightman 01553763574

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 9,601 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 1993 | Stories: | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 4,801 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Berthoud Sprayers Ltd has taken $646 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(60.02 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of Office/Business space from C Brewer \& Sons Ltd on a six year lease at $£ 6,000$ pa, equating to $£ 9.29 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 99.97 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to a rent review in year three and an option to break in year three. Collins \& Jarvis Llp and Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of C Brewer \& Sons Ltd. Berthoud Sprayers Ltd were unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 7,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 10.84 \mathrm{psf}(£ 116.64 \mathrm{psm})$. Achieved rent confirmed by Steven Collins at Collins \& Jarvis LLP.

## Lease Comparables

## 72 Westgate

Hunstanton - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ 56.3\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 18.5\% | 4 8.2\% |
| Market Overall | 8.3\% | $41.1 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | £11.95 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £10.05 | $40.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £9.97 | $\downarrow 1.0 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 6,200 | $\downarrow$ 18.9\% |
| Months On Market | 15.2 | † 7.6 |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 586 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2012 |
| Space Use: | Office |

Floor: $\quad$ GRND Floor

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

LEASE TERM
Start Date: May 2012

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 23 Jun 2011 |
| Date Off Market: | 18 Apr 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 18 May 2012

LEASING REP
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 1,040 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Dec 1996 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 520 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $586 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{( } 54 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on a lease with confidential terms. Cruso \& Wilkin acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 7,000$ pa, equating to $£ 11.95 \mathrm{psf}(£ 128.58 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

13A-13C St James St
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


TENANT
Tenant Name: Mr Dana

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 760 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2011 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: | $£ 9.87 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 3.68 / \mathrm{SF}$ |

Asking Discount: 62.67\%

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Dec 2011 |
| Expiry Date: | Dec 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Feb 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 19 Dec 2011 |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 19 Dec 2011

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: |  |
| Status: | Built Aug 1979 SF |  |  |  |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 3,820 SF |
|  |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |  |


| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 41,363 | 4 | $27.5 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 12.2 | 4 | 0.9 |

LEASE NOTES
Mr Dana has taken 760 sq ft (70.61 sq m) of ground and first-floor space at 13 St James Street from an undisclosed landlord on a new three year lease at $£ 2,800$ pa, equating to $£ 3.68 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 39.66$ psm). Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. Mr Dana was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 7,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 9.87$ psf ( $£ 106.22 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 22-28 Blackfriars St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $11.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $6.9 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
|  | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 4.34$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 9.68$ | $\downarrow$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.14$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2011 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity |  |  |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) |  | $\uparrow$ | $1,515$. |
| Months On Market |  | $\uparrow$ | 0.9 |

## TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Mind |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Personal Services |  |  |
| NAICS: | Voluntary Health Organizations -813212 |  |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,151 SF | Asking Rent: | £4.34/SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2011 | Achieved Rent: | £5.21/SF |
| Space Use: | Office |  |  |
| Floor: | 1st Floor | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
|  |  | Asking Discount | -20.05\% |

## LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Oct 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 28 Jan 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Oct 2011 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 3,786 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Nov 1973 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 1,893 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

Mind has taken $1,151 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 106.93 sq m ) of first floor office space from Haymarket Developments on a three year lease at $£ 6,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 5.21$ psf ( $£ 56.11 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of Haymarket Developments. Mind was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 5,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 4.34 \mathrm{psf}(£ 46.76 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Achieved rent confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 27-29 Bridge St

Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2011 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ 100\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 10.6\% | $\downarrow 1.7 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.1\% | $\downarrow 0.4 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2011 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £4.62 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £9.78 | $\downarrow$ 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | £10.16 | $\downarrow$ 0.4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2011 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 8,341 | 4 269.4\% |
| Months On Market | 19.7 | 44.0 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,379 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2011 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | E GRND, E 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £4.62/SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: $\quad$ Fully Repairing \& Ins...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 4 Jun 2009 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jul 2011 |
| Months on Market: | 25 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 4 Jun 2010 |
| Date Occupied: | 3 Aug 2011 |
| Months Vacant: | 13 Months |

## LEASING REP

Roche Chartered Surveyors
56-56A Thorpe Rd
Norwich, NR1 1RY
Graham Jones 01603756340

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 2,379 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 1,190 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,379 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 221 sq m ) of ground and first floor office space on confidential terms. Roche Chartered Surveyors acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 11,000$ pa, equating to $£ 4.62 \mathrm{psf}(£ 49.77 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

## 14 King St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

|  | 2011 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacancy Rate | $0.0 \%$ | $\rightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Current Building | $10.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.3 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $7.2 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 2011 Q2 | YOY |  |
|  | $£ 10.82$ |  | - |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 9.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Current Building | $£ 10.07$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star |  |  |  |
| Market Overall | 2011 Q2 | YOY |  |
|  | 7,648 | $\uparrow$ | $238.7 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity |  |  |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 22.8 | $\uparrow$ | 8.1 |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Binarydrive Ltd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 693 SF | Asking Rent: £10.82/SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2011 | Achieved Rent: £10.82/SF |
| Space Use: | Office | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |  |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | May 2011 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expiry Date: | May 2014 | Service: Internal Repairing \& ... |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |  |
| Breaks: | Tenant - May 2012, T... |  |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 24 Nov 2010 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 27 May 2011 |  |  |  |
| Months on Marke Occupied: | 6 Mos |  |  |  |

## LEASING REP

Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,979 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 990 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Binarydrive Ltd has taken 693 sq ft ( 64.38 sq m ) of ground-floor office space from Gould on a three-year lease at $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 10.83$ psf ( $£ 116.49 \mathrm{psm}$ ), with an annual break in favour of the tenant. Reportedly there are no rent reviews or incentives incorporated within the lease. The quoting rent was $£ 7,500$ pa, equating to $£ 10.83$ psf ( $£ 116.49$ psm). Achieved rent confirmed by Giles Stovold at Russen \& Turner.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

Elm High Rd - Blacksmiths Arms
Wisbech - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE


| LEASE |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 329 SF |  |  |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2011 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Office |  |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |  |  |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 7.60 /$ SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 7.60 /$ SF |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%
LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Mar 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 11 Mar 2011

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 17,623 SF |
| Status: | Built Jun 1929 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 8,812 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $329 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(31 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of first-floor office space, suite 5, within Market Chambers on confidential terms. Bury Metropolitan Borough Council acted on behalf of themselves. The quoting rent was $£ 2,500 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 7.60 \mathrm{psf}(£ 81.81 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 51 High St - Rear Of

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - 100\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 9.4\% | - $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 6.9\% | - $0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | £10.65 | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £10.02 | A 1.0\% |
| Market Overall | £10.21 | - $4.5 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 740 | - $67.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 16.8 | 41.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,408 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2010 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | E GRND, E 1, E 2 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.65 /$ SF

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 6 Dec 2007 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 26 Nov 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 35 Mos |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 1,408 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Stories: | 3 |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,408 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(131 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space from an undisclosed landlord for an undisclosed rent. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 14,995$ pa, equating to $£ 10.65$ psf ( $£ 114.59$ psm). Deal confirmed by Stuart Hemeter at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 3-5 St Anns St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $9.4 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $6.9 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 13.33$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.02$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.21$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 740 | $\downarrow$ | $67.2 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 740 | 16.8 | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ |
| Months On Market | 1.4 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 375 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2010 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 13.33 /$ SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 17 Feb 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 26 Nov 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 9 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: $\quad 30$ Nov 2010

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Office |  | 539 SF |  |
| Status: | Built Oct 1924 |  | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 534 SF |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $375 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{( } 35 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space from an undisclosed landlord for an undisclosed rent. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 5,000$ pa, equating to $£ 13.33$ psf ( $£ 143.52$ psm). Deal confirmed Stuart Hemeter at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 47 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 12.3\% | $42.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.5\% | $40.2 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | £14.19 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £10.00 | 4 0.8\% |
| Market Overall | £10.20 | - $3.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 2,258 | - |
| Months On Market | 15.7 | 43.3 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 740 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2010 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $£ 14.19 /$ SF

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

LEASE TERM
Lease Term: 9 Years

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 10 Feb 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

## LEASING REP

Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 740 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Feb 1991 |  | Stories: | 1 |
|  | Floor Size: | 740 SF |  |  |
| Construction: | Multi | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $740 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(68.74 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on confidential terms. Tawn Landles Estate Agent acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was £10,500 pa, equating to $£ 14.18 \mathrm{psf}(£ 152.73 \mathrm{psm})$.

## Lease Comparables

## 4-5 Market PI

Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2010 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 45.6\% | A $45.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 3.1\% | 4 1.8\% |
| Market Overall | 3.5\% | $41.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2010 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | £9.12 | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £15.83 | $\downarrow 36.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £17.23 | A $4.2 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2010 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | 9.9 | 42.9 |

TENANT
Tenant Name: Solar Vision Ltd

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 329 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2010 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | 1st Floor |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: | $£ 9.12 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 9.12 /$ SF |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Apr 2010 |
| Expiry Date: | Apr 2013 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 2 Sep 2008 |  |  |  |
| Date Vacated: | 2 Sep 2009 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 22 Mar 2010 |  | Date Occupied: | 23 Apr 2010 |
| Months on Market: | 18 Mos |  | Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 721 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 360 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 45.6\% |

## LEASE NOTES

Solar Vision Ltd has taken $329 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(31 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of first-floor office space at 4-5 market Place from Johnson Cleaners UK Ltd on a three year sublease expiring in April 2013 at $£ 3,000$ pa, equating to £9.12 psf (£98.15 psm). SGP Property \& FM acted on behalf of Johnson Cleaners UK Ltd. Solar Vision Ltd were unrepresented. The quoting rent was 3,000 pa, equating to $£ 9.12 \mathrm{psf}$ (£98.15 psm). Achieved rent confirmed by Tom Dymond at SGP Property \& FM.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 128-132 Norfolk St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2009 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 10.1\% | 4 4.9\% |
| Market Overall | 7.3\% | $41.9 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2009 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | $£ 4.87$ | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £9.92 | $\downarrow 6.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £10.56 | $40.6 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2009 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 0 | $\downarrow 100 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 12.4 | 46.9 |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 2,258 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2009 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 3 Sep 2009

## LEASING REP

Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 2,258 SF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | - | Stories: | - |  |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Lease details confidential.

## Lease Comparables

## 27 King St - St George's Chambers

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.3 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $5.7 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.1 \%$ |
|  | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.66$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.65$ | $\uparrow$ | $37.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 10.64$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | $\searrow$ | 0.3 |
| Months On Market | 7.2 | $\searrow$ |  |

TENANT
Tenant Name: Hayes \& Storrs Ltd

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,877 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2008 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | E GRND, E 1 Floor |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: $\quad £ 10.66 /$ SF |  |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 10.66 /$ SF |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $0.00 \%$ |
| PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 14 Nov 2007 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2008 |
| Months on Market: | 6 Mos |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 4,313 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | Stories: | 3 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,438 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Hayes \& Storrs Ltd has taken $1,877 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of office space from Brown \& Co on assignment of an existing lease expiring in May 2011 at a passing rent of $£ 20,000$ pa, equating to $£ 10.65$ psf ( $£ 114.63 \mathrm{psm}$ ). Brown \& Co represented themselves, Hayes \& Storrs Ltd were unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 20,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 10.65 \mathrm{psf}(£ 114.63 \mathrm{psm})$. Achieved rent confirmed by Edward Larke at Brown \& Co. (Costar Research 08/05/08)

## Lease Comparables

London Rd - Former County Court

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $92.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.2 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $5.7 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $1.1 \%$ |
|  | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 7.68$ |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 10.65$ | $\uparrow$ | $37.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 10.64$ | $\downarrow$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2008 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - |  | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | $\searrow$ | 0.3 |
| Months On Market | 7.2 | $\searrow$ |  |

TENANT
Tenant Name: Palm Paper Ltd

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,582 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2008 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unk, E GRND, E 1 FI... |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: | $£ 7.68 / \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 7.68 / \mathrm{SF}$ |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%
LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Apr 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2010 |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years |

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 20 Dec 2005 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Apr 2008 |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 20 Dec 2006 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Apr 2008 |
| Months Vacant: | 15 Months |

LEASING REP
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 3,582 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | - |
| Tenancy: | - | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| Parking: | 10 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |
| LEASE NOTES |  |  |  |

Palm Paper Ltd has taken $3,582 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of office accommodation on a two-year lease at $£ 27,500$ pa, equating to $£ 7.68 \mathrm{psf}(£ 82.66 \mathrm{psm})$. Cruso \& Wilkin acted on behalf of the landlord. Palm Paper Ltd were unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 27,500$ pa, equating to $£ 7.68$ psf ( $£ 82.66$ psm). Achieved rent confirmed by Richard Maxey at Cruso \& Wilkin. (Costar Research 16/06/08)

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 5-8 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


LEASE

| SF Leased: | 1,938 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2007 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Sep 2007

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 13 Nov 2006 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Sep 2007 |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
Queen St
Norwich, NR2 4SX

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |
| :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Nov 1999 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |
| Construction: | Masonry |
| Parking: | 20 Surface Spaces ar... |


| NIA: | $5,351 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stories: | 2 |
| Floor Size: | $2,675 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Vacancy at Lease: | $11.3 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,983 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(180 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on confidential terms. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 25,194$ pa, equating to £12.70 psf (£136.70 psm)(FOCUS Research 12/09/07)

## Lease Comparables

## 1-4 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall | - | - |
|  | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ | - |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall |  |  |
|  | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | - |  |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 1,266 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | May 2006 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

Floor: Unkwn Floor

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: $\quad$ Fully Repairing \& Ins...

LEASE TERM
Start Date: May 2006

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 3 Sep 2004 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2006 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 3 Sep 2005 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 May 2006 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

LEASING REP
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422
RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins... -

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 2,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | - |
| Tenancy: | - |  |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 1,266 sq ft ( 118 sq m ) of office space on confidential terms. Cruso \& Wilkin acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 12,660$ pa, equating to $£ 10$ psf ( $£ 107.64$ psm). (FOCUS Research 07/07/06)

## Lease Comparables

## 1-4 Bergen Way

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall | - | - |
|  | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| Asking Rent Per SF | $£ 10.00$ | - |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-2 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall |  |  |
|  | 2006 Q2 | YOY |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | - | - |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | - |  |

LEASE

| SF Leased: | 2,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | May 2006 |
| Space Use: | Office |

Floor: Unkwn Floor

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins...

LEASE TERM
Start Date: May 2006

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 3 Sep 2004 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 1 May 2006 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 3 Sep 2005 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 May 2006 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

LEASING REP
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422
RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10.00 /$ SF

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Industrial | NIA: | 2,532 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | - |
| Tenancy: | - |  |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,532 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(235 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of office space on confidential terms. Cruso \& Wilkin acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 25,320 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 10$ psf ( $£ 107.64$ psm). (FOCUS Research 07/07/06)

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 12 King St - Chequer House <br> Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 12,700 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 1991 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

RENTS
Achieved Rent: £2.50/SF

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Oct 1999


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 1991 Q2 | YOY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall | - | - |
|  | 1991 Q2 | YOY |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - | - |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall |  |  |
|  | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 1991 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | - | - |

LEASING REP

## Cruso \& Wilkin

Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Office | NIA: | 10,600 SF |  |
| Status: | - |  | Stories: | 4 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 2,650 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
The county court is about to move into the two remaining floors, totalling $12,700 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$. It is paying about \#2.50 psf. The deal was agreed by Cruso \& Wilkin nearly two years ago. (Estates Gazette Survey 11/09/93 p112)

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

12 King St - Chequer House<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket



| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 10,750 SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 1987 |
| Space Use: | Office |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |

RENTS
Achieved Rent: £2.50/SF

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 30 Sep 1999


| MARKET AT LEASE |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vacancy Rate | 1987 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall | - | - |
|  |  |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 1987 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | - | - |
| Market Overall | - | - |


| Submarket Leasing Activity | 1987 Q4 | YOY |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | - | - |
| Months On Market | - | - |

## LEASING REP

## Cruso \& Wilkin

Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ

## Brecker Grossmith Ltd

63 Wigmore St
London, W1U 1BQ

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Office |  | NIA: | 10,600 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 4 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 2,650 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Cruso \& Wilkin is asking \#3.50 psf for the ground floor. (Estates Times Survey 06/05/88 p17) Anglia Commercial Props Ltd (taken over by Finance for Industry Ltd in 1976) own the property. Rent is \#2.25 psf. Agents are Brecker Grossmith \& Co. (Database 1972) Acting for 3i Commercial Properties, Cruso \& Wilkin and Brecker Grossmith \& Co have let two office suites. Black Horse Agencies Ltd have taken about $6,350 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ and local solicitors Ben Pearson have taken about $4,400 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ at around $\# 2.50 \mathrm{psf}$. Three suites of about $6,350 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ each are still available. (Chartered Surveyor Weekly Survey 29/10/87 p51)

Rents

Lease Comparables


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address <br> Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2HD <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | 156 <br> New Direct | Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
|  | St Anns House <br> St Anns St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1LT <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | 475 <br> New Direct | Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
|  | St Anns House <br> St Anns St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1LT <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | $305$ <br> New Direct | Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
|  | St Anns House <br> St Anns St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1LT <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | 306 <br> New Direct | Apr 2014 |  |  |  |
| $11$ | Offices <br> Crossbank Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2HD <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | 191 <br> New Direct | Mar 2014 |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5-8 Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | $666$ <br> New Direct | Feb 2014 |  | £10.83/SF |  |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent <br> Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5-8 Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $605$ <br> New Direct | Nov 2013 |  | £11.92/SF |  |
|  | Bishops Lynn House <br> 18 Tuesday Market PI <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1JW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Seetec Ltd <br> Morston Assets Ltd | 3,988 <br> New Direct | Oct 2013 <br> 5 Years | £8.27/SF | Spread Over | Oct 2016 |
| $15$ | Greyfriars Chambers <br> 31A St James St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 5DJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Fenton Insurance Solutions | 842 <br> New Direct | May 2013 |  |  |  |
|  | 2 King St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1ES <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Morris Armitage | 848 <br> New Direct | Dec 2012 <br> 6 Years |  | £10.26/SF |  |
|  | 21 Tuesday Market PI <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1JW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Barclays Bank PLC | 2,662 <br> New Direct | Oct 2012 |  | £3.21/SF |  |
| $18$ | 4 Oldmedow Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 4TP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Berthoud Sprayers Ltd | 646 <br> New | May 2012 <br> 6 Years | £9.29/SF |  | Apr 2015 <br> Apr 2015 |

Lease Comparables

|  | Adross | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tenant } \\ \text { Lenadord } \end{gathered}$ | SF Leased Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { StartDate } \\ & \text { Term } \end{aligned}$ | Starting Rent <br> Effective Ren | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Free Rent } \\ & \text { Rates } \end{aligned}$ | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 72 Westgate <br> Hunstanton, PE36 5EP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark |  | $\begin{aligned} & 586 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | May 2012 |  |  |  |
|  | 13A-13C St James St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 5DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub. | Mr Dana | $\begin{aligned} & \text { con } \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dec } 2011 \\ & 3 \text { Years } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{\text {23.68SF }}$ |  |  |
|  | 22-28 Blackfriars St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark | Mind | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1,151 } \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Oct 201 3 Years | ع521/SF |  |  |
|  | 27-29 Bridge St <br> Downham Market PE38 9DW King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark |  | $\begin{gathered} 2,379 \\ \text { New } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 14 King St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1ES <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark. | Binaydive Ltd | ${ }_{\substack{\text { as } \\ \text { Now }}}$ | May 2011 <br> 3 Years | ¢10.82sF |  | May 201.2. |
|  | Blacksmiths Arms <br> Elm High Rd <br> Wisbech, PE14 ODH <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub |  | 329 New | Mar 2011 3 Years | ع7.60SF |  |  |

Lease Comparables



Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Former County Court <br> London Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 5ES <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Palm Paper Ltd | $\begin{aligned} & 3,582 \\ & \text { New } \end{aligned}$ | Apr 2008 <br> 2 Years | £7.68/SF |  |  |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5-8 Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | $1,938$ <br> New | Sep 2007 |  |  |  |
| $33$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1-4 Bergen Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2JG <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... |  | 1,266 New | May 2006 |  |  |  |





## SUMMARY STATISTICS

| Rent | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 49 | $£ 4.99$ | $£ 17.75$ | $£ 18.13$ | $£ 56.72$ |
| Achieved Rent Per SF | 16 | $£ 3.78$ | $£ 10.35$ | $£ 13.00$ | $£ 34.76$ |
| Net Effective Rent Per SF | - | - | - | - | - |
| Asking Rent Discount | 15 | $-1.5 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $65.1 \%$ |
| Rent Free Months | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lease Attributes | Deals | Low | Average | Median | High |
| Months on Market | 49 | 2 | 16 | 9 | 65 |
| Deal Size | 50 | 187 | 1,794 | 1,170 | 7,500 |
| Lease Deal in Years | 23 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 3.0 | 15.0 |
| Floor Number | 49 | GRND | GRND | GRND | 3 |


| Property Name - Address |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| $1$ | 47-49 Lynn Road | $t * * t *$ | 560 | GRND | 10/06/2015 | New | $£ 17.86$ | Asking |
| $2$ | 104 High St | $t * * t *$ | 1,560 | GRND, 1 | 07/05/2015 | New | £14.26 | Asking |
| 3 | 7 Wales Ct | $\star * * * *$ | 806 | GRND,1 | 28/04/2015 | New | £21.09 | Asking |
| 4 | Edward Benefer Way | $t * * t *$ | 5,585 | GRND | 09/02/2015 | New | $£ 13.50$ | Achieved |
| 5 | 47 High St | $t * * t *$ | 2,027 | GRND,1-2 | 01/02/2015 | New | £17.27/fri | Asking |
| 6 | 117-118 London Rd | $t * * t *$ | 282 | GRND | 01/01/2015 | New | £14.18/iro | Achieved |
| $7$ | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t * * * *$ | 1,475 | GRND, 1 | 25/11/2014 | New | £20.34/fri | Asking |
| 8 | 67 High St | $t * * t *$ | 1,053 | GRND | 10/10/2014 | New | £18.76/fri | Asking |
| $9\rangle$ | Vancouver Quarter 26 New Conduit St | $t * * t *$ | 4,158 | GRND,1 | 08/10/2014 | New | £3.78/fri | Achieved |
| 10 | 8 Greevesgate | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 736 | GRND | 27/08/2014 | New | £18.34/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 5,707 | GRND | 16/07/2014 | New | £10.51/fri | Achieved |
| $\langle 9\rangle$ | Vancouver Quarter 25 New Conduit St | $t * * * *$ | 3,332 | GRND,1 | 20/06/2014 | New | £9.00/iri | Achieved |
| 12 | 16 Tower St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 784 | GRND | 17/06/2014 | New | £16.26/fri | Asking |
| 13 | 83 Lynn Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,818 | GRND | 14/04/2014 | New | $£ 7.70$ | Asking |
| 14 | 5 New Conduit St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 733 | GRND,1 | 17/03/2014 | New | £19.10/fri | Achieved |
| 15 | 20 High St | $\star * * * *$ | 839 | GRND | 10/03/2014 | New | £20.86/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 11 Broad St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 865 | GRND | 01/02/2014 | New | £28.90/fri | Achieved |
| $16$ | 8-12 Wootton Rd | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 336 | GRND | 22/01/2014 | New | £19.35/fri | Achieved |
| 17 | 26 Tower St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 456 | GRND | 15/08/2013 | New | £15.35/fri | Asking |
| 18 | 97 Norfolk St | $\star * * * *$ | 929 | GRND | 21/06/2013 | New | £7.00/fri | Achieved |
| 19 | 142 Norfolk St | $\star \star * * *$ | 3,669 | GRND | 03/06/2013 | New | £23.17/fri | Asking |


|  |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Name - Address |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| $20$ | 33 Railway Rd | $t * t * t$ | 2,440 | GRND,1 | 11/04/2013 | New | £4.10/fri | Achieved |
| $21$ | 3 High St | $t * * t *$ | 343 | GRND | 01/04/2013 | New | £14.55/fri | Achieved |
| $22$ | 36 Tower St | $t * * t$ | 1,194 | GRND,1 | 15/03/2013 | New | $£ 6.70$ | Achieved |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter New Conduit St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 3,900 | GRND,1 | 01/03/2013 | New | £16.67/fri | Asking |
| 23 | 1 A High St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 797 | GRND | 01/03/2013 | New | £10.54/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t * * t *$ | 1,382 | GRND,1 | 28/02/2013 | New | £21.71/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter New Conduit St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,605 | GRND,1 | 15/02/2013 | New | £19.19/fri | Asking |
| $\sqrt[24]{ }$ | Former Monte Agency North St | $t * * t *$ | 3,495 | GRND,1 | 11/02/2013 | New | £6.44/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t * t * *$ | 865 | GRND | 01/02/2013 | New | £52.02/fri | Asking |
| $25$ | 1D High St | $t * * t$ | 851 | GRND | 01/02/2013 | New | £9.52/fri | Achieved |
| $11$ | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,593 | GRND,1 | 30/01/2013 | New | £20.40 | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t * * t *$ | 1,405 | GRND,1 | 20/01/2013 | New | £21.35/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 18/20-20 St Dominic Sq | $t * * t *$ | 2,783 | GRND,1 | 18/01/2013 | New | £17.97/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 24 Broad St | $t \star * * *$ | 934 | GRND | 15/01/2013 | New | £29.44/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 24 New Conduit St | $t * * t *$ | 3,310 | GRND,1 | 10/01/2013 | New | £18.13/fri | Asking |
| (11) | Vancouver Quarter Broad St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 2,659 | GRND,1 | 07/01/2013 | New | £20.68/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 14 Broad St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,448 | GRND,1 | 04/01/2013 | New | £20.72 | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter Harper Rd | $t * * t *$ | 1,843 | GRND,1 | 20/12/2012 | New | £18.99/fri | Asking |
| $26$ | 9 High St | $t * * t *$ | 187 | GRND | 10/12/2012 | New | £34.76/fri | Achieved |
| $27$ | 36 High St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,114 | GRND,1 | 02/12/2012 | New | £44.43/fri | Asking |
| 11 | Vancouver Quarter 29 New Conduit St | $t * * t *$ | 1,146 | GRND | 01/12/2012 | New | $£ 56.72$ | Asking |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

| Property Name - Address |  |  | Lease |  |  |  | Rents |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Rating | SF Leased | Floor | Sign Date | Type | Rent | Rent Type |
| 28 | 83 High St | $t * * * *$ | 2,683 | GRND,1-3 | 05/11/2012 | New | £16.77/fri | Asking |
| 29 | Hardwick Retail Park <br> Hardwick Rd | $t * * *$ | 7,500 | GRND | 22/10/2012 | New | £22.50 | Asking |
| 30 | 66 High St | $t \rightarrow t \rightarrow t$ | 1,121 | GRND | 02/10/2012 | New | £26.76/fri | Asking |
| 31 | 92 Westgate | $t * * * *$ | 643 | GRND | 01/10/2012 | New | £13.53/fri | Asking |
| 32 | 32 Norfolk St | $t * * t *$ | 2,005 | GRND,1-2 | 27/09/2012 | New | £4.99/fri | Asking |
| 17 | 26 Tower St | $t * * t$ | 477 | Unkwn | 30/07/2012 | New | £14.68 | Achieved |
| 33 | 14 St James St | $t * * * *$ | 1,000 | GRND | 02/07/2012 | New | £12.50 | Achieved |
| $34$ | 18A Wilton Rd | $t * * t$ | 307 | GRND | 01/06/2012 | New | £16.29 | Asking |

## Lease Comparables

## 47-49 Lynn Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.3\% | † $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 2.1\% | $\downarrow$ 0.9\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £16.09 | $43.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £18.25 | $\downarrow 8.6 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo . Leased SF (Thous) | 71,534 | A 171.4\% |
| Months On Market | 21.1 | 49.2 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 560 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2015 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Jun 2015

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 6 Mar 2015 |
| Date Off Market: | 10 Jun 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 3 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Feb 2015 |
| Date Occupied: | 10 Jun 2015 |
| Months Vacant: | 4 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 560 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 560 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $560 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(52.02 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was £10,000 pa. Deal confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co. The EPC is rated as: D.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

104-104A High St
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $60.2 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.3 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.1 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 16.09$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 18.25$ | $\downarrow$ | $8.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21,534 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $171.4 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 71 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 9.2 |
| Months On Market | 21.1 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | RH Fayers \& Son Funeral Directors |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Personal Services |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,560 SF |
| Sign Date: | May 2015 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: $£ 22,250$ PA |
| :--- |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: |


| Service Charge: | No |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 9,618$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 3 Feb 2014 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 22 May 2015 |  | Date Vacated: | 1 Jan 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 15 Mos |  | Months Vacant: | 16 Months |

LEASING REP
Core Consult Limited
69 Derwent Dr
Maidenhead, SL6 6LE
Howard Cooke 01628782639
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | 2,111 SF |  |
| Status: | Built Aug 1951 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 1,168 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

RH Fayers \& Son Funeral Directors has taken 1,270 sq ft (117.9 sq m) of retail space from an undisclosed landlord on confidential terms. Core Consulting Ltd acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 22,250$ pa. Deal confirmed by Howard Cooke at Core Consulting Ltd.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

7 Wales Ct
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.3 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.1 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.4 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 18.25$ | $\downarrow$ | $8.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2015 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.534 | $\uparrow$ | $171.4 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 71.1 | $\uparrow$ | 9.2 |
| Months On Market | 21.1 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Reeds of Downham Market Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 806 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2015 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: $£ 17,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| :--- |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Buildout Status: $\quad$ Full Build-Out |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Apr 2015 |
| Expiry Date: | Apr 2020 |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years |

Service Charge: Withheld Business Rates: £4,930 PA

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 13 Mar 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 3 Jul 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 40 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 28 Apr 2015

LEASING REP
Kevin Taylor \& Associates
12 Upper King St
Norwich, NR3 1HA
Kevin Taylor 01603622334
Pearl \& Coutts Limited
9 White Lion St
London, N1 9PD
Nick Reynolds 02078433761

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 725 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Jul 1986 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 598 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
Reeds of Downham Market Ltd has taken $806 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(74.88 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground and first floor retail space from Structadene Group Ltd on a new five-year lease on confidential terms. Pearl \& Coutts and Kevin Taylor \& Associates acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 17,000$ pa. Confirmed let by Sharna Nelson at Structadene Group Ltd.

## Lease Comparables

Edward Benefer Way
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


| Tenant Name: | The Norfolk Hospice |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Personal Services |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 5,585 SF | Asking Rent: £74,250 PA |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2015 | Achieved Rent: £75,400 PA |
| Space Use: | Retail |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | Asking Discount: $-1.55 \%$ |
|  |  | Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |
| Start Date: | Feb 2015 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| Expiry Date: | Feb 2020 | Business Rates: £23,859 PA |
| Lease Term: | 5 Years |  |

TIME ON MARKET
Date On Market: 23 Mar 2015 Date Occupied: 9 Feb 2015

## MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.1\% | † 0.5\% |
| Market Overall | 2.1\% | $\downarrow 1.3 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £16.50 | $45.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £18.72 | $\downarrow$ 2.6\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 58,600 | 4 34.6\% |
| Months On Market | 18.1 | 49.4 |

LEASING REP
Gilbert Bath
40 Berners St
London, W1T 3NA
Peter Newman 02076362494

PROPERTY


## LEASE NOTES

The Norfolk Hospice has taken $5,585 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(518.86 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground floor retail accommodation within Unit 2 from a private landlord on a five year lease at $£ 75,400$ pa, subject to a mutual break option at any point, with two months' notice. Gilbert Bath acted for the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 74,250$ pa. Deal confirmed from Wilkinson Williams investment schedule.

## Lease Comparables

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $61.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.1 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.1 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 16.36$ | $\uparrow$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 18.72$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2015 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | YOY |  |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 58,600 | $\mathbf{4}$ | $34.6 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 18.1 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 9.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,027 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2015 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1, 2 Floor |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $£ 35,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Feb 2015 |
| Expiry Date: | Jan 2025 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 24,492$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 11 Jul 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 2 Mar 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 20 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jul 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Feb 2015 |
| Months Vacant: | 19 Months |

## LEASING REP

Francis Darrah Surveyors Ltd
12 Bank St
Norwich, NR2 4SE
Carol Cooper 01603666630
Rob Alston Retail Ltd
4 Blacksmiths Ln
Leicester, LE8 0QB
Robert Alston 03301233224

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | 2,027 SF |  |
| Status: | Built Jan 1909 |  | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Stories: | 3 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 1,248 SF |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,027 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ (188.31) sq m of retail space from an undisclosed landlord with undisclosed terms. Francis Darrah Surveyors Limited acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 35,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by Francis Darrah Surveyors Limited.

## Lease Comparables

## 117-118 London Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - $5.2 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 5.1\% | - $0.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 2.1\% | - $1.3 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £16.36 | 4 5.6\% |
| Market Overall | £18.72 | $\downarrow 2.6 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2015 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 58,600 | 4 34.6\% |
| Months On Market | 18.1 | 49.4 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Inheritance Legal Services Limited |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Government |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 282 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2015 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 4,500 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 4,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |


| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| :--- |
| Asking Discount: $11.11 \%$ |

LEASE TERM
Start Date: Jan 2015

| Expiry Date: | Dec 2016 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Internal Repairing O... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 1,860$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 29 Apr 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Jan 2015 |
| Months on Market: | 21 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Apr 2013 |
| Date Occupied: | 2 Jan 2015 |
| Months Vacant: | 21 Months |

## LEASING REP

Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: |  |
| Status: | Built Apr 1988 SF |  |  |  |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 2,695 SF |

LEASE NOTES
Inheritance Legal Services Limited has taken $282 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(26.19 \mathrm{sqm})$ of ground floor retail space in Unit 2 from Mr Raines at $£ 4,000$ pa on a two year lease with a tenant option to break after the first year giving three months notice. No rent reviews or rent free periods were agreed. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 4,500$ pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

12-34 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $13.5 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $13.5 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.7 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.7 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 12.63$ | - |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.55$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2,700 | - |  |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 5.75 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 6.5 | - |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Doodlecards Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,475 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |
| Suite: | 20 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad £ 30,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | $£ 2,677$ PA |
| Business Rates: | $£ 17,074$ PA |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: $\quad 25$ Nov 2014

TENANT REP
Peter Short \& Co
2 Hamilton Ter
Leamington Spa, CV32 4LY

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 109,309 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 87,274 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 13.5\% |
| Parking: | 71 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
Doodlecards Ltd has taken $1,475 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(137 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space within unit 30 from Vancouver GP Ltd on a one -year lease, subject to a tenant option to break in year January 2015. GCW acted on behalf of the landlord. One week's rent-free period was agreed. Peter Short acted on behalf of the tenant. The quoting rent was $£ 30,000$ pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Philippe Micheal at GCW.

## Lease Comparables

## 67-67a High St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.7 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.7 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 16.63$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.55$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 50,833 | $\downarrow$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 50 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{\uparrow}$ |
| Months On Market |  |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,053 SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Oct 2014 |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $£ 19,750$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 13,978$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET
Date On Market: 9 Oct 2012
Date Off Market: 10 Oct 2014
Months on Market: 24 Mos

LEASING REP
Bilfinger GVA
65 Gresham St
London, EC2V 7NQ
Paul Faulkner 03459003900
Laura Soutar 02079112575
Cruso \& Wilkin
Waterloo St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NZ
Richard Maxey 01553816422

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  |  |  |
| Status: | Nuilt Feb 1969 |  | 1,873 SF |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 1,053 SF |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,053 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(97.82 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground floor retail space on confidential terms. GVA and Cruso \& Wilkin acted jointly on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 19,750$ pa. Deal confirmed by GVA.

2-46 New Conduit St - Vancouver Quarter
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $2.7 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.7 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 16.63$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.55$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 50,833 | $\downarrow$ | $15.0 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 50 | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |
| Months On Market | 17.3 | $\mathbf{4}$ | 7.3 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Roman Originals plc |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 4,158 SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor |
| Suite: | 26 |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Oct 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2016 |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | $£ 8,774$ PA |
| Business Rates: | $£ 29,202$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 10 Feb 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 22 Oct 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 8 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Feb 2014 |
| Date Occupied: | 21 Nov 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 9 Months |

$\frac{\text { LEASING REP }}{\text { GCW }}$

7-10 Chandos St
London, W1G 9DQ
Nick Warr 02076474818
Philippe Micheal 02074080030

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 81,260 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 3 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 40,630 SF |
| Parking: | 71 Covered Spaces ar.. | Vacancy at | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

Roman Originals has taken $4,158 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 386 sq m ) of ground and first-floor retail space within 26 New Conduit Street from Vancouver GP Ltd on a two-year lease at $£ 15,716$ pa and $14 \%$ of turnover. GCW acted on behalf of the landlord. 4 weeks rent-free period was agreed. Red Fox Ltd acted on behalf of the tenant. Achieved rent confirmed by Philippe Michael at GCW.

## Lease Comparables

## 8 Greevegate

Hunstanton - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.1 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 16.06$ | $\uparrow$ | $5.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 18.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q3 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26.386 | $\searrow$ | $27.5 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 46,386 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 14.7 | $\uparrow$ | 4.1 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 736 SF |
| Sign Date: | Aug 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 13,500 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Aug 2014

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 6,869$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 27 Aug 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 4 Mos |

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 1,254 SF |
| Status: | Built Jun 1958 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 756 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An unknown tenant has taken 736 sq ft of retail accommodation arranged over the ground floor of 8 Greevegate on confidential lease terms. Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 13,500$ per annum. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Select Fashion Limited |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 5,707 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 80,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 60,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $25.00 \%$ |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Jul 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Jul 2024 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Jul 2019 |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | $£ 12,652$ PA |
| Business Rates: | $£ 2,751$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 31 Mar 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 25 Jul 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 4 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 16 Jul 2014
$\frac{\text { LEASING REP }}{\text { GCW }}$

7-10 Chandos St
London, W1G 9DQ
Nick Warr 02076474818
Philippe Micheal 02074080030

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $20.2 \%$ |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Select Fashion Limited has taken $5,707 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(530.20 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of ground floor retail space within unit LSU2B on a 10 -year lease at $£ 60,000$ pa ( $£ 43$ Zone A). Select Fashion Limited has the option to break the lease at the end of the fifth year. Cedar Dean Gilmarc acted on behalf of Select Fashion Limited. GCW acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was £80,000 pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Nick Warr GCW. EPC Rating confirmed as: C.

## 2-46 New Conduit St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $4.7 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.6 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.57$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,354 | $\downarrow$ | $59.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 20 | $\mathbb{4}$ | 1.0 |
| Months On Market | 11.9 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Shoe Zone Retail Ltd |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |  |
| NAICS: | Shoe Stores - 448210 |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 3,332 SF | Asking Rent: $£ 45,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2014 | Achieved Rent: £30,000 PA |
| Space Use: | Retail | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  |
| Floor: | GRND, 1 Floor | Asking Discount: 33.33\% |
| Suite: | 25 | Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |

$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: }}$

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Internal Repairing \& ... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | $£ 8,377$ PA |
| Business Rates: | $£ 31,322$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 11 Feb 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 24 Jul 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos |

LEASING REP
GCW
7-10 Chandos St
London, W1G 9DQ
Nick Warr 02076474818
Philippe Micheal 02074080030

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 81,260 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |  | Stories: | 3 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 40,630 SF |
| Parking: | 71 Covered Spaces ar.. |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $4.7 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Shoe Zone Retail Ltd has taken 3,332 sq ft ( 309.55 sq m ) of 25 New Conduit St ground \& first floors retail space from Vancouver Limited Partnership on a five year lease at $£ 30,000$ pa. No rent reviews or breaks were agreed. The Zone A rent is $£ 21.20 \mathrm{psf}$, equated from an ITZA of 861.75 sq ft . GCW acted on behalf of Vancouver Limited Partnership. The quoting rent was £45,000 pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Philippe Micheal at GCW. EPC Rating confirmed as: D.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 16 Tower St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 784 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 12,750 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jun 2014 |
| Expiry Date: | Jun 2017 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 6,241$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 26 Nov 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 17 Jun 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Nov 2013 |
| Date Occupied: | 17 Jun 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

## LEASING REP

Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.6 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.43$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,354 | $\searrow$ | $59.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 20.9 | $\uparrow$ | 1.0 |
| Months On Market | 11.9 |  |  |


| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: |  |  |
| Status: | Built 1900 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 784 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An unknown tenant has taken 784 sq ft of retail accommodation at 16 Tower Street from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Brown \& co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 12,750$ per annum.

## Lease Comparables

## 81A-83 Lynn Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,818 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | May 2014 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 14,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Business Rates: £5,000 PA


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.6 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.43$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.96$ | $\uparrow$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q2 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 26,354 | $\downarrow$ | $59.8 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 21.9 | $\uparrow$ | 1.0 |
| Months On Market | 10 |  |  |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 2 Aug 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Apr 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 8 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 14 May 2014
$\frac{\text { LEASING REP }}{\text { Belton Duffey }}$
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 1,818 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built 1910 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 1,818 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
An unknown tenant has taken $1,818 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ of retail accommodation from an unknown landlord on confidential terms. Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 14,000$ per annum. The deal was confirmed by Belton Duffey.

## 5 New Conduit St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.6 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.62$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.21$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23,552 | $\searrow$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 8.7 | $\searrow$ | 13.2 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Cafe Mocha Ltd |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |  |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 733 SF | Asking Rent: | £16,000 PA |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2014 | Achieved Rent: | £14,000 PA |
| Space Use: | Retail | Escalations: | £2.73 Annual |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  |  |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
|  |  | Asking Discount: | 12.50\% |
| LEASE TERM |  | Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |
| Start Date: | Mar 2014 |  |  |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2029 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Lease Term: | 15 Years | Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Mar 2017, T... | Business Rates: | £5,417 PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 27 Jan 2014 |
| Date Off Market: | 17 Jun 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 17 Mar 2014

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Nuilt 1900 |  | 733 SF |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 593 SF |

LEASE NOTES
Cafe Mocha Ltd has taken $733 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(68 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail accommodation from an undisclosed landlord on a 15 year lease at $£ 14,000$ pa, rising to $£ 16,000$ pa in year six with a further rent review in 2024. There is a tenant only option to break at the end of the third, eighth and thirteenth years. Brown \& co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 12,000$ per annum.

## Lease Comparables

## 18-22 High St

Hunstanton - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 839 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 17,500 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Mar 2014

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 4,899$ PA |



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ 28.4\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.6\% | $40.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.4\% | $\downarrow 0.5 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2014 Q1 | YoY |
| Current Building | - |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £15.62 | - 9.4\% |
| Market Overall | £19.21 | $\downarrow 1.9 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2014 Q1 | YoY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43,552 | $\downarrow$ 3.9\% |
| Months On Market | 8.7 | - 13.2 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 5 Jun 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 12 Mar 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 33 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Aug 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 10 Mar 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 31 Months |

LEASING REP
Francis Darrah Surveyors Ltd
12 Bank St
Norwich, NR2 4SE
Francis Darrah 01603666630

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 2,610 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1977 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 1,305 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $839 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(77.9 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of ground-floor retail space on confidential terms. Francis Darrah Chartered Surveyors acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 17,500$ pa. Deal confirmed by Francis Darrah at Francis Darrah Chartered Surveyors. EPC Rating - E.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 19.4\% | 4 | 9.6\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.6\% | 4 | 0.6\% |
| Market Overall | 3.4\% | $\downarrow$ | 0.5\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2014 Q1 |  | YOY |
| Current Building | - |  | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £15.62 | $\downarrow$ | 9.4\% |
| Market Overall | £19.21 | $\downarrow$ | 1.9\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2014 Q1 |  | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43,552 | $\downarrow$ | 3.9\% |
| Months On Market | 8.7 |  | 13.2 |


| TENANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tenant Name: | Warren James (Jewellers) Ltd |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |
| NAICS: | Jewelry Stores -448310 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 865 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
| Suite: | Unit 7B |


| RENTS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Asking Rent: | $£ 32,500$ PA |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 25,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT

| Asking Discount: | $23.08 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rent Free Months: | 9 Months |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Feb 2014 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expiry Date: | Jan 2024 | Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years | Service Charge: | £2,068 PA |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Jan 2017, T... | Business Rates: | £17,545 PA |
| Reviews: | Jan 2019 |  |  |

## TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 20 May 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 5 Mar 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 May 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 5 Mar 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 10 Months |

LEASING REP

TENANT REP
Brasier Freeth LLP
38 Clarendon Rd
Watford, WD17 1SE
Anthony Appleby 01923205508
stuart La Frenais 02032964240
Andrew Criss 02076377100
Roche Chartered Surveyors
56-56A Thorpe Rd
Norwich, NR1 1RY
Adrian Fennell 01603756334

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 19.4\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
Warren James (Jewellers) Ltd has taken $865 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(80.36} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m)} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{ground-floor} \mathrm{retail} \mathrm{space}$ within unit 7B from VSC No 1 Ltd on a 10-year FRI lease at $£ 25,000$ pa, subject to a rent review at the end of the fifth year and a tenant only option to break in the third and sixth years. Jackson Criss LLP and Roche Chartered Surveyors acted on behalf of VSC No 1 Ltd. Nine months rentfree period was agreed. EPC rating is C. Brasier Freeth LLP acted on behalf of Warren James (Jewellers) Ltd. The quoting rent was $£ 32,500$ pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Anthony Appleby at Brasier Freeth LLP.

## Lease Comparables

## 8-12 Wootton Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.6 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $0.6 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $3.4 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.5 \%$ |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 15.49$ | $\downarrow$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.21$ | $\downarrow$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2014 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23,552 | $\searrow$ | $3.9 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 43 |  |  |
| Months On Market | 8.7 | $\searrow$ | 13.2 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Sunshine Blinds Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Manufacturing |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 336 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2014 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 6,500$ PA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 6,500 \mathrm{PA}$ |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $0.00 \%$ |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Jan 2014 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Jan 2021 |
| Lease Term: | 7 Years |
| Reviews: | Jan 2017 |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 30 Apr 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 22 Jan 2014 |
| Months on Market: | 9 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Apr 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 22 Feb 2014 |
| Months Vacant: | 10 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 336 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Flories: | 236 SF |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Sunshine Blinds Ltd has taken 336 sq ft ( 31.22 sq m ) of ground-floor retail space from Mr Chan on a seven-year lease at $£ 6,500 \mathrm{pa}$, subject to a rent review in year three with no option to break. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of Mr Chan. No rent-free period was agreed. Sunshine Blinds Ltd was unrepresented. Achieved rent confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## Lease Comps Report

## 26 Tower St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.5\% | 入 $1.5 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.6\% | - $4.5 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £15.33 | $\downarrow$ 6.6\% |
| Market Overall | £18.22 | $\downarrow$ 0.9\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 63,937 | - $40.3 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 10.6 | † 6.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 456 SF |
| Sign Date: | Aug 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 7,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Aug 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 3,527$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 17 Jan 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 30 Aug 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jan 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 15 Aug 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | 456 SF |  |
| Status: | Built Sep 1935 |  | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Stories: |  |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 456 SF |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $354 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(32.89 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space on a confidential lease. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 7,000$ pa. Confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 97 Norfolk St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 93.5\% | 4 39.8\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 5.6\% | - $1.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.9\% | - $1.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £14.86 | $\downarrow \mathrm{7.2} \mathrm{\%}$ |
| Market Overall | £18.33 | 4 1.2\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 65,495 | - $41.7 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 10.8 | † 6.2 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Mr Auskas |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 929 SF | Asking Rent: | £6,500 PA |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2013 | Achieved Rent: | £6,500 PA |
| Space Use: | Retail |  |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | Asking Discount: | 0.00\% |
|  |  | Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |  |
| Start Date: | Jun 2013 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Expiry Date: | Jun 2016 | Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years | Service Charge: | No |
|  |  | Business Rates: | £2,633 PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 17 Jan 2013 |
| Date Off Market: | 12 Jul 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 6 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Nov 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 21 Jun 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 7 Months |

LEASING REP
Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 930 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 930 SF |
| Parking: | 1 Surface Space is a... |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $93.5 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Mr Auskas has taken $870 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(80.83 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space from lan Williamson \& Son (Kings Lynn) Ltd on a three-year lease at $£ 6,500$ pa, subject to no rent reviews nor options to break. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of Ian Williamson \& Son (Kings Lynn) Ltd. No rent-free period was agreed. Mr Auskas was unrepresented. The quoting rent was £6,500 pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 142 Norfolk St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 100\% | 4 6.6\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.6\% | $\downarrow 1.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.9\% | † 1.0\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £15.04 | $\downarrow 6.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £18.33 | $41.2 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 65,495 | - $41.7 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 10.8 | † 6.2 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | The Entertainer |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,669 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |


| RENTS |
| :--- |
| Asking Rent: $\quad £ 85,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jul 2013 |
| Expiry Date: | Jul 2023 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 3,341$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Jan 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 5 Jun 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 17 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jan 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 5 Jul 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 18 Months |


| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 3,669 SF |
| Status: | Built 1910 |  |  |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 3,669 SF |

LEASE NOTES
The Entertainer has taken $3,669 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(340.86 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space from Welbeck Investment Management Limited. CBRE Ltd were the marketing agents for the landlord. Welbeck Investment Management Limited completed the deal direct with the The Entertainer. The quoting rent was $£ 85,000$ pa. Details confirmed by CBRE Ltd.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 33 Railway Rd

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


| MARKET AT LEASE |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | 0.0\% |  |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 5.6\% | $\downarrow 1.0 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 3.9\% | $\downarrow 1.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £14.86 | $\downarrow$ 7.2\% |
| Market Overall | £18.33 | A 1.2\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 65,495 | $\downarrow$ 41.7\% |
| Months On Market | 10.8 | - 6.2 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Anglia First Home Improvements Ltd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Manufacturing |
| NAICS: | Plastics Material and Resin Manufacturing - 325211 |

## LEASE

| SF Leased: | 2,440 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Apr 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Apr 2016 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |


| $l$ PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 6,830$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 19 Sep 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 2 May 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 56 Mos |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

## PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 2,440 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Jan 1960 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 1,995 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Anglia First Home Improvements Ltd has taken 2,440 sq ft ( 226.7 sq m ) of ground and first-floor retail space from Mr Roffe on a three-year lease at $£ 10,000$ pa, in year one, rising to $£ 12,000$ pa, in year two and to $£ 14,000$ pa in year three. Belton Duffey and Brown \& Co.acted on behalf of Mr Roffe. Anglia First Home Improvements Ltd was unrepresented. Achieved rent confirmed by David Hardingham at Belton Duffey.

## Lease Comparables

3 High St<br>Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 80.7\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.6\% | - 1.1\% |
| Market Overall | 3.9\% | - 1.0\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £15.04 | $\downarrow$ 6.1\% |
| Market Overall | £18.33 | A $1.2 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q2 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 65,495 | $\downarrow$ 41.7\% |
| Months On Market | 10.8 | † 6.2 |

## TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Outdoor Antics |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 343 SF |
| Sign Date: | Apr 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 7,000$ PA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 4,992$ PA |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT

| Asking Discount: | $28.69 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

## LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Apr 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2014 |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 1,782$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 15 Nov 2007 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 19 Sep 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 70 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 14 Nov 2008 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Apr 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 52 Months |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 425 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 213 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 80.7\% |

## LEASE NOTES

Outdoor Antics has taken $851 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(79.06 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space on a rolling oneyear lease at $£ 4,992$ pa. Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. Outdoor Antics was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 7,000$ pa. Confirmed by Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 36 Tower St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\downarrow$ - $41.8 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 5.0\% | - $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | † $0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £17.04 | 4 6.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $49.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow 56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,194 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

## RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 8,000$ PA |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 8,000$ PA |

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Asking Discount: 0.00\%
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

## LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Mar 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Mar 2016 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |
| Breaks: | Tenant - Mar 2014, T... |

## PROPERTY EXPENSES

Business Rates: $£ 3,554 \mathrm{PA}$

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 17 Jan 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 22 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 15 Mar 2013

LEASING REP

## Geoffrey Collings \& Co

17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 1,195 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | - | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 710 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,194 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(110.93 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m})$ of ground-floor retail space from Haymarket Investments on a three-year lease at $£ 8,000$ pa, subject to an annual option to break for the tenant. Geoffrey Collings \& Co acted on behalf of Haymarket Investments. No rent-free period was agreed. The tenant was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 8,000$ pa. Achieved rent confirmed by Jeffrey Hazel at Geoffrey Collings \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | † 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow$ 0.8\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | 4 7.9\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | 4 9 4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow 56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,900 SF |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 65,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Mar 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 28,396$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 1 Nov 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 4 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Jun 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Mar 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 21 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $3,900 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(362 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit SU17A on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 85,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report
1A High St
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.04$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.8 | $\uparrow$ | 7.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\searrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Ink Shrink Tattoos |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Personal Services |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 797 SF | Asking Rent: $£ 8,400 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| Sign Date: | Mar 2013 | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |
| Space Use: | Retail |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Buildout Status: Full Build-Out |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| LEASE TERM |  |  |
|  |  | Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Start Date: | Mar 2013 |  |

TIME ON MARKET
Date On Market: 2 Aug 2012
Date Off Market: 19 Sep 2013
Months on Market: 13 Mos

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | SF |
| Status: | Built Feb 1938 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 797 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Ink Shrink has taken 797 sq ft ( 74.04 sq m ) of ground-floor retail space on a confidential lease.
Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 8,400$ pa. Confirmed by
Alison Richardson at Brown \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $9.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.25$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.8 | $\mathbb{4}$ | 7.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,382 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad £ 30,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Feb 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 16,603$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKE |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date On Market: | 22 May 2012 | Date Occupied: | 28 Feb 2013 |


| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $9.8 \%$ |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,382 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(128} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m)} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{ground} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{first-floor} \mathrm{retail} \mathrm{space} \mathrm{in}$ unit E6 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 30,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $9.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.25$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 25,316 | $\downarrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,8 | $\uparrow$ | 7.7 |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,605 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 50,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Feb 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 26,793$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Date On Market: 22 May 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 2,605 sq ft (242 sq m) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit SU11 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 50,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

North St - Former Monte Agency<br>Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $89.9 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\searrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.04$ | $\uparrow$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.8 | $\uparrow$ | 7.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\searrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,495 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £22,500 PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Feb 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 6,314 \mathrm{PA}$ |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 1 Feb 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 7 Jun 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 28 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Feb 2012 |
| Date Occupied: | 11 Feb 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 12 Months |

LEASING REP
Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 3,495 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1962 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single | Floor Size: | 3,142 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 89.9\% |
| Parking: | 10 Surface Spaces ar... |  |  |
| LEASE NOTES |  |  |  |
| An undisclosed Tawn Landles | nt has taken $3,495 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 32 on behalf of the landlord. | sq m) of retail space e quoting rent was $£$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { on confide } \\ & \text { 22,500 pa. } \end{aligned}$ |

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | $\downarrow$ 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow 0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | A $7.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $4 \mathrm{9} .4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ 56.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 865 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £45,000 PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Feb 2013

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 16,129$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 1 Nov 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 4 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jun 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Feb 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 20 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $865 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(80 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space in Unit 7B on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 45,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

1D High St
Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 5.0\% | - $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow 0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building |  |  |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £17.04 | 4 6.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | 4 P 4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ 56.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Kaleidoscope |
| :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 851 SF |
| Sign Date: | Feb 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS

| Asking Rent: | $£ 10,000 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Achieved Rent: | $£ 8,100 \mathrm{PA}$ |
|  |  |
| CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Asking Discount: | $19.00 \%$ |
| Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |

LEASE TERM

| Start Date: | Feb 2013 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Expiry Date: | Jan 2014 |  |  |
|  | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |  |
| Lease Term: | 1 Year |  |  |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 2 Aug 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 19 Sep 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 13 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Feb 2013

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
25-26 Tuesday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 1JJ
Alison Richardson 01553770771

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 851 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | 2 |  |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Stories: | 20 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry Size: | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |  |

## LEASE NOTES

Kaleidoscope has taken 851 sq ft ( 79.06 sq m ) of ground-floor retail space on a rolling one-year lease at $£ 8,100$ pa, subject to no rent reviews nor options to break. Brown \& Co acted on behalt of the landlord. Kaleidoscope was unrepresented. The quoting rent was $£ 10,000$ pa.
Confirmed by Alison Richardson at Browne \& Co.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | $42.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | - $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | † $0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | 4 7.9\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $49.4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow 56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF Leased: | 1,593 SF | Asking Rent: | £32,500 PA |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Retail | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |  |  |

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: Jan 2013 |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 30 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Sep 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 30 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 16 Months |

LEASING REP

## BC Retail

20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,593 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ ( 148 sq m ) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit E10 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 32,500$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $9.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.25$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.8 | $\uparrow$ | 7.7 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,405 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad £ 30,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: Jan 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 15,229$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: 21 May 2012 |  |  |  |  |


| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Months on Market: | 10 Mos |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $9.8 \%$ |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $1,405 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(131 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit E3 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 30,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | $\downarrow$ 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow$ 0.8\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | 4 7.9\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | 4 9 4\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ 56.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,783 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £50,000 PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: Jan 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 9,046$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 16 Sep 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 30 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Sep 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 18 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 16 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken 2,783 sq ft (259 sq m) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit 18/20 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 50,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | $\downarrow$ 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow 0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | A $7.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $4 \mathrm{9} .4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ 56.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 934 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 27,500 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: Jan 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 14,830$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 21 Jun 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 33 Mos |

TIME VACANT

| Date Vacated: | 1 Jun 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Occupied: | 15 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 19 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken $934 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(87} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space in unit E8 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 27,500$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | † 2.2\% |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | $\downarrow 0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | A $7.9 \%$ |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $4 \mathrm{9} .4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | $\downarrow$ 56.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 3,310 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: £60,000 PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: Jan 2013

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 23,184$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 21 Jun 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 33 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 21 Jun 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 10 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 18 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Julian Bishop 02073185069
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $3,310 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(308 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space in unit SU16B on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 60,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $9.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $5.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $4.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.8 \%$ |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.25$ | $\uparrow$ | $7.9 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.59$ | $\uparrow$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2013 Q1 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 20.316 | $\downarrow$ | $56.2 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | $45,3.8$ | $\mathbb{4}$ | 7.7 |
| Months On Market | 21.8 |  |  |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,659 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $\quad$ £55,000 PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- |
| Start Date: Jan 2013 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 24,961$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 5 Dec 2008 |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 51 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Dec 2009 |
| Date Occupied: | 7 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 37 Months |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
Green \& Partners
2 Gees Ct
London, W1U 1JA
Mike Willoughby 02076594827
James Dellar 02076594841

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |  | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $9.8 \%$ |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken 2,659 sq ft ( 247 sq m ) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit SU8 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 55,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 $2.1 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 5.0\% | - $2.2 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 4.0\% | - $0.8 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.25 | 4 7.9\% |
| Market Overall | £19.59 | $4 \mathrm{~A} .4 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2013 Q1 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 45,316 | - $56.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.8 | 47.7 |


| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF Leased: | 1,448 SF | Asking Rent: | £30,000 PA |
| Sign Date: | Jan 2013 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Retail | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Buildout Status: | Full Build-Out |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |  |  |

PROPERTY EXPENSES
Business Rates: £15,422 PA
LEASE TERM
Start Date: Jan 2013

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 21 Jun 2010 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 33 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Jun 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 4 Jan 2013 |
| Months Vacant: | 19 Months |

LEASING REP

## BC Retail

20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 9.8\% |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |  |  |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken 1,248 sq ft (116 sq m) of ground and first-floor retail space in unit E4 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 30,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 6.0\% | † $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.8\% | 4 3.7\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.84 | A 13.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.91 | A 16.8\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | A 127.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.6 | 49.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,843 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 35,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Dec 2012

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 8,803$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  |  | TIME VACANT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: 21 Mar 2012 |  |  |  |  |


| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Months on Market: | 12 Mos |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588
 unit E9 on confidential terms. BC Retail and Green \& Partners acted on behalf of Alfred McAlpine plc. The quoting rent was $£ 35,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## 9 High St

Downham Market - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket



MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $6.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.7 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.84$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.91$ | $\uparrow$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23,977 | $\mathbb{4}$ | $127.2 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 9.6 | $\mathbb{4}$ | 9.4 |
| Months On Market | 21.6 |  |  |

LEASING REP
Belton Duffey
12-16 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
David Hardingham 01553770055

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 383 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | 3 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Flories: | 383 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

Sunshine Daycare has taken 187 sqft ( 17.37 sqm) of ground floor retail space on a 6 month lease at $£ 6,500$ pa. David Hardingham of Belton Duffey acted on behalf of the landlord.
Sunshine Daycare was unrepresented. The quoting rent was listed at $£ 6,500$ pa. Achieved rent confirmed by David Hardingham at $£ 6,500$ pa.

## Lease Comparables

## 36 High St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $76.9 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $6.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.7 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.84$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | $£ 19.91$ | $\uparrow$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 23,977 | $\uparrow$ | $127.2 \%$ |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 9.6 | $\uparrow$ | 9.4 |
| Months On Market | 21.6 |  |  |

TENANT

| Tenant Name: | I Like |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LEASE |  |  |  |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,114 SF | RENTS |  |  |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2012 |  |  |  |
| Space Use: | Retail |  |  |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct |  | CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT |  |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1 Floor |  |  |  |

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date:

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 22,961$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 13 May 2008 |  |  |  |  |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Dec 2011 |  |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 20 Jun 2013 |  | Date Occupied: | 1 Jan 2013 |  |
| Months on Market: | 61 Mos |  | Months Vacant: | 13 Months |  |


| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 1,114 SF |
| Status: | Built 1880 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 870 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $76.9 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
I Like has taken $870 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(80.83 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground floor retail space on confidential terms.

## Lease Comparables

## 20 Broad St - Vancouver Quarter

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 9.8\% | 4 2.1\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 6.0\% | - $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.8\% | 4 3.7\% |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.84 | 4 13.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.91 | 4 16.8\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | 4 127.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.6 | 49.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 1,146 SF |
| Sign Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Dec 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Sep 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 2 Years 9 Months |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 11 Mar 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Mar 2013 |
| Months on Market: | 24 Mos |

LEASING REP
BC Retail
20 Little Portland St
London, W1W 8BS
Nick Furlong 02071830588

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |
| :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Apr 1961 |
| Tenancy: | Multi |
| Construction: | Steel |
| Parking: | 75 Covered Spaces ar.. |


| NIA: | 135,682 SF |
| :--- | :--- |
| Stories: | 2 |
| Floor Size: | 67,841 SF |
| Vacancy at Lease: | $9.8 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $2,328 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(216 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground and first-floor retail space in 29 New Conduit Street from an undisclosed head tenant on assignment of an existing lease expiring in September 2015 at an undiscloaed passing rent. BC Retail acted on behalf of the assignor. The quoting rent was $£ 65,000$ pa. Deal confirmed by BC Retail.

## Lease Comparables

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 6.0\% | † $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.8\% | $43.7 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.84 | A 13.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.91 | 4 16.8\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | A 127.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.6 | 49.4 |

TENANT
Tenant Name: Beaconsfield Footwear Limited

| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,683 SF |
| Sign Date: | Nov 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, P 1, P 2, P 3... |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 45,000$ PA

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: $\quad$ Dec 2012 |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service Charge: | No |
| Business Rates: | $£ 21,412$ PA |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 25 Jan 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 5 Nov 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 22 Mos |

LEASING REP
Pearl \& Coutts Limited
1-9 White Lion St
London, N1 9PD
Matt King 02078433785
Leigh Peters 07989747996
GCW
7-10 Chandos St
London, W1G 9DQ
James Crittenden 02076474816
Simon Morris 02076474802

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 2,683 SF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | - |  | Stories: | 4 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 671 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Beaconsfield Footwear Limited have taken 2,683 sq ft ( 249.26 sq m ) of retail space from Structadene Group Ltd on confidential terms. Pearl \& Coutts acted on behalf of Structadene Group Ltd. The quoting rent was $£ 45,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 16.77 \mathrm{psf}(£ 180.51 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

## Hardwick Rd - Hardwick Retail Park

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - 7.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 6.0\% | $\downarrow 0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | 7.8\% | $43.7 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.84 | 4 13.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.91 | A $16.8 \%$ |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | 4 127.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.6 | 49.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 7,500 SF |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Oct 2012 |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 168,750$ PA

| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 15 Nov 2010 |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Nov 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 24 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 22 Oct 2012

LEASING REP
CBRE Ltd
6-12 Henrietta PI
London, W1G 0NB
Charles McIntosh 02071822246

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 107,110 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built May 1997 | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | Multi | Floor Size: | 107,110 SF |
| Construction: | Steel | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $7,500 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(696.77 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail space on confidential terms. CBRE Ltd acted on behalf of the landlord, UBS Global Asset Management. Details confirmed by CBRE Ltd.

## Lease Comparables

## 66 High St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow$ 0.0\% |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 6.0\% | † 0.1\% |
| Market Overall | 7.8\% | $43.7 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| Current Building | - |  |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £17.84 | 4 13.6\% |
| Market Overall | £19.91 | 4 16.8\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q4 | YOY |
| 12 Mo . Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | A 127.2\% |
| Months On Market | 21.6 | 49.4 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | $1,121 \mathrm{SF}$ |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |

## RENTS

Asking Rent: $£ 30,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES

| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Nov 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Oct 2022 |
| Lease Term: | 10 Years |


| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 15,155$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 22 Mar 2012 |
| Date Off Market: | 9 Oct 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 7 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Nov 2012

LEASING REP
GVA
10 Stratton St
London, W1J 8DA
Paul Faulkner 03459003900
Jessica Hawes 02079112409

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 1,926 SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Status: | Built Oct 1912 | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - | Floor Size: | 963 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry | Vacancy at Lease: | 0.0\% |
| LEASE NOTES |  |  |  |
| An undisclosed floor on a new rent was $£ 30,00$ GVA. | nt has taken 1,9 on confidential equating to $£ 15$ | sq m ) of retail accom cted on behalf of the 7.66 psm). Deal confir | modation landlord. T med Paul |

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

## 92 Westgate

Hunstanton - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | $0.0 \%$ | $\leftrightarrow$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $6.0 \%$ | $\downarrow$ | $0.1 \%$ |
| Market Overall | $7.8 \%$ | $\uparrow$ | $3.7 \%$ |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Asking Rent Per SF | - |  | - |
| Current Building | $£ 17.84$ | $\uparrow$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | $£ 19.91$ | $\uparrow$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| Market Overall |  |  |  |
|  | 2012 Q4 | YOY |  |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 21.6 | $\uparrow$ | 9.4 |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 93,977 | $\uparrow$ | $127.2 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 21.6 |  |  |


| Tenant Name: | Deja Vu |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Retailers/Wholesalers |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |
| SF Leased: | 643 SF | Asking Rent: $£ 8,700 \mathrm{PA}$ |
| Sign Date: | Oct 2012 | PROPERTY EXPENSES |
| Space Use: | Retail |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Service: Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| Floor: | GRND Floor |  |

$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: } \quad \text { Oct } 2012}$

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 26 Apr 2012 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 14 Dec 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 8 Mos |

TIME VACANT
Date Occupied: 1 Oct 2012

## LEASING REP

Tawn Landles Estate Agents
Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Tim Landles 01553772816

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 643 SF |  |
| Status: | Built May 1983 |  | Stories: | 1 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 643 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Deja Vu have taken $643 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(60 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail space on confidential terms. Tawn Landles acted on behalf of the landlord. The quoting rent was $£ 8,700$ pa.

## Lease Comparables

## 32 Norfolk St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | - 24.9\% |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | 7.0\% | 4 1.1\% |
| Market Overall | 8.1\% | $4.4 .0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 1-3 Star | £16.42 | 4 2.6\% |
| Market Overall | £18.38 | 4 6.6\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 107,141 | 4 293.3\% |
| Months On Market | 17.3 | 46.8 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 2,005 SF |
| Sign Date: | Sep 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | P GRND, 1, 2 Floor |

RENTS
Asking Rent: $£ 10,000 \mathrm{PA}$

CONCESSIONS AND BUILDOUT
Buildout Status: Full Build-Out

PROPERTY EXPENSES
LEASE TERM
Start Date: $\quad$ Sep 2012

| Service: | Fully Repairing \& Ins... |
| :--- | :--- |
| Business Rates: | $£ 4,980$ PA |


| TIME ON MARKET |  |  | TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Date On Market: | 31 Jul 2012 |  |  |  |
| Date Off Market: | 27 Sep 2012 |  |  |  |
| Months on Market: | 2 Mos |  |  |  |

LEASING REP
Brown \& Co
27 King St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1ET
Alison Richardson 01553770771

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: | 2,005 SF |
| Status: | Built Feb 1911 |  | Stories: | 3 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 1,002 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
An undisclosed tenant has taken 2,005 sq ft (186.27 sq m) of retail space from an undisclosed landlord on confidential terms.

Brown \& Co acted on behalf of the landlord.
The quoting rent was $£ 10,000 \mathrm{pa}$, equating to $£ 4.99 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 53.69 \mathrm{psm}$ ).

## Lease Comparables

## Lease Comps Report

## 26 Tower St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE

| Vacancy Rate | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current Building | 0.0\% | $\leftrightarrow 0.0 \%$ |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | 7.0\% | A 1.0\% |
| Market Overall | 8.1\% | 4 $4.0 \%$ |
| Asking Rent Per SF | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| Current Building | - | - |
| Submarket 2-4 Star | £16.42 | 4 1.9\% |
| Market Overall | £18.38 | 4 6.6\% |
| Submarket Leasing Activity | 2012 Q3 | YOY |
| 12 Mo. Leased SF (Thous) | 107,141 | A $293.3 \%$ |
| Months On Market | 17.3 | 46.8 |


| LEASE |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| SF Leased: | 477 SF |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2012 |
| Space Use: | Retail |
| Lease Type: | Direct |
| Floor: | Unkwn Floor |
|  |  |
| LEASE TERM |  |
| Start Date: | Jul 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Jul 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET
Date On Market: 14 Jun 2012
Date Off Market: 29 Jul 2012
Months on Market: 1 Mo

## LEASING REP

Geoffrey Collings \& Co
17 Blackfriars St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1NN
Jeffrey Hazel 01553774566

PROPERTY

| Property Type: | Retail | NIA: | 456 SF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Status: | Built Sep 1935 |  | Stories: | 3 |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Floor Size: | 456 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $477 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(44.31 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of ground-floor retail space from an undisclosed landlord on a three-year lease at $£ 7,000$ pa, equating to $£ 14.68 \mathrm{psf}$ ( 157.96 psm ).

Geoffrey Collings \& Co. acted on behalf of the landlord.
The quoting rent was $£ 7,000$ pa, equating to $£ 14.68$ psf ( $£ 157.96$ psm).

## Lease Comparables

## 14 St James St

Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


MARKET AT LEASE


TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Miss Walescza |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Industry: | Business Services |  |  |
| LEASE |  |  |  |
| SF Leased: | 1,000 SF | RENTS |  |
| Sign Date: | Jul 2012 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Retail | Achieved Rent: |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | GRND Floor |  |
| Floor: |  |  |  |


| LEASE TERM |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start Date: | Jul 2012 |
| Expiry Date: | Jul 2015 |
| Lease Term: | 3 Years |

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 7 Feb 2012 | Date Vacated: | 1 Feb 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date Off Market: | 1 Jul 2012 | Date Occupied: | 2 Jul 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 5 Mos | Months Vacant: | 5 Months |

LEASING REP
Sheridan Sales \& Letting Agents
2 Saturday Market PI
Kings Lynn, PE30 5DQ
Sarah Sheridan 01553766777

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | NIA: |  |
| Status: | Built 1700 |  | Stories: | 2 |
| Tenancy: | - |  | Floor Size: | 544 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Vacancy at Lease: | $0.0 \%$ |

LEASE NOTES
Miss Walescza has taken $1,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}(92.90 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail space from Mr Howard on a three year lease at $£ 12,500$ pa, equating to $£ 12.50 \mathrm{psf}$ ( $£ 134.55 \mathrm{psm}$ ), subject to an option to break in year three. Sheridan Estate Agents acted on behalf of Mr Howard. The tenant was unrepresented. Achieved rent confirmed by Sheridan Estate Agents.

## Lease Comparables

Lease Comps Report

18A Wilton Rd
Kings Lynn - King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Submarket


TENANT

| Tenant Name: | Razor Sharp |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Industry: | Personal Services |  |  |
| LEASE |  | RENTS |  |
| SF Leased: | 307 SF | Asking Rent: | £5,000 PA |
| Sign Date: | Jun 2012 |  |  |
| Space Use: | Retail | PROPERTY EXPENSES |  |
| Lease Type: | Direct | Service Charge: | No |
| Floor: | GRND Floor | Business Rates: | £704 PA |

$\frac{\text { LEASE TERM }}{\text { Start Date: }}$

TIME ON MARKET

| Date On Market: | 13 Jun 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Off Market: | 31 May 2012 |
| Months on Market: | 11 Mos |


| TIME VACANT |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Date Vacated: | 1 Aug 2011 |
| Date Occupied: | 1 Jun 2012 |
| Months Vacant: | 10 Months |

LEASING REP
Russen \& Turner
17 High St
Kings Lynn, PE30 1BP
Giles Stovold 01553763574

| PROPERTY |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Type: | Retail |  | 480 SF |  |
| Status: | Nuilt Mar 1974 |  | 1 |  |
| Tenancy: | Single |  | Stories: | 480 SF |
| Construction: | Masonry |  | Floor Size: | 480 |

## LEASE NOTES

An undisclosed tenant has taken $307 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft} \mathrm{(29} \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{m}$ ) of retail space on confidential terms. Russen \& Turner acted on behalf of the landlord.


Lease Comparables


|  | 104-104A High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | RH Fayers \& Son Funeral Directors | $1,560$ <br> New Direct | May 2015 |  | £9,618 PA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7 Wales Ct <br> Downham Market, PE38 9JZ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Reeds of Downham Market Ltd Structadene Group Ltd | $806$ <br> New Direct | Apr 2015 <br> 5 Years |  | £4,930 PA |  |
|  | Edward Benefer Way <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 2HW <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | The Norfolk Hospice Turnstone Estates Ltd | $5,585$ <br> New Direct | Feb 2015 <br> 5 Years | $£ 75,400 \mathrm{PA}$ | £23,859 PA |  |
|  | 47 High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1BE <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | $2,027$ <br> New Direct | Feb 2015 10 Years |  | £24,492 PA |  |
|  | 117-118 London Rd Kings Lynn, PE30 5ES <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Inheritance Legal Services Limited | $282$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2015 2 Years | £4,000 PA | 0 Mos £1,860 PA | Dec 2015 |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | Vancouver Quarter <br> 12-34 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Submark... | Doodlecards Ltd Vancouver Quarter | $1,475$ <br> New Direct | Nov 2014 <br> 1 Year |  | £17,074 PA | Jan 2015 |
|  | 67-67a High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1AY <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | $1,053$ <br> New Direct | Oct 2014 |  | £13,978 PA |  |
| $9$ | Vancouver Quarter <br> 2-46 New Conduit St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DL <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Roman Originals plc Vancouver Limited Partnership | 4,158 <br> New Direct | Oct 2014 <br> 2 Years | £15,716 PA | 1 Mo at Start £29,202 PA |  |
| $10$ | 8 Greevegate <br> Hunstanton, PE36 6BJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | 736 <br> New Direct | Aug 2014 |  | £6,869 PA |  |
| $11$ | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Select Fashion Limited <br> Alfred Mcalpine plc | $5,707$ <br> New Direct | Jul 2014 <br> 10 Years | £60,000 PA | £2,751 PA | Jul 2019 |
| $12$ | Vancouver Quarter <br> 2-46 New Conduit St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DL <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Shoe Zone Retail Ltd | 3,332 <br> New Direct | Jun 2014 <br> 5 Years | £30,000 PA | £31,322 PA |  |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 16 Tower St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1EJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | 784 <br> New Direct | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jun } 2014 \\ & 3 \text { Years } \end{aligned}$ |  | £6,241 PA |  |
|  | 81A-83 Lynn Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 4PR <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | 1,818 <br> New Direct | May 2014 |  | £5,000 PA |  |
|  | 5 New Conduit St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DE <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Cafe Mocha Ltd | 733 <br> New Direct | Mar 2014 <br> 15 Years | £ 14,000 PA | £5,417 PA | Mar 2017... |
|  | 18-22 High St <br> Hunstanton, PE36 5AF <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | 839 <br> New Direct | Mar 2014 |  | £4,899 PA |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Warren James (Jewellers) Ltd Alfred Mcalpine plc | 865 <br> New Direct | Feb 2014 <br> 10 Years | £25,000 PA | Spread Over $£ 17,545 \mathrm{PA}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text {. Jan 2017... } \\ & \text { Jan } 2019 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 8-12 Wootton Rd Kings Lynn, PE30 4EX King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Sunshine Blinds Ltd | 336 <br> New Direct | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Jan } 2014 \\ & 7 \text { Years } \end{aligned}$ | £6,500 PA |  | Jan 2017 |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $19$ | 26 Tower St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1EJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | 456 <br> New Direct | Aug 2013 |  | £3,527 PA |  |
| $20$ | 97 Norfolk St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1AQ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Mr Auskas | 929 <br> New Direct | Jun 2013 <br> 3 Years | £6,500 PA | £2,633 PA |  |
|  | 142 Norfolk St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1AU <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | The Entertainer | $3,669$ <br> New Direct | Jul 2013 10 Years |  | £3,341 PA |  |


|  | 33 Railway Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1NF <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Anglia First Home Improvements L... | $2,440$ <br> New Direct | Apr 2013 <br> 3 Years | £10,000 PA | £6,830 PA |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $23$ | 3 High St <br> Downham Market, PE38 9DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Outdoor Antics | 343 <br> New Direct | Apr 2013 <br> 1 Year | £4,992 PA | £1,782 PA |  |
| 24 | 36 Tower St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1EJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | $1,194$ <br> New Direct | Mar 2013 <br> 3 Years | £8,000 PA | $£ 3,554 \mathrm{PA}$ | Mar 2014... |
|  |  | Copyrighted report licensed to HDH Plan | nning \& Devel | 701359. |  |  | Star" |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent <br> Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 3,900 <br> New Direct | Mar 2013 |  | £28,396 PA |  |
|  | 1A High St <br> Downham Market, PE38 9DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Ink Shrink Tattoos | 797 <br> New Direct | Mar 2013 |  |  |  |
| $27$ | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 1,382 <br> New Direct | Feb 2013 |  | £16,603 PA |  |
| $28$ | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $2,605$ <br> New Direct | Feb 2013 |  | £26,793 PA |  |


Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1D High St <br> Downham Market, PE38 9DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Kaleidoscope | 851 <br> New Direct | Feb 2013 <br> 1 Year | £8,100 PA |  |  |


| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $1,593$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 | £8,706 PA |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $1,405$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 | £15,229 PA |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 2,783 <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 | £9,046 PA |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 934 <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 | £14,830 PA |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $3,310$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 | £23,184 PA |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $2,659$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 |  | £24,961 PA |  |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | $1,448$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 |  | £15,422 PA |  |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 1,843 <br> New Direct | Dec 2012 |  | £8,803 PA |  |
|  | 9 High St <br> Downham Market, PE38 9DA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Sunshine Daycare | 187 <br> New Direct | Dec 2012 <br> 6 Months | £6,500 PA | £1,697 PA |  |
|  | 36 High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1BJ <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | I Like | $1,114$ <br> New Direct | Jan 2013 |  | £22,961 PA |  |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vancouver Quarter <br> 20 Broad St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1DP <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Alfred Mcalpine plc | 1,146 <br> New Direct | Dec 2012 <br> 2 Years 9 Months |  | £24,948 PA |  |

Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant Landlord | SF Leased Type | StartDate Term | Starting Rent Effective Rent | Free Rent Rates | Breaks <br> Reviews |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 83 High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1BL <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... | Beaconsfield Footwear Limited Pearl \& Coutts Ltd | 2,683 <br> New Direct | Dec 2012 |  | £21,412 PA |  |
|  | Hardwick Retail Park <br> Hardwick Rd <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 4NA <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | $7,500$ <br> New Direct | Oct 2012 |  |  |  |
|  | 66 High St <br> Kings Lynn, PE30 1AY <br> King's Lynn \& West Norfolk Ret Sub... |  | $1,121$ <br> New Direct | Nov 2012 <br> 10 Years |  | £15,155 PA |  |


Lease Comparables

|  | Address | Tenant <br> Landlord | SF Leased <br> Type | StartDate <br> Term | Starting Rent <br> Effective Rent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rates |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix 4 - Residential Land Transactions

|  | Plannning Reference | Application Type | Current Status | Address | Description | Gross <br> Area | Date Application Granted | Range of Proposed Units | No of Affordable Housing units |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 13/01810/FM | Full | STARTED | Land At Foundry Field Burnham Market Norfolk PE31 8HG | Construction of 32 new dwellings, the provision of a public car park ( 186 spaces), retail units (Class A1, A2 or A3), public toilets and public open space and proposed Pedestrian Works and the demolition of the former day care centre and replacement with | 4.75 | 22/08/2014 | 30-39 | 6 |
| Rural | 13/01123/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Fosters Sports Ground Main Road Clenchwarton Norfolk PE34 4BP | Outline Application: residential development up to 40 dwellings of which 8 will be affordable | 1.42 | 20/01/2015 | 40-49 | 8 |
| Rural | 12/01567/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Station Road Docking King's Lynn Norfolk PE31 8LY | Outline Application for the Development of up to 32 Residential Dwellings \& 300 m 2 B1 Office units with some matters reserved | 0 | 06/11/2013 | 30-39 | Approx 7 |
| Urban | 11/01609/FM | Full | STARTED | Land South of Railway Road Downham Market Norfolk | Re-Design of extant permission and construction of 117 residential dwellings including 20 percent affordable homes, associated open space and landscaping | 0 | 11/04/2012 | 50+ | 24 |
| Urban | 13/01164/FM | Full | STARTED | Land Between Railway Road And Richmond Road Downham Market Norfolk | Residential Development of 97 dwellings with public open space (including demolition of existing dwelling) | 3.34 | 02/05/2014 | 50+ | 19 |
| Rural | 14/00325/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Former Works Adj Gayton Mill Litcham Road Gayton Norfolk | OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH SOME MATTERS RESERVED: Redevelopment of former industrial site for housing | 1.15 | 03/12/2014 | 30-39 | 20\% |
| Urban | 13/00850/FM | Full | GRANTED | Warehouse Clearance Shops St Edmunds Terrace Hunstanton Norfolk PE36 5EH | Erection of Later Living retirement housing for the elderly (category II accommodation), including communal facilities, landscaping and car parking | 0.15 | 08/10/2014 | 30-39 | 0 |
| Urban | 14/01690/OM | Outline | LAPSED | Land North Of Gaywood River Wootton Road King's Lynn Norfolk | Outline Application: residential development | 1 | 17/07/2015 | Approx 80 | 20\% |
| Urban | 08/01182/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Land North West Of St Nicholas Business Park Edward Benefer Way King's Lynn Norfolk | Outline Application: residential development | 2 | 09/07/2009 | 50+ | approx 15 |
| Urban | 11/00406/RMM | Reserved Matters | STARTED | The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (nora) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | Reserved Matters Application - Mixed Use Development | 5.06 | 10/10/2011 | 50+ |  |
| Urban | 12/00414/RMM | Reserved Matters | STARTED | Phase 3 Yours South Lynn Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | Reserved Matters Application: Construction of 56 dwellings | 0 | 30/04/2013 | 50+ | 0 |
| Urban | 12/00546/FM | Full | STARTED | Hillington Square King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 5HR | Demolition of existing stair cores, lifts, bin stores, sheds, some walkways and a number of dwellings. Erection of new stair and lift cores, new entrances to bedsits, extension of bedsits, extension to some upper floor units. Refurbishment of garage space | 0 | 03/07/2012 | 50+ |  |
| Urban | 13/01088/FM | Full | GRANTED | Head Post Office Blackfriars Street King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 1YB | Change of use from a Post Office and Telephone Exchange to a development comprising Retail, Office, Health Facility and Residential Use. The Residential use comprises 27 one \& two bed units. The development includes the replacement of the single storey bu | 0.23 | 04/12/2013 | 20-29 | 0 |
| Urban | 13/01295/FM | Full | STARTED | Former Zoots Nightclub John Kennedy Road King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 1QN | The demolition of the existing building for the redevelopment and erection of 25 dwellings with associated parking | 0.3 | 20/12/2013 | 20-29 | III Affordable 25 unit |
| Urban | 14/00027/FM | Full | STARTED | 50 Ferry Road West Lynn King's Lynn Norfolk PE34 3NB | Demolition of former care facility building and redevelopment for 20 houses | 0.51 | 02/09/2014 | 20-29 | 3 |
| Urban | 14/00569/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Alderman Jackson Special School Marsh Lane King's Lynn Norfolk | OUTLINE APPLICATION WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED: Demolition of former school buildings and redevelopment of the site for residential purposes | 0.83 | 01/10/2014 | 20-29 | 15\% |
| Urban | 14/00997/RMM | Reserved Matters | GRANTED | The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | Reserved Matters Application: construction of 126 dwellings, associated roads, parking and open space at Phase 3 | 2.82 | 03/12/2014 | 50+ | 19 |
| Urban | 14/01 199/RMM | Reserved Matters | STARTED | The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION: Phase 2 of development, construction of 59 dwellings | 2.16 | 04/12/2014 | 50+ | 9 |
| Rural | 12/01899/OM | Outline | GRANTED | Land South of The Saltings Terrington St Clement Norfolk | Residential development, off The Saltings (Outline-41 dwellings) | 2.3 | 28/03/2013 | 40-49 | 8 |
| Rural | 11/01923/OM | Outline | GRANTED | KGB Transport 44 St Johns Road Tilney St Lawrence Norfolk PE34 4QJ | Outline Planning Permission for Residential Development | 1.42 | 23/01/2013 | 20-29 | 20\% |
| Rural | 12/00294/RMM | Reserved Matters | STARTED | English Brothers Ltd 239 Salts Road West Walton Norfolk PE14 7EB | Reserved Matters Application - Construction of 26 dwellings | 0.96 | 05/10/2012 | 20-29 | 5 |

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council CIL - Post PDCS Viability Update - January 2016

| Address | Units | Gross <br> Area | Price Paid | £/ha | £/unit |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land At Foundry Field Burnham Market Norfolk PE31 8HG | 32 | 4.75 | £3,055,000 | £643,158 | £95,469 |  |
| Fosters Sports Ground Main Road Clenchwarton Norfolk PE34 4BP | 40 | 1.42 | £450,000 | £316,901 | £11,250 | Price Paid was for a much larger site - consented area about 20\% |
| Station Road Docking King's Lynn Norfolk PE31 8LY | 32 | 1.13 | £980,000 | £867,257 | £30,625 |  |
| Land South of Railway Road Downham Market Norfolk | 117 | 0 | £4,247,000 |  |  | Combined with below - One site but no plan |
| Land Between Railway Road And Richmond Road Downham Market Norfolk | 97 | 3.34 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 214 | 3.34 | £4,247,000 | £1,271,557 | £19,846 |  |
| Former Works Adj Gayton Mill Litcham Road Gayton Norfolk |  | 1.15 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! |  |
| Warehouse Clearance Shops St Edmunds Terrace Hunstanton Norfolk PE36 5EH |  | 0.15 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! |  |
| Land North Of Gaywood River Wootton Road King's Lynn Norfolk |  | 1 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! |  |
| Land North West Of St Nicholas Business Park Edward Benefer Way King's Lynn Norfolk |  | 2 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! |  |
| The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (nora) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk |  | 5.06 | £25,000 | £4,941 | \#DIV/0! | East block £25,000 Rest owned by council |
| Phase 3 Yours South Lynn Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | 56 | 0 | £760,000 | \#DIV/0! | £13,571 | Part of larger site |
| The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | 126 | 2.82 |  | £0 | £0 | With Yours Sth Lane |
| The Nar Ouse Regeneration Area (NORA) Wisbech Road King's Lynn Norfolk | 59 | 2.16 |  | £0 | £0 | In sites 1 and 2 |
|  | 241 | 10.04 | 785000 | £78,187 | £3,257 |  |
| Hillington Square King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 5HR |  | 0 |  | \#DIV/0! | \#DIV/0! | No Price Data |
| Head Post Office Blackfriars Street King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 1YB | 27 | 0.23 |  | £0 | £0 |  |
| Former Zoots Nightclub John Kennedy Road King's Lynn Norfolk PE30 1QN | 25 | 0.3 | £550,000 | £1,833,333 | £22,000 |  |
| 50 Ferry Road West Lynn King's Lynn Norfolk PE34 3NB | 20 | 0.51 | £182,000 | £356,863 | £9,100 |  |
| Alderman Jackson Special School Marsh Lane King's Lynn Norfolk | 24 | 0.83 | £305,000 | £367,470 | £12,708 |  |
| Land South of The Saltings Terrington St Clement Norfolk |  | 2.3 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! | No Price Data |
| KGB Transport 44 St Johns Road Tilney St Lawrence Norfolk PE34 4QJ |  | 1.42 |  | £0 | \#DIV/0! | No Price Data |
| English Brothers Ltd 239 Salts Road West Walton Norfolk PE14 | 26 | 0.96 | £325,000 | £338,542 | £12,500 |  |
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KLWN StratA.xIsm
Cover

Localityeen/ Brown r rative Use
Kings Lynn Green Amenity Lal
Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Brown Industrial




Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Playing Fiell
Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Playing fiell


Number
South of Parkway
無 든



$\stackrel{n}{5}$







$\underset{\substack{\text { KLWN Strata. } \times \text { sm } \\ \text { site make up }}}{ }$

Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Brown Industrial
Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Agricultural



Locality een/Brown r rative Use
South Woo Green Agricultural
Locality een/Brown rnative Use
South Woo Green Agricultural

Total cost Rate








Locality $\cdot$ een／Brown rnative Use
Downham $/$ Green Agricultural
Locality •een／Brown rnative Use
Hunstantor Green Agricultural

KLWN StratA．xlsm
Site make up
这


言采水






${ }_{\text {ste }}$


|  | $\circ \cdot \frac{0}{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Ste2


Ste 3


ste4


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $0$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\circ$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |




|  |  | ${ }^{\text {and }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |




|  |  |  |  |  | Years $/$ Year6 $/$ Yeary 1 Years |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{25703} 385$ |  |  |  | ${ }_{4}^{23700385}$ |  | 28．62．031 |  |
| （ |  | ${ }^{3,366271}$ | ${ }^{9550,877}$ | 14.311 .016 | ${ }^{19,981354}$ | ${ }^{28,620.031}$ | 23，620．031 | 23.622031 | ${ }^{285202031}$ | 23．62，031 | 23，620．031 | 23.622031 | ${ }^{23392370}$ | ${ }^{38,1627799}$ | 47，703，396 | 47，703386 |  |  | 47，7093．366 | 47，703236 |  | 47，703，386 |  |  |
| ， |  | ${ }^{135348}$ | ，877 |  | ${ }^{681,741}$ | ${ }^{1.022612}$ | ${ }^{10202612}$ | ${ }^{1.022612}$ | ${ }_{1}^{1.022612}$ | ${ }^{1.022612}$ | ${ }^{1.022 .612}$ | 1.0202612 | 1，198，048 | ${ }^{131368433}$ |  | $1,704.354$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1.0202612}$ |  |
| Atracabe |  | 208 | 520.8 | ${ }^{781.046}$ | 1．041，34 | 1.562092 | 1.562082 | 1.562082 | 1.562082 | 1.562092 | 1.562 .082 | 1.562 .082 | 1.322 .440 | 2082789 | 2.6803 .486 | 2.6038 .486 | 2.603 ， | 2.680388 | 2.6808 .886 | 2.680 .488 | 2.603 | ${ }^{26003488}$ | 1.562082 |  |
| Soial fent |  | ： | $\bigcirc$ | 。 | ： | ： | ： | ： | $\bigcirc$ | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： |  |
| wCome | 0 | 4，1，00998 | 10，402，245 | 15，603368 | 208084490 | ${ }^{31,206,735}$ | 31，206，735 | 31，26，7，35 | 31206，735 | 31，26，735 | 312，26， 735 | 312，26，735 | 368077858 | 41，600，990 | 52，011，26 | 52.011226 | 520112.26 | 52，012，26 | $52.012,26$ | 52.011226 | 52.011226 | 52，011，26 | 312，26， 735 |  |
| ExPenorure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Stanp outy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0 6.36 .509 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pamanimgee |  | ： |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10.8872090 \\ & \begin{array}{l} 271.60 \\ 400.137 \end{array} \\ & 440 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,30,813 \\ & 407520 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16,30,8,813 \\ 407520 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16,30,0813 \\ 40,520 \\ 720,206 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.30,813 \\ \substack{10,5200} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16,30,8,813 \\ 407520 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16,30,8,813 \\ & 407520 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.30 .813 \\ 40,520 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.017,615 \\ 475.40 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 21,73.4.48 } \\ 513350 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27,168.020 \\ 679201 \\ 679 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27,1680022 \\ 679.201 \\ 60 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27,168022 \\ 679.201 \\ 601 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 27,168.022 \\ 679201 \\ 6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,1,680.022 \\ & .679201 \\ & \hline 6701 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 27,168.020 \\ 679.201 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 16,30,0,13 \\ & 40,520 \\ & 407 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 27,1680.02 \\ 679.201 \\ 6601 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 27,1,68002 \\ 679201 \\ 679 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Pannigg Consumans | $\begin{aligned} & 2,219,234 \\ & 4,438,468 \\ & 11,096,170 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }^{5,433654}$ | 8．150．07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ： |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }_{5} 5.386$ | ${ }_{135840}$ | 203,760 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Abmomats |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Finance Fees Legal and Valuation | $\substack{10.000 \\ 7500}$ | ${ }_{\substack{124,827 \\ 20,84}}^{\substack{1 / 2}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 312007 \\ & 52.011 \\ & 5.007 \end{aligned}$ | ${ }_{\substack{488,101 \\ 78,077}}$ | ¢ $\begin{aligned} & \text { 624，1，35 } \\ & 10,022\end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 956,202 \\ & 156,034 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 936,202 \\ & 156,034 \end{aligned}$ | 936,202156,034 | 936,202156,034 | 986,202156,034 | 936,202156,034 | 936,202156,034 | 1，092，236 <br> 182， | $1,248,269$ 208，045 | 1，560，33 <br> 260，056 | $1,560,337$ 260,05 | $1,560,337$260,056 | 1，560，337 <br> 260，0 | $1,560,337$260,056 | $\begin{gathered} 1,560,337 \\ 260,056 \end{gathered}$ | $1,560,337$260,056 | 1，560，337 260，0 | ${ }_{\substack{96502 \\ 156,04}}$ | ： |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COSTS EEFOREE LANO INT ANO PRO | 49.945 .386 | $2{ }^{249937}$ | 6，778．922 | 9，260，387 | 12，247，123 | 18．520．75 | 18，520，75 | 18，520，75 | 18．520，75 | 18，520，75 | 18，520，75 | 18，520，75 | 21.60757 | 24，694，367 | 30，867，958 | 30，867958 | 00867．958 | 387，988 | 387，988 | 30，867，958 | 30，887，958 | 30，867，988 | 18．520 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 6．988，709 | 6883,107 | 6，44，107 | $5,996,477$ | 5．582，214 | 5027．711 | 4，991．056 | 3．977．413 | 3，309，615 | 2498847 | 1.48974 | 113，997 |  |  |  |  |  | 。 |  |  |
| situal Valuatio | 42／33，944 | 6．403553 | 6733399 | 6．909．082 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 。 |  | － |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash how | 91479,330 | $4.712,092$ | 2．509，74 | 6，101 | 1，580，598 | 2285 | 51，533 | 48 | 7，157，47 | 7.658 | 8，94，904 | ${ }^{8,766.548}$ | ${ }^{114986873}$ | ${ }^{14415,767}$ | 19，653，54 | 21，029270 | 21，143887 | 21，43，3，27 | 21，43，287 | 143 | ${ }^{21.1432}$ | 21，143，26 | 55．90 | －158．94，${ }^{\text {a }}$／ |
|  | －1，479，30 | －96，19，421 | －96，701， 67 | －9927729 | －97788．671 | －919．915，87 | ．85．683964 | －78974．481 | －71， 16.734 | －64，157，95 | ．55．9304041 | 47，199493 | 35697， 20 | 21．282，054 | －1．629．530 | 19，400740 | 40．544008 | 61．887275 | 82280．543 | 103977．380 | 125，17，077 | 146,820345 | 158996，305 | $\bigcirc$ |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 8 $\frac{8}{3}$ $\frac{8}{8}$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Ster


| 令 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Stes


ste9





| －… ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 登 <br> 童 |
|  |  |
|  | 童 |
|  |  |

$\underset{\substack{\text { kuws stanasum } \\ \text { Steit }}}{ }$


| 等 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| $\frac{5}{2}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | (1) |  |

$\begin{array}{rr}\text { Site } 10 & \text { Site } 11 \\ \text { \＃\＃Wisbech Fringe } \\ \text { Green } & \text { Green }\end{array}$ Agricultural Agricultural

응
ờ ờ oे

8
$\stackrel{0}{N}$
N


305，000
7，716，500
330,000
$8,349,000$
SI6＇七とโ



$\stackrel{Z}{7}$
$\begin{array}{cr}\text { Site } 8 & \text { Site } 9 \\ \text { Knights Hill East of Lynn Rd }\end{array}$


앙


305,000
$4,553,650$
330,000
$4,926,900$
362，156
482,767
$5,406,992$
ャ0s＇t09
6I


$\underset{\sim}{\sim}$
웅 oㅇ

ờ ò ò
oㅇ

305,000
$5,648,600$
330,000
$6,111,600$
630，588

$7,196,899$
177

$62 T$

Site 5
Bankside


$\stackrel{\circ}{\sim} \stackrel{\circ}{\mathrm{i}} \stackrel{\mathrm{N}}{ }$




 | $\circ$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 |
| $\circ$ |
| G |
| 岕 |

 8
0
0
0
0
0

330,000
$63,360,000$ $\begin{array}{rrrr}360,000 & 240,000 & 240,000 & 456,000 \\ 1,476,000 & 2,112,000 & 2,184,000 & 1,185,600\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}-1,746,423 & 143,258 & 407,456 & \text { \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃} \\ -1,746,423 & 191,011 & 411,983 & \# \# \# \# \# \# \# \#\end{array}$

\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃6TL＇068＇โ \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ع0L＇tてと＇6
0＜ป
て68＇6と9＇6 06て－$\quad$ Z $6 \mathrm{~S}^{-}$โ6ち－
$\stackrel{\text { H }}{\text { \＃}}$

$\begin{array}{lll}n & \stackrel{\circ}{r} \\ \cdots & \stackrel{r}{r}\end{array}$

20,000
106,000
304，000
\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃
324，000
曅

S9－
\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃
211,206
329,233
\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃
\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃

|  | 0 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Green／brown field |  |
|  | Use |
| Site ，Gross | ha |
| Net | ha |
| Unit： | 0 |
| Mix Market |  |
| Intermediate to Buy |  |
| Affordable Rent |  |
| Social Rent |  |
| Alternative Land Value | £／ha |
|  | £ site |
| Uplift | £／ha |
|  | £ site |
| Viability Threshold | £／ha |
|  | £ site |
| Resic Gross | £／ha |
| Net | £／ha |
|  | £ site |
| Additional Profit | £ site |
|  | £／m2 |
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Number
Large Greenfield

Locality een／Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Agricultural

Number



Number
large Settlement Edge



Locality een/Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Paddock

Number




Number
Small Greenfield


Larger

Locality $\cdot e \mathrm{en} /$ Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Brown Industrial

愛登登


Number
Urban Infill

Locality een／Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Brown Industrial
Locality een／Brown rnative Use
Kings Lynn Green Plot




Number
Small Infill




Green/brown field
Use


| Site Area | Gross | ha | 3.70 | 1.55 | 1.40 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 1.11 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Net | ha | 2.78 | 1.39 | 1.25 | 0.50 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.83 | 0.30 | 0.10 | 0.05 |
| Units |  |  | 100 | 40 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Average Unit S |  | m2 | 96.08 | 96.20 | 97.53 | 90.86 | 100.29 | 95.00 | 96.20 | 100.29 | 95.00 | 135.00 |
| Mix | Intermediate to Buy |  | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% |  |  | 4.50\% |  |  |  |
|  | Affordable Rent |  | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% |  |  | 10.50\% |  |  |  |
|  | Social Rent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Price | Market | £/m2 | 2,200 | 2,200 | 2,350 | 2,300 | 2,300 | 2,050 | 1,950 | 1,900 | 1,900 | 2,750 |
|  | Intermediate to Buy | £/m2 | 1,430 | 1,430 | 1,528 | 1,495 | 1,495 | 1,333 | 1,268 | 1,235 | 1,235 | 1,788 |
|  | Affordable Rent | £/m2 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
|  | Social Rent | £/m2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grant and Subsid | d Intermediate to Buy | £/unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Affordable Rent | £/unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Social Rent | £/unit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sales per Quart |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unit Build Time |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Alternative Use | Value | f/ha | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 250,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 200,000 |
| Up Lift \% |  | \% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |  |
| Additional Uplif |  | £/ha | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Easements etc |  | £ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Legals Acquisiti |  | \% land | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% |
| Planning Fee | <50 | £/unit | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 | 385 |
|  | >50 | £/unit | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 | 115 |
| Architects |  | \% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% | 6.00\% |
| QS / PM |  | \% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% |
| Planning Consula | tants | \% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% | 1.00\% |
| Other Professio |  | \% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% |
| Build Cost - BCI | Based | £/m2 | 931 | 938 | 933 | 941 | 1,005 | 1,042 | 933 | 1,005 | 1,042 | 1,042 |
| CfSH |  | \% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% | 1.50\% |
| Energy |  | £/m2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design |  | £/m2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Over-extra 2 |  | £/m2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Over-extra 3 |  | £/m2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUDS |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 2.5\% |  |
| Infrastructure |  | \% | 20.0\% | 15.0\% | 15.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 12.5\% | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 5.0\% |
| Pre CIL s106 |  | £/Unit | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| Post CIL s106 |  | £/Unit | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,000 |
|  |  | £/m2 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Contingency |  | \% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 2.50\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 2.50\% |
| Abnormals |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.00\% | 5.00\% | 5.00\% |  |
|  |  | £/site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FINANCE | Fees | £ | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
|  | Interest | \% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% | 7.00\% |
|  | Legal and Valuation | £ | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| SALES | Agents | \% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 3.00\% | 2.00\% |
|  | Legals | \% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% | 0.50\% |
|  | Misc. | £ | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 0 |
| Developers Pro | it \% of costs (before int |  |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
|  | $\%$ of GDV |  | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% | 20\% |

stien


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



| Resoun cast flow for wreast |  | Vear1 |  |  |  | Vear2 |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {rear3 }}$ |  |  |  | Vear |  |  |  | Vears |  |  |  | Vear6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \％ |  | ${ }^{176581}$ | ${ }^{7}$ \％${ }^{8} \times 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | ！ | ○ | ： |  |  |  |  |  | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { cis }}}_{\substack{3817 \\ \text { cib }}}$ |  |  | ！ |  | 。 |  |  | ： |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\bigcirc$ | ． | － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ： | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| Expemorue |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 3225 \\ & 12085 \\ & 12085 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panmarifo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | － |  | ， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One pobesmux | ${ }_{\text {c，}}^{26}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {ch，}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\underbrace{\substack{\text { a }}}_{\substack{20.773 \\ 7,63}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 为 |  | ： |  | $\underset{\substack { 7,108 \\ \begin{subarray}{c}{10{ 7 , 1 0 8 \\ \begin{subarray} { c } { 1 0 } }\end{subarray}}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} 15236 \\ 12290 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.580 \\ 21,580 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 15236 \\ 1,290 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7,789 \\ \substack{1,19} \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | ! | ! |  | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ！ | ： |  |
| Thavorow | ${ }_{\substack{10.000 \\ 7,50}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sems | － | : | ： | ： | ： | － | ${ }_{\substack{24.42 \\ 4.00}}$ | $\substack{24142 \\ 4.000}_{\substack{\text { a }}}$ | $\underbrace{8,14}_{\text {48，8，}}$ | $\underset{\substack{48 \text { ens } \\ 8.41}}{ }$ |  | ${ }_{\substack{48,43 \\ 8.41}}$ | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： | ： |
| Us\％ | 30.922 | 。 |  | 220.85 | 5m，00 | 7e8ese | ${ }^{27} 27.127$ | ${ }^{227,127}$ | ${ }^{65} 50.04$ | 366529 | ss， 9 | soma | 。 | 。 | 。 | 。 | 。 | 。 | 。 |  | 。 | 。 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1936 | 19735 | ${ }^{26721}$ | 32.30 | ${ }^{43,482}$ | 5，38 | ${ }^{6038}$ | ${ }^{6335}$ | ${ }^{47,43}$ | 28.0012 | $\bigcirc$ | － | 。 | － | 。 | － | 。 | 。 | $\bigcirc$ | － | － | － |  |
| Cash |  | 1936 | 396187 |  | （12150 | （12245 | （70，085 | 12007 | ceses | 1224， | Is5075 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| cosem buand | －1， 1083 | 1，127732 | ．1588888 | －1．85， | 2.284884 | 3271008 | 3.487 .54 | 3.68081 | 2772.198 | 1 12880901 | stoed | 1.888 .100 | $1.680,100$ | 1 182， 0 ， | 1880.100 | 1.688100 | 1.882 .100 | 1882，100 | ${ }_{188,100}$ | 1.682100 | 1.68 .100 | 1.882100 | 1208， 10 |  |


|  |  | $\therefore \frac{8}{6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

stes


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | 黒 <br> 8 <br>  <br> 会 |
|  | 品 |
|  |  |



|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{cc} 8 \\ 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $8$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |



|  |  | ○嗃 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | 量 |
|  |  | 童 <br> 喜 <br> 高 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |



|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8^{-8}$ |  |  |
| － 8.0 |  |  |
| $88^{8}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $8_{8}^{8}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 娄 <br> $\stackrel{8}{\text { ？}}$ <br> 善 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Green/brown field | 0 | Site 1 | Site 2 | Site 3 | Site 4 | Site 5 | Site 6 | Site 7 | Site 8 | Site 9 | Site 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Large Greenfield !dium Greenfield nent Edge nent Edge Greenfield |  |  |  |  | Smaller Infill | Larger Urban | Urban Infill | Small Infill | Single Plot |
|  |  | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Green | Brown | Brown | Brown | Green |
|  | Use | Agricult | Agricultural Agricultur |  | Paddock | Paddock | Garden | Industrial | Industrial | Industrial | Plot |
| Site / Gross | ha | 3.7 | 1.55 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 1.11 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.05 |
| Net | ha | 2.78 | 1.39 | 1.25 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.83 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.05 |
| Unit: | 0 | 0100 | 40 | 30 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 30 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Mix Market |  | 85.00\% | 85.00\% | 85.00\% | 85.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 85.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% |
| Intermediate to Buy |  | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 4.50\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 4.50\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Affordable Rent |  | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 10.50\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 10.50\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Social Rent |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |
| Alternative Land Value | £/ha | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 250,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 200,000 |
|  | £ site | 92,500 | 38,750 | 35,000 | 25,000 | 15,000 | 25,000 | 421,800 | 114,000 | 38,000 | 10,000 |
| Uplift | £/ha | 305,000 | 305,000 | 305,000 | 310,000 | 310,000 | 50,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 0 |
|  | £ site | \#\#\#\#\#\# | 472,750 | 427,000 | 155,000 | 93,000 | 5,000 | 84,360 | 22,800 | 7,600 | 0 |
| Viability Threshold | £/ha | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 360,000 | 360,000 | 300,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 200,000 |
|  | £ site | \#\#\#\#\#\# | 511,500 | 462,000 | 180,000 | 108,000 | 30,000 | 506,160 | 136,800 | 45,600 | 10,000 |
| Resic Gross <br> Net | £/ha | 451,552 | 520,273 | 630,037 | 803,322 | 754,867 | 25,467 | -32,829 | -169,992 | -409,148 | 1,517,687 |
|  | £/ha | 600,986 | 580,161 | 705,642 | 803,322 | 754,867 | 25,467 | -43,903 | -169,992 | -409,148 | 1,517,687 |
|  | £ site | \#\#\#\#\#\# | 806,424 | 882,052 | 401,661 | 226,460 | 2,547 | -36,440 | -50,997 | -40,915 | 75,884 |
| Additional Profit | £ site | 531,298 | 332,466 | 472,252 | 244,654 | 127,155 | -28,750 | -583,670 | -198,700 | -90,499 | 69,291 |
|  | £/m2 | 62 | 96 | 179 | 203 | 172 | -151 | -225 | -268 | -418 | 513 |

## Appendix 7 -Appraisals, - Older People's Housing

## King's Lynn



## Downham Market



## Hunstanton



## Appendix 8 - Appraisals, Non-Residential Development

## Employment

## Large Industrial - North



## Large Industrial - King's Lynn

|  |  |  | Greenfield |  |  |  |  |  |  | Brownfield |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | cı | cil $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{m} 2$ | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 120 | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | 120 |
| Income | m2 |  | 1500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 | 1,500 |
|  | £/m2 |  | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 | 600 |
|  | Capital Value |  | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 | 900,000 |
| Costs | Land Used | ha | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.330 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 | 0.230 |
|  |  | £/ha | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 |
|  |  | Uplift $\mathrm{f} / \mathrm{ha}$ | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 300,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  | 20.00\% | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 | 76,000 |
|  |  | Site Cost | 75,900 | 75,900 | 75,900 | 75,900 | 75,900 | 75,900 | 75,900 | 104,880 | 104,880 | 104,880 | 104,880 | 104,880 | 104,880 | 104,880 |
|  | Strategic Promotion |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
|  | Planning |  | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 |
|  | Construction | /m2 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 | 713 |
|  |  |  | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 | 1,069,500 |
|  | Infrastructure | 10.00\% | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 |
|  | Abnormals | 10.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 | 106,950 |
|  | Fees | 8.00\% | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 | 85,560 |
|  | S106 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | , | , | , | 0 | 0 |
|  | cil |  | 0 | 30,000 | 60,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 | 150,000 | 180,000 | 0 | 30,000 | 60,000 | 90,000 | 120,000 | 150,000 | 180,000 |
|  | Contingeno | .5\% \& 5\% | 26,738 | 26,738 | 26,738 | 26,738 | 26,738 | 26,738 | 26,738 | 53,475 | 53,475 | 53,475 | 53,475 | 53,475 | 53,475 | 53,475 |
|  | Finance Costs |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
|  | Sales | 3.00\% | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 27,000 | 27,000 | 27,000 |
|  | Misc. Financial |  | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
|  | Subtotal |  | 1,375,748 | 1,405,748 | 1,435,748 | 1,465,748 | 1,495,748 | 1,525,748 | 1,555,748 | 1,509,435 | 1,539,435 | 1,569,435 | 1,599,435 | 1,629,435 | 1,659,435 | 1,689,435 |
|  | Interest | 7.00\% | 48,151 | 49,201 | 50,251 | 51,301 | 52,351 | 53,401 | 54,451 | 52,830 | 53,880 | 54,930 | 55,980 | 57,030 | 58,080 | 59,130 |
|  | Profit \% GDV | 20.00\% | 189,630 | 189,840 | 190,050 | 190,260 | 190,470 | 190,680 | 190,890 | 190,566 | 190,776 | 190,986 | 191,196 | 191,406 | 191,616 | 191,826 |
|  | costs |  | 1,689,429 | 1,720,689 | 1,751,949 | 1,783,209 | 1,814,469 | 1,845,729 | 1,876,989 | 1,857,711 | 1,888,971 | 1,920,231 | 1,951,491 | 1,982,751 | 2,014,011 | 2,045,271 |
| Residua | Land Worth | Site | -789,429 | -820,689 | -851,949 | -883,209 | -914,469 | -945,729 | -976,989 | -957,711 | -988,971 | $-1,020,231$ | $-1,051,491$ | $-1,082,751$ | -1,114,011 | $-1,145,271$ |
|  | Existing Use Value | £/ha | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 380,000 |
|  | Viability Threshold | £/ha | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 330,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 | 456,000 |
|  | Residual Value | £/ha | -3,432,300 | $-3,568,213$ | $-3,704,126$ | $-3,840,039$ | -3,95,952 | $-4,111,865$ | $-4,24,778$ | -4,163,962 | $-4,29,885$ | -4,43, 788 | $-4,571,701$ | $-4,707,614$ | $-4,843,527$ | $-4,979,440$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Additiona Profit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Additional Profit |  | $-865,329$ -577 | $-896,589$ -598 | $-927,849$ -619 | -659,109 | $-990,369$ -660 | $-1,021,629$ -681 | $-1,022,889$ -702 | $-1,062,591$ -708 | $-1,033,81$ -729 | $-1,125,111$ -750 | $-1,156,371$ -771 | $-1,187,631$ -792 | $-1,218,891$ -813 | $-1,250,151$ -833 |

## Large Industrial - South



Small Industrial North and King's Lynn


Small Industrial - South


## Large Office－North and South

| arip |  | $88$ |  | 8ige ion |  |  | N |  |  | 罂亳 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $8 \%$ |  | $\overbrace{0}^{8}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ぞ } \\ & \text { 訁̈ } \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\tilde{j}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 关 } \\ & \text { 婴 } \end{aligned}$ |  | \％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{\text {\％}}$ |
| 8 8 욱 웅 |  | $8{ }_{6}^{\circ} 8$ |  | 8icios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $8{ }_{0}^{8}$ |  | 8icios |  |  | 镸 | $\frac{\tilde{y}}{\tilde{n}}$ |  | 管華 |
| \& | Oig oig oig ig id | $8{ }_{6}^{8} 8$ |  | Biog ion | $\begin{gathered} \frac{2}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} \end{gathered}$ | Ejo |  | 登 |  |  |
| : |  | \％ $0_{0}$ |  |  |  |  | Kin | $\begin{gathered} \tilde{6} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{6} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 笭 |
| $\circ \text { or }$ |  | ${ }_{0}^{8} 8$ |  | 8ien ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 先 } \\ \text { 合 } \end{gathered}$ | 줋 | $\begin{gathered} \tilde{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{\tilde{N}} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| 욱욱 |  | $8{ }_{0}^{\circ} 8$ |  | ${ }_{\text {B }}^{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { \%ig } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } \\ & \overrightarrow{~ E} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 员 } \\ & \stackrel{a}{寸} \end{aligned}$ |  | 营咢 |
| 욱욱 | \％\％\％igigin | $8 \%$ | 帚房品 | ision oig ion |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 总 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{d} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 誉 } \\ & \text { / } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{8}{9} 8 \stackrel{8}{8}_{8}^{8}$ |  |
|  |  | $8{ }^{\circ}$ | 帚房途 | iog io | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { \% } \\ & \text { \% } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 呂 } \\ & \stackrel{\theta}{d} \end{aligned}$ | 商 |  |  |
| $8 \text { 品品薄 }$ | \％\％\％\％\％\％\％\％ | \％\％\％ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ※. } \\ & \text { \% } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 就菏 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 亳 } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{d} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{y}{2} \\ & \frac{y}{4} \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4}$ | 尝弥 |
| 号品品范 |  | \％\％\％ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% \% } \\ & \text { \%im } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 皆 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| ? |  | \％\％\％ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{7}$ | $\underbrace{8}_{0}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% } \\ & \text { \%im } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 緟 |  |  | 学㝑 |
|  | \％\％\％ | Bocic |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \%ig } \\ & \text { \%in } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 登 } \end{aligned}$ | Big | 舜㖘 |
| 答 |  |  |  | \％i้ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{2}{7}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 宕 |  | 皆 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 咅 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 勆 |  |  |

## Large Office - King's Lynn



Small Office - North and South


Small Office－King＇s Lynn

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { +86- } \\ & \text { tz8'960 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { غ96- } \\ & 999^{\prime 26 \tau-} \end{aligned}$ | 276 － 88t＇88I | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zz6- } \\ & \text { ož'tst- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { to6- } \\ & \text { zst'ost- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 088- \\ & \text { } 886^{\prime} \mathrm{SLL}- \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 658- } \\ & 998^{\prime} \mathrm{TLI} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9/9- } \\ & \text { T9t'ser- } \end{aligned}$ | SS9－ ع66＇0عโ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { teq- } \\ & \text { sz8'grt- } \end{aligned}$ | ยเ9－ Ls9＇zzI | 265－ 68 t＇8t | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zLS- } \\ & \text { Izع'tI- } \end{aligned}$ |  | H．fod deuoutppy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 508＇00＇9． | TL8＇596＇s－ | 886＇928＇s－ | 500＇889＇s． | tLo＇6ts＇s | 8et＇ort＇s－ | Soz＇tz＇S－ | عเદ＇t8s＇t－ | 088＇stot＇t－ | 9tr＇90e＇t－ | عts＇L9T＇t－ | 085＇820＇t－ | 959＇688＇$\varepsilon$－ | £LL＇ossı＇$\quad$－ | 84／7 | ante＾Ienpis |  |
| 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇9st | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | 000＇09 | е4／7 |  |  |
| 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 84／7 | an｜e＾asn supsux |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tot＇E8T－ | 966＇8LT－ | 808＇tLI－ | Ot9＇OLT－ | zLt＇99T－ | toe＇z9\％－ | 9Et＇8st－ | 6zs＇દET－ | т9を＇£ฐ－ | £6t＇6zT－ | szo＇str | Ls8＇OrT－ | 689＇9тt－ | tes＇zit | 24.15 | чгом риет | enp！${ }^{\text {a }}$ y |
| tot＇zzs | 966 ＇8ts | 808 ＇tis | 0t9＇0ts | zて＇90s | poézos | 9 gt ＇86t | 6zs＇ll | T9¢＇๕く | ¢6I＇69\％ | 520 ＇59\％ | L58＇09力 | 689＇95\％ | tzs＇sp |  | sisos |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 996＇0＜ | 886\％${ }^{\circ}$ | 0t6＇0＜ | 288 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | t58 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{CL}$ | 928＇0＜ | 861＇0L | 6EL＇OL | til＇ol | 8890\％ | ¢59\％\％ | ＜29\％く | $665^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | uLs＇oL | \％0002 | $109 \%$ गlyoud |  |
| 828＇t¢ | 889 ＇ti | $8 \mathrm{8tSt}$＇t | 807＇tr | 897＇tr | 88 t ¢ | 886＇£ | ¢69＇£ | ¢ร¢＇غ̇ | stt＇$\frac{1}{}$ | s＜z＇ย̇ | รร̇＇¢̇ | S66＇ż | ¢58＇2 | \％00＇L | 153əวบ |  |
| 0¢9＇Ert | 0096「t | 009＇sto | 019＇trt | 019＇20 | 019＇60\％ | 009668 | S6z＇t68 | S6z＇C8E | 967＇z8E | S62＇6LE | s6z＇sıE | S6z＇tLe | S6z＇L98 |  | 1e2orqns |  |
| 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s |  | ｜e．jueuti jsin |  |
| 007＇0t | ．007＇ot | ．007＇Ot | ．007＇Ot | ． $00 \chi^{\prime}$ Or | 00\％＇or | 007＇OT | 00\％＇0t | 007＇OT | 00\％＇or | 00\％＇0¢ | 00\％＇0¢ | ． 00 ＇or | 007＇OT | \％00＇$\varepsilon$ | sales |  |
| 000＇s | ＂000＇s | －000＇s | 000＇s | －000＇s | ＂000＇s | －000＇s | 000＇s | －000＇s | ＇000＇s | －000＇s | ＇000＇s | －000＇s | ＇000＇s |  | ร150う әృueuty |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 056＇zt | 0s6＇zt | 0s6＇zt | 0s6＇zt | 0s6＇zt | 0s6＇zt | 0s6＇zt | sLt＇s | SLt＇9 | SLt＇9 | SLt＇9 | s Lt＇9 | sct＇9 | SLt＇9 | \％$\% 8 \% 5$ |  |  |
| 000＇tz | $0^{000}$ | $0^{000} 9$ | ${ }^{0} 000$＇z | 000＇8 | 000＇\％ | 0 | 000 ＇rz | 00002 | 000＇9r | 000 ＇z | 000＇8 | 000＇t | 0 |  | 715 |  |
| － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 90Ts |  |
| ozl＇or | ozloz | ozior | OzL＇or | ozloz | oztor | 0zLoz | orL＇or | ozloz | ortor | oztor | oztor | ozloz | ožor | \％008 | รəə |  |
| 006＇sr | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006 ＇sz |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \％000 ${ }^{\text {o }}$ | spemouqy |  |
| 006＇sz | 006 ＇sr | 006 ＇sz | 006 ＇sz | 006 ＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sr | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | 006＇sz | \％00＇0r | วппрпиserju｜ |  |
| 000＇652 | 000＇65z | 000＇65z | 000＇65z | 000＇65z | 000＇65z | 000＇65z | 000＇6sz | 000＇65z | 000＇6sz | 000＇6sz | 000＇6sz | 000＇6sz | 000＇6sz | э |  |  |
| ¢6z＇t | S62＇t | S62＇t | 56\％＇T | S62＇t | ¢6\％＇t | S62＇t | 56\％＇t | S62＇t | S6z＇t | S62＇t | s6z＇t | S62＇t | 56て＇T | zw／ |  |  |
| 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz |  | suluueld |  |
| 000＇0t | ${ }^{000} 0^{\prime}$ ¢ | 000＇or | 000＇or | ${ }^{000} 0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | ${ }^{000} 0^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | ${ }^{000} 0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | ${ }^{000} 0^{\prime}$ ¢ | ${ }^{000} 0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | 000＇or | ${ }^{000} 0^{\prime}$ ¢ | ${ }^{000} 0^{\circ} \mathrm{T}$ | ${ }^{000} 0^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | ${ }^{000}$＇or |  |  |  |
| 089＇£̇ | 089＇\＆I | 089＇¢】 | 089＇¢I | 089＇¢I | 089＇£ | 089＇£I | 008＇โ | 008＇T | 008＇ז | 008＇T | 008＇โ | 008＇โ | 008＇t | 1507 3 H5 |  |  |
| 000＇92 | 000＇9L | 000＇9L | 000＇9L | 000＇9L | 000＇9L | 000＇9L | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | 000＇s | \％000 |  |  |
| － | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 000＇0 \％ | $0^{000}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ | 000＇0 $\varepsilon^{\prime}$ | $0^{000}$＇$\varepsilon$ | 000＇0 ${ }^{\circ}$ | $0^{000}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ | ${ }^{000}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ | eप／F P ！ 1 d |  |  |
| 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇088 | 000＇sr | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | 000＇sz | セ4／7 |  |  |
| 08\％ 0 | 080 | 080 | 080\％ | 0800 | 0800 | 080 | 080\％ | $0 ¢ 00$ | $0 \varepsilon \% 0$ | $00^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | 080 | $0 ¢ 00$ | －¢00 | ${ }^{\text {e4 }}$ | pasn pueq | 51500 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 000＇00¢ | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶ¢ | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶ¢ | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶ¢ | 000＇018 | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶE | 000＇0ヶ¢ |  | anlen Ientej |  |
| 001＇T | 002＇T | 002＇T | 00＇t | 002＇T | 000＇T | 002＇T | 00＜＇T | 002＇T | 00＇t | 002＇T | 004＇T | 00＇t | 00＇t |  | 2W／7 |  |
| 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 | 002 |  | zш | әшоэи |
| OzI | 00t | 08 | 09 | ot | 02 | 0 | Ozt | 002 | 08 | 09 | 0 | 02 | 0 | 2w／3 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | рр！！บวә！ |  |  |  |

## Retail

## Larger Supermarkets



## Smaller Supermarkets



## Retail Warehouse - North



## Retail Warehouse - King's Lynn



## Retail Warehouse - South



Shop - North


## Shop－King＇s Lynn

|  |  |  |  |  |  | aige ig ig | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 俞 } \\ & \text { 等 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 等管 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bo |  | 8 | \％\％ | $8_{0} 0_{0}^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ |  | 冗ä: |  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\sim}$ |  | 兼产 |
| Bo |  | $8{ }^{8} 8$ |  | $8_{0}^{\circ}{ }_{0}^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | 佱 | 感营 |  | \％ | Bige or io |  |
|  |  | $8{ }^{8} 8$ |  | 8igigig |  | 愈涊 |  | 呂 |  | \％ |
|  |  | \％iog |  | $8$ |  | 5\％ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\vec{g}$ |  | \％\％\％\％ |
| : iop oicieg |  | \％\％\％ | Io | $8$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ig } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$ | \％\％ | 発 | $E$ |  | 筞 |
| - 唯菏然 |  | \％${ }_{\square}^{\text {and }}$ |  | 8icige | $\stackrel{\text { ® }}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{i}}$ | 愛麇 | 寻 | \％ |  | ＊ |
|  |  | gotig |  | Bige ig ig | 登 | \&ig |  | $\check{ٌ}$ |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}_{\sim}^{\text {\％}}$ |
| Bo |  | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\substack{0}}$ | Ĩ ⿳亠丷厂犬̃㇒ | 8뮹 | 熗 | 寧寻 |  | 貔 |  | 款 |
| 品号菏菏 | \％\％\％ | ${ }_{\square}^{\circ} 8$ |  | $8{ }^{\circ} 8$ | 管 |  | §్户口 | 发 |  |  |
| $8 \text { 品菏淙 }$ |  | $8{ }_{9}^{8} 8$ |  | $8^{8}$ | 発 | 产发 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{6}{6} \\ & \stackrel{e}{6} \end{aligned}$ | 亜 |  |  |
| ৪ ọ | \％\％\％\％\％ | geation |  | $\stackrel{B}{4}_{0}^{\circ}$ |  |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{8}{7}}{\pi}$ |  | \％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{6}$ |
| io io |  |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{\tilde{Z}}$ | 劳 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 侖 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 愛 |  | \％\％ |
| -号荡葌 | \％\％\％8 \％ | $8.8$ | İ |  | 若 | iag em em | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 骨 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 永 | $\stackrel{8}{8} \stackrel{\circ}{8}$ | กั\％ |
| 聯 |  |  | E" | \％ix |  | ถ్ํ \％ |  | $\pm$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 离 } \\ & \frac{3}{3} \end{aligned}$ |  | 愿 | 㜢 |  |  |
| ¢ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 辟 |  |  |

Shop－South

|  | ®8 8 8ix |  |  |  |  |  | की |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \％${ }^{\text {g \％gim }}$ |  |  |  | \％igis |  |  | 合 |  |  |  |  |
| ళin ieg |  |  |  | \％igig | 長 |  | 感 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $8{ }_{8}^{88}$ |  | \％\％ | 铁 | \％\％\％ | 䒟 |  |  |  | 䌢年 |
|  |  | \％\％\％ |  |  |  |  | $\frac{9}{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $8{ }^{8} 8$ |  |  | \％ |  | z |  |  |  | 离咢 |
|  |  | $8{ }^{8} 8$ |  | 感䂞 | \％ | ${ }^{\frac{7}{2}}$ | \％ |  |  |  |  |
| gig ig |  | $8{ }^{8}$ | ฐ \％\％ | 8 m |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ |
| \％${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 8 |  |  | \％ | 素繇 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Big |  | 88 | \％\％\％\％ |  | 長 | \％\％ | ะ |  |  |  |  |
|  | \％ | $8{ }_{8}^{8}$ |  | 感䂞 | 発 |  | \％ |  |  |  | \％\％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{\text {\％}}$ |
| $8 \overbrace{\mathrm{~g}}^{\mathrm{g}}$ |  | $8{ }^{8} 8$ |  | Bog | 驵 | giaig | 8 |  |  |  | \％ |
| Big | \％\％\％egigis | 8 | Ig eige | Big | 染 |  | 蝺枵 |  |  |  | 产尔 |
| İ ie ig | \％\％ | 88 | ${ }_{8}$ | Binige g | 嶓 | \％\％ |  |  |  |  | \％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{8}$ |
|  |  |  | 5f ex ex |  |  | \％\％\％\％ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 䢒 | 囇 |  |  |  | 高 | 誉 | 后 |  |  |  | 彭 |
|  | 数 |  |  |  |  |  | 咢 |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix 9 Charging Zone Maps

The pages in this appendix are not numbered.


Community Infrastructure Levy


Charging Zones
Strategic Site: Bankside (E1.15), King's Lynn


## Charging Zones

Strategic Site: Boal Quay (E1.5), King's Lynn


## Charging Zones

Strategic Site: East of Lynn Road, Downham Market



## Legend

$\square £ 40 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ Area, South and West of the Brough $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ Area, West Winch, strategic growth area $£ 0 / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ Area, West Winch, strategic growth area

Charging Zones
Strategic Site: West Winch, strategic growth area


## Charging Zones

Strategic Site: Wisbech Fringe, Walsoken


HDH Planning and Development Ltd is a specialist planning consultancy providing evidence to support planning authorities, land owners and developers.

The firm is led by Simon Drummond-Hay who is a Chartered Surveyor, Associate of Chartered Institute of Housing and senior development professional with a wide experience of both development and professional practice. The firm is regulated by the RICS.

The main areas of expertise are:

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- District wide and site specific Viability Analysis
- Local and Strategic Housing Market Assessments and Housing Needs Assessments
- Future Housing Numbers Analysis (post RSS target setting)

HDH Planning and Development have clients throughout England and Wales.

HDH Planning and Development Ltd
Registered in England Company Number 08555548
Clapham Woods Farm, Keasden, Nr Clapham, Lancaster. LA2 8ET simon@drummond-hay.co.uk 01524251831 / 07989975977


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The NPPF was published and came into effect on $27^{\text {th }}$ March 2012.
    ${ }^{2}$ http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/
    ${ }^{3}$ SI 2010 No. 948. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 Made 23rd March 2010, Coming into force 6th April 2010. SI 2011 No. 987. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011 Made 28th March 2011, Coming into force 6th April 2011. SI 2011 No. 2918. The Local Authorities (Contracting Out of Community Infrastructure Levy Functions) Order 2011. Made 6th December 2011, Coming into force 7th December 2011. SI 2012 No. 2975. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2012. Made 28th November 2012, Coming into force 29th November 2012. SI 2013 No. 982. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013. Made 24th April 2013, Coming into force 25th April 2013. SI 2014 No. 385. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013. Made $24^{\text {th }}$ February 2014, Coming into force $24^{\text {th }}$ February 2014. S1 2015 No. 836. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2015. Made 20th March 2015.

[^1]:    11 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 the 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, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.
    ${ }^{12}$ To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ The previous wording gave the Council considerable latitude which has now been removed:

[^3]:    ${ }^{5}$ CIL Regulations 123(3)
    ${ }^{6}$ This is the list of the items on which the Council will spend CIL payments.

[^4]:    ${ }^{7}$ Viability Testing in Local Plans - Advice for planning practitioners (LGA/HBF - Sir John Harman) June 2012 (known as the Harman Guidance)
    ${ }^{8}$ Financial viability in planning, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN 94/2012) which was published during August 2012 (known as the RICS Guidance)

[^5]:    ${ }^{9}$ http://planningguidance.planningportal.gov.uk/revisions/23b/030/

[^6]:    ${ }^{10} \mathrm{https}: / / \mathrm{www}$. gov.uk/government/news/pm-and-chancellor-announce-one-nation-plans-to-spread-homeownership-across-the-country

[^7]:    ${ }^{11}$ From PPG Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 55-001-20150318

[^8]:    ${ }^{12}$ https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/fixing-the-foundations-creating-a-more-prosperous-nation

[^9]:    ${ }^{13}$ Barnet: APP/Q5300/ A/07/2043798/NWF, Bristol: APP/P0119/ A/08/2069226, Beckenham: APP/G5180/ A/08/2084559, Bishops Cleeve; APP/G1630/A/11/2146206 Burgess Farm: APP/U4230/A/11/2157433, CLAY FARM: APP/Q0505/A/09/2103599/NWF, Woodstock: APP/D3125/ A/09/2104658, Shinfield APP/X0360/ A/12/2179141, Oxenholme Road, APP/M0933/A/13/2193338 Vannes: Court of Appeal 22 April 2010, [2010] EWHC 1092 (Admin) 2010 WL 1608437
    ${ }^{14}$ Viability Testing in Local Plans has been endorsed by the Local Government Association and forms the basis of advice given by the, DCLG funded, Planning Advisory Service (PAS).
    ${ }^{15}$ PAS is funded directly by DCLG to provide consultancy and peer support, learning events and online resources to help local authorities understand and respond to planning reform. (Note: Much of the most recent advice has been co-authored by HDH).

[^10]:    ${ }^{16}$ As required by 173 of the NPPF
    ${ }^{17}$ Paragraphs 7 to 9 of REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE DRAFT MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE by Keith Holland BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI ARICS an Examiner appointed by the Mayor Date: $27^{\text {th }}$ January 2012

[^11]:    ${ }^{18}$ APP/X0360/A/12/2179141 (Land at The Manor, Shinfield, Reading RG2 9BX) January 2013.
    ${ }^{19}$ APP/M0933/ A/13/ 2193338 (Land to the west of Oxenholme Road, Kendal, Cumbria) October 2013.

[^12]:    ${ }^{20}$ NPPF Paragraph 173
    ${ }^{21}$ NPPF Paragraph 174
    ${ }^{22}$ CIL Regulation 14

[^13]:    ${ }^{23}$ This Viability Model has is used as the basis for the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) Viability Workshops. It is made available to Local Authorities, free of charge, by PAS.

[^14]:    ${ }^{24}$ Including the Government's Help to Buy scheme

[^15]:    ${ }^{25}$ CLG Live Table 581 (Last Update April 2014)
    ${ }^{26}$ CLG Live Table 582 (Last updated April 2014)

[^16]:    ${ }^{27}$ Residential Property Focus. Savills. Issue 12015 - http://pdf.euro.savills.co.uk/residential-property-focus-uk/residential-property-focus-issue-1-2015.pdf.

[^17]:    ${ }^{28}$ The Land Registry makes all transactions available as and when they are registered via the 'beta' format tool at https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/price-paid-data-downloads. It does take some time for transactions to be registered - we estimate this to be about 4 to 6 months.

[^18]:    ${ }^{29}$ We understand that the objective is to reduce the overall costs of Housing Benefit / Local Housing Allowance / Universal Credit to the Exchequer.

[^19]:    ${ }^{30}$ An increase in yields leads to a reduction in prices.
    ${ }^{31}$ The creation and issuance of tradable securities, such as bonds, that are backed by the income generated by an asset, a loan, a public works project or other revenue source. (Source FT Lexicon)

[^20]:    ${ }^{32}$ The rents of new affordable housing is not actually subject to the LHA cap (the LHA cap applies to the PRS sector only), however, through the consultation process, this was considered a pragmatic assumption.

[^21]:    ${ }^{33}$ Rightmove August 2015.

[^22]:    ${ }^{34}$ The capitalisation of rents using the yields and Year's Purchase is widely used by Chartered Surveyors and others. The Year's Purchase is the factor by which the rent is multiplied to calculate the capital value (calculated at $1 /$ yield).

[^23]:    ${ }^{35}$ Land value estimates for policy appraisal. Department for Communities and Local Government, February 2015
    ${ }^{36}$ Point 2, Page 14, Land value estimates for policy appraisal. DCLG, February 2015

[^24]:    ${ }^{37}$ In this context the following CIL Examination are relevant. Mid Devon District Council by David Hogger BA MSc MRTPI MCIHT, Date: 20 February 2013 and Greater Norwich Development Partnership - for Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council. by Keith Holland BA (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI ARICS Date: 4 December 2012.

[^25]:    ${ }^{38}$ See Chapter 2 for further details and debate around EUV plus v Market Value methodologies.
    ${ }^{39}$ Paragraphs 7 to 9 of REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE DRAFT MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE by Keith Holland BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI ARICS an Examiner appointed by the Mayor Date: $27^{\text {th }}$ January 2012

[^26]:    ${ }^{40}$ REPORT TO GEDLING BOROUGH COUNCIL, THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF PINS/N3020/429/4, MAY 2015

[^27]:    ${ }^{41}$ Social Housing Grant
    ${ }^{42}$ APP/X0360/A/12/2179141 (Land at The Manor, Shinfield, Reading RG2 9BX)
    ${ }^{43}$ i.e. the developers profit / competitive return.

[^28]:    ${ }^{44}$ DCLG \& University of Glasgow, Factors Affecting Housing Build Out Rates, February 2008
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