Report for Bury Council

Local Plan Viability Assessment

March 2026

Three Dragons

Document control sheet	
Project name	Bury Council Local Plan
Project reference	Viability
Report title	Local Plan Viability Assessment
Doc ref	Final
Date	March 2026
Prepared by	Mark Felgate, Dominic Houston, Shane Vallance
Reviewed by	Lin Cousins
Quality statement	In preparing this report, the authors have followed national and professional standards, acted with objectivity, impartially, without interference and with reference to appropriate available sources of information. No performance-related or contingent fees have been agreed and there is no known conflict of interest in advising the client group.
Use of this report	This report is not a formal land valuation or scheme appraisal. It has been prepared using the Three Dragons toolkit and is based on borough level data supplied by Bury Council, consultant team inputs and quoted published data sources. The toolkit provides a review of the development economics of illustrative schemes, and the results depend on the data inputs provided. This analysis should not be used for individual scheme appraisal. No responsibility whatsoever is accepted to any third party who may seek to rely on the content of the report unless previously agreed.
Cover Image	HEC M.E.D. Images

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Three Dragons was commissioned by Bury Council to undertake a viability assessment of the emerging Bury Local Plan (BLP), which will be a follow-on plan sitting alongside the adopted Greater Manchester Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (PfE). The viability assessment process is compliant with national guidance and includes consultation with the development industry active in Bury (including registered providers), as well as consultation with the promoters of the PfE allocations.
2. This viability assessment uses a set of notional typologies representative of the different forms of development proposed by the draft Local Plan and tests these according to the costs and values associated with new development in Bury. The viability testing includes allowances to cover the cost of meeting national, PfE and proposed local policies.
3. At the time of writing, there are c8,000 homes identified in the housing supply without planning permission – within this, the majority (66%) will be from the PfE allocations in the borough:
    - Three of the five allocations in Bury are not directly affected by the policies in the new Bury Local Plan (JPA 7, JPA 8 and JPA 9) and have already been found sound in PfE. These are therefore not included in the testing
    - PfE leaves the affordable housing requirement for the cross boundary JPA 1.2 Simister & Bowlee and JPA 1.1 Heywood & Pilsworth, to be set in the respective Local Plans. These allocations are therefore considered in the viability testing.
4. The main part of the testing in this viability study relates to the 34% of the housing supply without permission outside the PfE allocations. 79% of this housing supply balance is anticipated to be brownfield town centre development and the testing includes different sizes and types of typologies representative of the schemes likely to come forward. The testing also includes some lower density suburban typologies on brownfield, greenfield and green belt.
5. The viability testing results show that there are viable forms of development within each of the site size categories and across the different locations of supply. This includes brownfield town centre development with 15% affordable housing (20% affordable for Build to Rent schemes) as well as development elsewhere in the borough with 25% affordable housing.
6. The LPVA shows that JPA 1.1 and JPA 1.2 are deliverable and able to support the 25% affordable housing set out in PfE for the other strategic allocations in Bury.
7. Therefore, the overall development planned for in the new Local Plan is considered to be viable.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Context

1.1 Bury Council (BC) is reviewing its current adopted Local Plan – the Bury Unitary Development Plan (UDP), 1997 'saved' policies. The Council adopted a Joint Development Plan, Places for Everyone (PfE), in March 2024. PfE provides a range of strategic and thematic policies that replace some parts of the UDP. The emerging Bury Local Plan (BLP) will form a complementary part of the development plan to PfE. The BLP consists of local policies that cover a range of matters including spatial principles and locations for growth, housing, economy, design and environment.

1.2 This viability assessment informs the development of policies in the BLP. The local plan viability assessment (LPVA) provides evidence to demonstrate the deliverability of potential future policies in the BLP, including what balance of affordable and market housing is viable and whether this varies across the authority. It needs to take account of relevant national guidance; and where appropriate, incorporate any information from the viability assessment undertaken for the PfE Joint Development Plan.

1.3 The assessment includes an analysis of the impact of the policies set out in the latest draft version of the Reg.19 plan and has been undertaken in accordance with national policy and guidance - including the December 2023 National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.[1] However, given recently announced proposed changes to national guidance including the NPPF 2024, the approach to the testing and the recommendations, where appropriate, are also mindful of potential changes to provide some longevity to the assessment outcomes and avoid a lack of local policy direction.

1.4 Underlying the assessment is a series of tests that calculate the viability of a set of notional typologies, representative of the types of development likely to come forward over the life of the Local Plan. The LPVA has been prepared in consultation with the development industry and other key stakeholders.

1.5 This report does not reconsider viability in respect of PfE allocations as these have already been through an extensive examination process and have a policy framework already established, that is not being repeated within the BLP. However, where PfE

[1] This report has been prepared using the December 2023 version of NPPF – it is understood that whilst the NPPF December 2024 has been published (and a newer consultation version is also available) that the Bury Local Plan will be Examined using transitional arrangements that will refer to the December 2023 version of NPPF.

policy refers to BLP for further detail then this will be reviewed, in line with the same approach as the testing done in support of the PfE allocations for consistency.

Viability in plan making

1.6 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 for the landowner to sell the land for the development proposed. If these conditions are not met, a scheme will not be viable.

1.7 This report sets out the typologies and assumptions used to inform the viability testing reflecting latest available information. The viability testing for this report has:

- reviewed broad costs associated with addressing the proposed policies in the latest available version of draft Reg. 19 Local Plan
- tested the quantum and broad form of proposed development
- been designed to assess the balance around development contributions including affordable housing, and whether there are differences in viability across different areas within Bury or between different types of development that are sufficient to justify different policy approaches.

1.8 The testing has drawn on the following evidence:

- review of the types of sites outlined in the consultation Reg. 18 and latest draft Reg. 19 Local Plan and supporting evidence including the SHLAA
- review of the policies in the draft Local Plan, PfE and central government guidance that may have implications for development viability
- review of recent planning consents including details of unit sizes, density, built form
- a review of recent developer contributions agreed by the council as well as discussion with council officers about the proposed use of s106 going forward
- consultation with BC officers, including officers dealing with planning, estates, regeneration and housing matters
- desk research to form initial views on the values and costs of residential development in the BC area
- a range of consultation exercises with the development industry and registered providers of affordable housing – referred to as RPs.

Chapter 2 National & local policy context and consultation

National policy

2.1 National policy and guidance on viability for plan making is set out in National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). There is also useful guidance contained within 'Viability Testing Local Plans - Advice for planning practitioners' (Harman 2012) and 'Assessing Viability in Planning' (RICS 2021). BC have been advised that the BLP will be examined, using transitional arrangements and therefore the NPPF December 2023 and associated guidance applies. However, whilst this LPVA has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF 2023, it is also mindful of the update in December 2024 and changes to PPG and the consultation on a revised NPPF published in December 2025.

2.2 It should be noted that whilst there were changes between the NPPF 2024 and NPPF December 2023, in respect of the approach to viability testing, the important principles around standard assumptions and land value remain the same.

2.3 There are a number of national policies recently introduced, that have a bearing on development costs and which have been included in the viability testing undertaken. These include:

- More stringent requirements to improve building standards, including to reduce carbon emissions in new homes, particularly the 2021 update to Building Regulations Part F (ventilation), Part L (conservation of fuel and power), and Part O (overheating), effective from June 2022
- Update to Part S of the Building Regulations (2021) - Infrastructure for Charging Electric Vehicles which requires new development to provide electric vehicle charging points where a parking space is provided or cabling elsewhere
- Provision for biodiversity net gain introduced through the Environment Act 2021, with 10% net gain a mandatory requirement for most development types from April 2024
- Through the updated NPPF (December 2024), the removal of the requirement, previously introduced through Written Ministerial Statement (24 May 2021), that a minimum of 25% of affordable housing units should be First Homes.

2.4 In March 2026 the government published new statutory guidance in Approved Document L and Approved Document F of the Building Regulation. The Regulations come into force in 2027 and implement the Future Homes and Buildings Standard. Greater Manchester Combined Authority have confirmed that policy JP-S2: Carbon and

Energy in Places For Everyone is already set for standards beyond the recently published requirements for Future Homes and Buildings and that no additional cost allowances are required to these changes to building regulations, for those Greater Manchester Authorities that have adopted Places For Everyone as part of their Local Plan.

2.5 In March 2025 the Government published the [consultation outcome on the Building Safety Levy](). This sets out the potential levy to be applied to all residential development by local authority area and by greenfield and brownfield site types. As the intention is to introduce the Levy in Autumn 2026, it has been included within the testing. However, we are aware there is continued discussion about the scale of the rates, their application and the duration of the levy and therefore not all development may be required to meet the rates included in the viability testing.

Local policy

2.6 The NPPF is clear that viability testing should take into account the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development. The BLP, along with PfE will be the overarching authority- wide planning document for BC and it will set out the spatial strategy and development principles for the area, together with more detailed policies to help determine planning applications (the scope of which may be subject to the introduction of national development management policies).

2.7 Given the development plan status of PfE, it is important to consider the implications arising from its adopted policies - these are set out in Table 2.1a below. Following this, Table 2.1b summarises some of the emerging policies in the latest draft Reg. 19 BLLP which have viability implications (with a complete list in Appendix A) and have been considered in the testing, alongside other national requirements.

Table 2.1a PfE policies with viability implications

Policy	Response
Policy JP-Strat14: A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network	No implications - local transport requirements picked up in s106 allowances. Major transport upgrades will be funded 'centrally'.
Policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy	An expectation that new development will, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not practicable or financially viable, be net zero carbon which applies: - from adoption – to regulated operational carbon emissions; - from 2028 – to all emissions 'in construction'.

Policy	Response
	From 2025 development should also calculate and minimise carbon emissions from unregulated emissions alongside regulated emissions. Development was tested as net zero carbon with Bury specific costs supplied by cost consultant.
Policy JP-S3: Heat and Energy Networks	Expectation that major developments (over 10 dwgs, 1,000 sq. m floorspace) will connect to a heat network if within a network opportunity area unless it can be demonstrated that there are more effective alternatives for minimising carbon emissions or such connection is not practicable or financially viable. No viability implications as assumed that most cost effective solution will be applied
Policy JP-H2: Affordability of New Housing	Maximising the delivery of additional affordable homes, including through local plans setting targets - no targets in PfE
Policy JP-H3: Type, Size and Design of New Housing	Use nationally described space standards; and all new homes are assumed to achieve Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations - as used in the viability testing
Policy JP-H4: Density of New Housing	Range of densities in different locations including town centre and suburban development. Lower density may be acceptable depending on site and market
Policy JP-G6: Urban Green Space	General policy - interpreted through Local Plans No specific viability implications
Policy JP-G8: A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity	Assumed 10% Biodiversity Net Gain – costs derived from the government impact assessment (Biodiversity net gain and local nature recovery strategies, Impact Assessment 2019)
Policy JP-P5: Education, Skills and Knowledge	Ensuring sufficient school places – within s106 allowance

Policy	Response
Policy JP-C8: Transport Requirements of New Development	Local requirements assumed to be within s106 allowance or major items funded centrally but some items are reflected in the testing: 1) Car parking for disabled drivers (within allowance for 'external works') 2) Providing secure and covered cycle storage - provision within build/plot costs
Policy JPA 1.1, 1.2, 7, 8, & 9	See allocations discussion in chapter 3 below

Table 2.2b draft Reg. 19 Bury Local Plan policies with viability implications

Policy	Response
LP-H1: Housing land provision	Policy sets out the approach to providing housing land to meet needs. This is reflected in the typologies used in the testing
LP-H2: Windfall housing development	Policy sets out the approach to providing housing land to meet needs. This is reflected in the typologies used in the testing
LP-H3: Housing mix	Requirement for an appropriate mix of dwellings. The LPVA testing includes a variety of different dwelling types and tenures, with market dwellings reflecting recent supply and affordable dwellings meeting affordable housing needs.
LP-H4: Affordable housing provision	Requirement that developments with 10+ dwellings to provide: • 10% affordable housing on developments of 10-24 dwellings • 15% affordable housing on 25+ dwelling developments in Bury, Radcliffe and Prestwich town centres • 25% affordable housing on developments of 25+ dwellings outside town centres • 50% affordable housing on any developments of 10 or over in the Green Belt Affordable housing to be 60% social/affordable rent and 40% affordable home ownership (except for Build

Policy	Response
	to Rent, specialist housing, self/custom build or affordable housing schemes. Build to Rent to provide 20% affordable housing as Affordable Private Rent with at least 20% discount. Affordable housing dwellings to relate to mix of market dwellings. The typology and site testing includes provision of affordable housing proportions and tenure mixes. Gross rents are used to assess GDV in the testing for BtR schemes.
LP-H5: Housing for older people and people with disabilities	Sets out accessibility standards for all housing. Part M4(2) and M4(3) included in viability testing.
LP-H7: Custom, self-build and community-led housing	5% of all dwellings of 200+ dwellings to be serviced plots for self or custom build. Custom build included as part of testing for larger typologies meeting the threshold.
LP-CM2: New development and health and wellbeing	Policy sets out health and well being requirements. Health s106 allowance included in testing as appropriate.
LP-CM3: Education provision in new housing	Policy requires developments of 10+ houses to mitigate education impacts where existing capacity is exceeded. Education s106 allowances included in the viability testing as appropriate.
LP-TR1: Sustainable transport	Policy includes contributions from development for sustainable transport. Transport s106 allowances are included in the viability testing as appropriate
LP-TR5: Highways	Policy includes highways mitigation required from new development. Testing includes allowances for plot costs and site infrastructure, with s106 for transport costs where appropriate.
LP-BE6: Design and layout of new development	Policy includes integral nesting boxes/swift bricks, hedgehog highways, appropriate urban greening and SuDS. The viability testing includes allowances for build and plot costs and site infrastructure (e.g. planting, greening & SuDS), with s106 & BNG allowances for other mitigation where appropriate (e.g. swift bricks).

Policy	Response
LP-GI2 and LP-G15: Biodiversity assets and wildlife features	Policy includes protection for biodiversity assets and creation of wildlife features in new development. The viability testing includes allowances for wildlife features and contributions for Holcroft Moss mitigation.
LP-GI3: Biodiversity net gains from new development	The testing includes allowances for 10% biodiversity net gain.
LP-OS2: Open space, sport and recreation provision in new housing	The policy requires developments of 10+ dwellings to provide new/enhanced open space. The testing includes s106 allowances as well as allowances for non-developable space within typologies used in the testing.
LP-DM1: Planning contributions and infrastructure	Requirement for development to contribute towards infrastructure, including affordable housing, subject to viability. The testing includes affordable housing, s106 and BNG allowances.

Consultation with the development industry

2.8 The PPG sets out that:

> *"Plan makers should engage with landowners, developers, and infrastructure and affordable housing providers to secure evidence on costs and values to inform viability assessment at the plan making stage."*[2]

2.9 Consultation with the development industry, undertaken for this assessment, involved different activities which provided opportunities for the development industry to engage with the process. The activities were:

- a workshop consultation exercise with developers and agents active in Bury in Autumn 2025
- follow up consultation with individual developers
- consultation with RPs active in Bury to discuss transfer values, mix and available grants for affordable housing.

2.10 The industry consultation raised the following issues:

[2] Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 006 Reference ID: 10-006-20190509

- Although overall the market values proposed for the viability assessment were broadly acceptable, there will be variation in values across Bury and that new developments may be able to create their own values
- Transfer values for affordable housing will differ between sites in the two Broad Rental Market area (BRMA) that cover Bury
- Estimated s106 costs for inclusion in the testing appear high
- Build to Rent – suggested that returns may differ between different funding models for BtR and that they may be higher in some cases
- Build costs vary between those of national housebuilders (£2,100/m2) and affordable housing providers (£2,600 -£2,900/m2)

2.11 The LPVA responds to these comments as follows:

- The analysis of market values used for the viability assessment indicated some variation in values across the borough but that this variation was limited for newbuild properties. Scheme viability in Bury town centre is affected by the mix of units modelled rather than lower values for similar house types. See chapter 4 for detail
- S106 costs in the future may be higher than has been the case historically as there is a new requirement for an education contribution. The testing has included a standard contribution as set out in chapter 4. This is a conservative estimate and may not be required for all development
- The approach to BtR focuses on forward funded schemes. Assumptions are set out in chapter 4

2.12 Comments from the RPs about the affordable housing assumptions included

- Different views on having the three AH tenures (social rent, affordable rent and shared ownership) on the same site
- Differing views on capitalisation rate – and whether 4.5% is appropriate
- Various detailed comments about modelling assumptions to be used to calculate transfer values e.g. management and maintenance costs could vary over time. However, RPs generally considered proposed transfer values were acceptable for this type of testing
- Preference to have schemes without 2 bed flats (which implies will be families with children above ground floor)

2.13 The LPVA responds to these comments as follows:

- Testing undertaken with mix of tenures as set out in chapter 4 to provide a proportionate assessment of the viability impact of different amounts and combinations of affordable housing tenures. This includes a test of affordable rent and discount market sale
- Updated transfer values are set out in chapter 4
- Dwelling mix with ranges discussed set out in chapter 4

2.14 Individually the site promoters for PfE allocations in Bury made the following comments:

- Suggested that PfE allocations have already been found sound through PfE examination and may not require further viability testing
- During consultation with one of the allocation promoters, concerns were expressed that high level cost and value assumptions had been set out with little detail. However, it was acknowledged that some allocations are in the initial stages of planning with limited information available upon which to base testing assumptions.
- More specific comments related to
    - Developer return used should be 20%
    - Build to Rent assumptions e.g. yield and return are questioned
    - Building Safety Levy costs should be included
    - Clarification about abnormals, plot costs and site infrastructure
    - To be compliant with PfE will need to use a net density of 35 dph
    - Request that Three Dragons specify the appraisal model to be used and request for transparency in setting out appraisal details including cash flow
    - Sufficient viability headroom is required to allow for uncertainty of development form and assumptions – as was shown in PfE and sufficient flexibility in policy to account for possibility of changes to enable future delivery
    - Some example sales transactions were provided by the site promoters

2.15 The LPVA responds to these comments as follows:

- It is agreed that all the PfE allocations were found sound through PfE examination and that many are in advanced stages in planning and development as set out in chapter 3 and therefore do not require further testing as part of the Local Plan preparation. However, it is also acknowledged that affordable housing requirements for the cross boundary sites at JPA1.1 and JPA1.2, whilst tested in the evidence base were not set out in PfE policy and therefore should be considered as part of the BLP

- Testing assumptions – their sources and analysis are set out in chapters 3 and 4 of the report
- Testing was undertaken using the Three Dragons toolkit which has been used extensively for local plan and site-specific viability studies and found sound at examination. Cashflow is set out in the relevant parts of the testing assumptions in chapter 4
- Responding to the specific comments:
    - The developer return is mid-point in the range shown in the PPG and has been used across a number of viability assessments. No particular risk for the development of the allocated site, PfE JPA 1.2 has been identified and therefore the same return has been used as for other large greenfield sites
    - Build to Rent assumptions are set out in chapter 4. This section of the report describes the source information used to derive the rents and other assumptions used to calculate the values for BtR units
    - Density tested at 35 dph – see appraisal summaries in the appendices
    - Building Safety Levy costs have been included in the testing at the rate for Bury MBC, although the rate and application are yet to be confirmed by the Government
    - In the absence of further detail, the testing for JPA 1.2 includes plot and site infrastructure costs consistent with approach taken in PfE. It is assumed that should there be additional site-specific costs (abnormals), these would be taken into account through an adjustment to site value (PPG viability para 013)
    - The viability testing considers the headroom on a scheme and per dwelling basis – see chapter 5
    - The additional data on house prices has been checked with the values used in the viability testing.

Chapter 3 Approach to testing and viability

Approach to viability and typologies

3.1 As is standard practice, a residual value approach has been used in the LPVA. Residual value is the value of the completed development (known as the Gross Development Value or GDV) less scheme costs. The value of the scheme includes both the value of the market housing and affordable housing. Scheme costs include the costs of building the development, plus professional fees, scheme finance and a return to the developer as well as any planning obligations or other policy costs and the costs of the land and its purchase, as described in PPG:

"Viability assessment is a process of assessing whether a site is financially viable, by looking at whether the value generated by a development is more than the cost of developing it. This includes looking at the key elements of gross development value, costs, land value, landowner premium, and developer return." Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 10-011-20180724

3.2 In respect of the types of sites to test, PPG states that:

"Assessing the viability of plans does not require individual testing of every site or assurance that individual sites are viable. Plan makers can use site typologies to determine viability at the plan making stage." Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 10-003-20180724

3.3 An important response to the PPG on viability is to reflect on appropriate available evidence – within the context of Bury, the work supporting PfE is part of this consideration. The PfE viability evidence was found sound in 2024 and the approach in this report is consistent with that methodology. This assessment also makes use and updates as appropriate parts of the PfE evidence viability evidence base.

Uses included in the testing

3.4 The uses considered are listed below and focus on developer-led forms of development rather than publicly led uses such as new infrastructure facilities or development types that are not common:

Residential

- residential for sale
- housing for older persons
- Build to Rent (BtR)

3.5 Following consultation with BC officers and the development industry it was agreed that co-living and (Purpose Built Student Accommodation) PBSA forms of development were less likely to come forward within Bury over the plan period and therefore unnecessary to test in respect of viability.

Non-residential

3.6 Employment land allocations and other non-residential requirements are typically derived from needs assessments such as the Employment Land Review and the Retail and Town Centre Assessment, with the objective of meeting forecast growth over the plan period. These non-residential allocations are typically framed as land area or floorspace requirements rather than as delivery of buildings, recognising that the built form is likely to be tailored to intended occupiers. Whilst local plans can support the identification of potential locations for such uses, it is the operational needs of the occupier that generally determine delivery rather than planning policy.

3.7 The policy review (at Tables 2.1a and 2.2b) found limited policies regarding non residential development and none that would have a significant impact on viability and thus cause any substantial delivery issues as a result of policy requirement.

3.8 Where policies that are directly relevant to these types of developments (e.g. digital connectivity), on the basis of the consultant team's experience, they only represent modest costs and would not, either on their own or in combination, effect delivery of these forms of development. Given the PPG requirement for a proportionate response to viability, the LPVA therefore does not consider non-residential development in terms of viability modelling.

3.9 Furthermore, the new build non-residential market is already delivering to high building standards to meet occupier requirements. Added to this, non-residential development is usually delivered on a pre-let basis (especially outside of major city centres and or locations with well known business park locations), so such schemes will be designed to meet specific occupier current needs, which generally include high standards to reduce operational energy costs over the life of the building.

Typology and allocated sites selection

3.10 Three Dragons worked with BC to draw up a suite of residential typologies. These are intended to reflect the type of sites likely to come forward over the life of the BLP. The generic typologies are not intended to represent specific development proposals but to reflect typical forms of development that are likely to come forward over the plan period.

3.11 The starting point for the typologies was a review of the typologies set out in the PfE viability evidence base. These were updated based on the types of sites emerging from the most recent SHLAA. In discussion with the council, it was decided that site specific testing of sites was not appropriate as the council is not intending to allocate specific sites in the BLP, instead relying on the PfE allocations and broad 'key locations' to meet their housing requirements, where a range of different site types and tenures are expected (with the chosen typologies reflecting these).

3.12 The typologies are set out below, organised in the two broad groups of development types (standard residential and specialist homes).

Generic residential for sale across Bury

3.13 The generic residential typologies are set out in Table 3.1. These are focused on small to medium schemes of 5 to 75 dwellings, across the BC area, excluding town centres. All scheme sizes are tested in both brownfield and greenfield locations.

3.14 The development types are predominantly housing with some affordable housing apartments, reflecting an average scheme height drawn from existing and pipeline development indicated by the Council. The gross site areas and proportions of net developable area reflect policy requirements as well as typical characteristics of this site type.

Town centre typologies

3.15 The Council have suggested that a range of different development types are anticipated to continue coming forward in the town centres over the plan period. It is suggested that there is interest for both traditional sale schemes and Build to Rent – all sites are brownfield and for the purposes of testing are assumed to be cleared and development-ready and within the town centre boundaries in the BLP.

3.16 The sale schemes are tested at medium densities with either a combination of houses and apartments or houses only. However, whilst the Council is not expecting sale schemes for 100% apartments to come forward imminently, it is anticipated that there could be interest in the future, so two further typologies are considered at higher density apartment only schemes but with 5 yr forecast future costs and values. Given that town centre developments of this form are not identified within the housing trajectory for at least 5 years, this is considered a reasonable approach for local plan testing.

3.17 BtR is a specialist form of development that requires a critical mass to be attractive to investment. Whilst a relatively new addition to the housing market, commentary suggests that a minimum of c100 units is normally required for a standalone scheme.

Based on discussion with the council, two typologies are tested, of 100 to 200 units, both at 6 storeys. As there are limited differences in terms of gross floorspace the same site areas and densities are used as for standard apartment development.

3.18 For the purposes of testing, the definition set out Annex 2 Glossary NPPF is used for BtR. It states that BtR is purpose-built housing that is typically 100% rented out. Schemes will usually offer longer tenancy agreements of three years or more and will typically be professionally managed stock in single ownership and management control.

Green Belt typologies

3.19 Whilst the Council is not proposing any Green Belt releases as part of this local plan, there could be a scenario in which this form of development comes forward, through the application of the 'golden rules'. NPPF December 2024 (para 67) suggests that affordable housing requirements should be higher than what would apply to land not within the Green Belt and requires at least 50% of the housing to be affordable, unless this would make the development of these sites unviable.

3.20 A set of three Green Belt typologies are included in the LPVA, testing to ascertain a reasonable policy response to the golden rules – whilst this was not part of the 2023 NPPF, it is one of those scenarios set out in the introduction whereby moving to the latest policy position is a pragmatic local response, rather than leaving a policy vacuum.

Older person typologies

3.21 There are a number of different types of older person homes, including retirement housing (sheltered housing), extra care and care homes and are as described by The Retirement Housing Group as follows:

- Retirement housing – also known as housing with support, sheltered housing, retirement flats or communities, offering self-contained homes for people over 60, with on-site dedicated manager and typical facilities such as communal lounge, laundry, gardens, guest rooms, emergency call system and secure entry
- Extra care - also known as housing with care, assisted living, independent living integrated retirement communities or retirement villages, offering self-contained homes for people over 60, with 24 hour on-site staff, optional care or domiciliary services, restaurant or cafe available for meals, leisure facilities such as gym, swimming pool, exercise programme, a social event programme and typical facilities include communal lounge and/or library, laundry, hairdressers, gardens, guest rooms - service charges are likely to be higher than in retirement housing but this reflects the more extensive range of facilities

- Care Homes - This includes what have traditionally been described as residential care homes or nursing homes and is where integral 24-hour personal care and/or nursing care are provided together with all meals. A care home is a residential setting where a number of older people live, usually in single rooms and people occupy under a licence arrangement. Care homes are not included in this viability testing

3.22 For this LPVA, commercial sheltered and extra care schemes are tested. In discussion with the Council, further testing of other types of older persons accommodation was not considered necessary as there has been little interest in bringing these types of schemes forward on a commercial (i.e. without public sector subsidy) basis.

PfE allocations

3.23 As described in the introduction and in common with other local planning authorities within Greater Manchester, that have adopted PfE as part of their development plan, the Council is not intending to reallocate or provide further policy in respect of the sites allocated in PfE within the BLP. In terms of viability, these sites have already been subject to a viability assessment and an Examination process that found the PfE plan sound. Furthermore, many of the sites are progressing on the basis of the PfE policy, including completions, under construction and planning applications etc. Whilst some of the sites are not yet permitted, BC and others within GM have confirmed that they will be determined in accordance with PfE as the main development plan document. However, it is recognised that for two of the PfE sites in the BLP area, which are cross boundary, the approach to affordable housing was left to the BLP to determine as they were not established in PfE.

3.24 There are 5 PfE allocation within or partially within Bury – their current status and proposed approach in respect of the BLP are as follows:

- JPA 1.1 Heywood and Pilsworth – this is mainly an employment site with some residential, of which the majority is permitted and in an adjoining local authority (Rochdale) – a small amount of housing which is within Bury c200 units is not yet permitted – however given this is considered a ‘standalone’ part of the wider site, given its location and local connections, the approach is to rely on the generic testing to provide assurance that the affordable housing requirement is reasonable.
- JPA 1.2 Simister and Bowlee – this is a large residential led allocation with the majority of the site within Bury (c1,350 dwellings) and the remaining part of the allocation (c200 dwellings) within Rochdale. As a cross boundary allocation, the PfE policy did not specify the percentage of affordable housing, instead leaving that to the relevant local plans. Therefore, the Council considers that the allocation should

be tested (on a similar basis to the testing undertaken for PfE, for consistency) as part of the BLP viability assessment

- JPA 7 Elton Reservoir – the Council has carried out consultation on the emerging Development Framework for the site. Given that it is not anticipated that any policies within the proposed BLP will directly impact on viability matters for this site it is not considered necessary to undertake any further testing as it will serve no useful purpose and therefore contrary to PPG seeking a proportionate response.
- JPA 8 Seedfield – the Council has advised that the majority of this site is being developed and therefore not affected by BLP policies.
- JPA 9 Walshaw – similar position to JPA 7 but even more advanced, whereby an application has been submitted on part of the site and the site promoters confirmed that they are policy compliant and not challenging requirements on the basis of viability.

3.25 By undertaking an update to the viability testing at JPA 1.2, not only will this help inform the affordable housing approach that was reverted to BLP, but it will also provide some comfort that the other PfE sites, which are similar in terms of their scale of development and characteristics when compared to the rest of the supply in Bury, would likely have a similar outcome, so the testing at JPA1.2 could be a proxy for those sites. Bury Council has requested that the both the indicative number set out in the Development Framework (1,350 dwellings) and the site promoters suggested housing number (1,325 dwellings) are tested.

3.26 The typologies used in the LPVA are set out in the following tables:

Table 3.1 Generic 'for sale' typologies

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
GBF 1	Sale	Brownfield - houses	5	35	2	0.14
GGF 2	Sale	Greenfield - houses	5	35	2	0.14
GBF 3	Sale	Brownfield - mixed	15	40	2	0.43
GGF 4	Sale	Greenfield - mixed	15	40	2	0.43
GBF 5	Sale	Brownfield - mixed	30	33	2	1.07
GGF 6	Sale	Greenfield - mixed	30	33	2	1.07
GBF 7	Sale	Brownfield - mixed	75	40	2	2.50

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
GGF 8	Sale	Greenfield - houses	75	40	2	2.50

Table 3.2 Generic town centre typologies (all brownfield)

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
TC 1	Sale	Houses/ apartments	150	80	2 - 5	1.75
TC 2	Sale	Houses	40	60	2	0.67
TC 3	BtR	Apartments	100	220	6	0.45
TC 4	BtR	Apartments	200	202	4 - 6	0.99
TC 5	Future sale	Apartments	50	220	6	0.23
TC 6	Future sale	Apartments	100	220	6	0.45

Table 3.3 Green Belt typologies

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
GB 1	Sale	Mixed	30	33	2	1.07
GB 2	Sale	Mixed	75	40	2	2.50
GB 3	Sale	Mixed	200	35	2	8.00

Table 3.4 Specialist residential typologies (all brownfield)

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
OP1	Retirement housing (sheltered)	Apartments	50	100	4	0.56

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
OP2	Extra care	Apartments	60	100	4	0.67

Table 3.5 PfE allocations

Typology	Tenure	Type	Dwellings	Net density (dph)	Average storey height	Gross site (hectare)
JPA 1.2 Simister & Bowlee - a	Sale	Greenfield - Mixed	1,350	35	2	60.78
JPA 1.2 Simister & Bowlee - b	Sale	Greenfield - Mixed	1,325	35	2	60.78

Chapter 4 Development assumptions

4.1 The LPVA employed a range of data sources, including government impact assessments, national datasets and local examples of development to draw up a series of assumptions. These were reviewed at the development industry workshop and in follow up discussions, adjusted as necessary, with a final set of testing assumptions agreed with the council. The final set of assumptions was used in the viability testing. This chapter summarises the key assumptions and the data upon which they rely.

Market and affordable housing proportions

4.2 The starting point for testing was the Reg 18 version of the Local Plan (policy H4) which set out different proportions of market and affordable housing, varying by site size:

- 1 – 9 dwellings – 100% market and 0% affordable housing
- 10 – 24 dwellings – 90% market and 10% affordable housing
- 25 dwellings plus – 75% market and 25% affordable housing
- Green Belt – 10 dwellings plus – 50% market and 50% affordable housing

4.3 The policy indicated that the above proportions would also apply to BtR, older persons and across all locations including the town centre and the 2 PfE sites (JPA 1.1 & JPA 1.2).

4.4 However, following some initial testing and the experience of the consultant team of similar circumstances, a revised set of affordable housing testing was suggested and used in the LPVA – as follows:

- Standard housing outside town centres
    - 1 – 9 dwellings – 100% market and 0% affordable housing
    - 10 – 24 dwellings – 90% market and 10% affordable housing
    - 25 dwellings plus – 75% market and 25% affordable housing
- Standard housing within town centres
    - All sizes – 10 dwellings plus – 85% market and 15% affordable housing
- Build to rent
    - All sizes – 80% market and 20% affordable housing (as per PPG)
- Green Belt – 10 dwellings plus
    - 50% market and 50% affordable housing and
- Older persons
    - 100% market and 0% affordable housing. Noting that: affordable housing not tested as work in other areas with similar characteristics indicate that

for generic testing for speculative development, the inclusion of affordable housing is unlikely to be viable - although it is acknowledged that on a site specific basis, Bury Council has previously been successful in securing s.106 contributions from older persons housing schemes.

4.5 As per Reg 18 policy H4, the standard affordable housing tenure mix is 60% rented and 40% affordable home ownership. The affordable home ownership component was tested as discount market sale as this has been the preferred choice in the past with no indication that this is likely to change. The Council wanted to understand the implications of different proportions of social and affordable rent within the rented component, therefore the testing includes:

- 30% social rent, 30% affordable rent and 40% discount market sale
- 60% social rent and 40% discount market sale
- 60% affordable rent and 40% discount market sale

4.6 In line with government guidance, for BtR, 20% of the units were considered to be affordable housing, with rents at 80% of the open market rent assumed to be all at 20%, noting that PPG requires that additional evidence of need is supplied should the Council wish to deliver affordable housing on these types of schemes at a level above 20%. (PPG Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 60-002-20180913).

4.7 In all the testing with affordable housing as part of the mix, no grant is included and housing is assumed to be delivered on-site (although an equivalent commuted sum could also be collected in particular circumstances set out in policy).

Dwelling mix and size

4.8 For each typology, a mix and size of dwellings was devised. These mixes were based on Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), housing delivery including data from Land Registry/Energy Performance Certificates (EPC) planning applications and the housing need assessment. They were agreed with the council and also presented as part of the stakeholder consultation.

4.9 The **standard market dwelling** mix is based upon the Land Registry price paid data, which provides a breakdown of dwelling types; and then refined in line with the industry consultation and typology characteristics. To simplify the testing of market dwellings, a blended house size was used. The affordable dwelling mix is based upon discussion with the council, drawing on housing need assessments and was also sense checked with RPs who were supportive of the mixes put forward.

4.10 For the standard residential typologies, the market dwelling sizes used are based on averages derived from EPC and planning application data but meet minimum requirements set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS). Market unit sizes for houses and apartments are each blended but represent a range of sizes that the market is delivering. Affordable units are based on the housing needs assessment and meet the NDSS.

4.11 For the PfE allocation JPA 1.2 the approach to mix is consistent with the PfE testing and uses house types rather than a blended average – this is explained in the specific section on PfE allocations.

4.12 The size of home affects both their market value (as sale values were assessed on a per sq. m basis) and their development costs. The average floor areas and value per sq. m were derived from the same sources and so the relationship is consistent. Construction costs for apartments will include industry standard non-saleable circulation and common areas (confirmed by our cost consultants) - for schemes with 1-2 storeys apartments, an allowance of 10% on top of the apartments 'saleable floor' area for circulation and common areas and for schemes where apartments are 3 to 6 storey the allowance is 15%. Unit sizes for older persons are based on consultation with providers and local schemes and the Retirement Housing Group guidance. A blended rate of 65 sq. m is used for sheltered apartments and 72.5 sq. m for extra care apartments, based on a 50/50% mix of 1 and 2-bed units. Circulation and communal spaces are added at 23% for sheltered schemes and 35% for extra care schemes.

4.13 **The BtR** units are considered likely to be a similar size to market units within flatted developments and whilst the standard allowances for circulation space is added, consultation feedback elsewhere suggested that BtR schemes also have additional communal space (for example workspace, lounge, communal kitchen, games room/cinema and gym). Based on local information an additional 1.5 sqm per unit is added to all BtR units. Affordable allowances follow national guidance as set out previously.

Table 4.1 Market housing mix and size by typology

Unit type and size	Market mix and unit size for G1 – G8, & GB1 – GB3	Market mix and unit size for TC1	Market mix and unit size TC3 – TC4	Market mix and unit size TC5 – TC6
Apartments (net)	n/a	50% - 60 sq. m	100% - 55 sq. m	100% - 60 sq. m

Unit type and size	Market mix and unit size for G1 – G8, & GB1 – GB3	Market mix and unit size for TC1	Market mix and unit size TC3 – TC4	Market mix and unit size TC5 – TC6
House	100% - 106 sq. m	50% - 106 sq. m	n/a	n/a

Table 4.2 Affordable housing mix and size by typology

Unit type and size	Affordable mix and unit size for G3 – G8, & GB1 – GB3	Affordable mix and unit size for TC1	Affordable mix and unit size TC3 – TC4	Affordable mix and unit size TC5 – TC6
Apartments (rent) net	32% - 50/61 sq. m	32% - 50/61 sq. m	100% - 55 sq. m	100% - 50/61 sq. m
Houses (rent)	68% - 79/93/106 sq. m	68% - 79/93/106 sq. m	n/a	
Apartments (DMS)	n/a	n/a	n/a	100% - 60 sq. m
Houses (DMS)	100% - 79/93/106 sq. m	100% - 79/93/106 sq. m	n/a	n/a

Table 4.3 Specialised housing mix and size

Older persons		
Blended unit sizes (net)	Sheltered – 65 sq. m	Extra care – 72.5 sq. m

Values – standard residential market

4.14 The market values in Bury were derived from an analysis of new build Land Registry data for past five years. The Land Registry data was matched to planning application data/Energy Performance Certificates to enable a value per sq. m to be generated for the different dwelling types, based on more than 300 new build records. This is then grossed up by the dwelling sizes to provide an approximate home value. Sales values are indexed to align with the base date of the build cost information, so that cost and values have the same base date of 3Q2025 – the most recent date with value information at the time of the study data collection.

4.15 As part of the exercise determining sales values, local knowledge of the area (from local property expert Promark) and broad locations for future growth were used to identify potential areas of varying values for new build properties. The emphasis is on new build properties and future growth. These areas do not always match with values of existing second-hand stock, especially where transformational change is anticipated, such as the PfE allocations and Bury town centre.

4.16 The analysis of future growth, potential value areas and house price data suggests that whilst values will fluctuate across Bury in terms of existing stock the variance is less for new build and therefore a single set of values is used for the main testing. It is accepted that achieved values maybe higher or lower than the average tested but that in the spirit of PPG it is sensible to take an approach that will consider the majority of circumstances rather than focus on the extremes. The exception to using a single value area is taken for the PfE allocation, JPA1.2, whereby a more localised approach is taken – this is set out in a later part of this report.

4.17 Table 4.4 below sets out the £/sqm used in the generic typology testing and the associated unit values.

Table 4.4 'Sold' residential values (figures rounded)

Unit type	Bury
Apartments (£/sqm)	**£3,440**
Apartment (£/dwelling)	£206,000
Houses (£/sqm)	**£3,580**
House(£/dwelling)	£380,000

4.18 To 'sense' check these values, advertising prices shown on Rightmove (Q1 2026) for properties in Bury were reviewed - a total of 45 dwellings. Table 4.5 suggests that generally the advertised prices are not significantly different to those set out in Table 4.4. Therefore, the assumptions around values, which are driven by Land Registry evidence base, are considered to be realistic.

Table 4.5 Q1 2026 advertised market values by dwelling types

Home type	Price advertised
4+ bedrooms	There were 17 such properties on the market, ranging from £330,000 to £900,000 – all of these were detached apart from the lowest value in the range which was a terrace
3 bedrooms	24 dwelling with 3 bedrooms were advertised and are a mixture of detached, semi and terrace housing – they range from £275,000 to £390,000, which is around the values used within the modelling on a per dwelling basis
2 bedrooms	There was only one 2 bedroom house and three 2 bedroom apartments, with the house at £320,000 and the apartments ranging from £202,000 to £204,000 which is similar to the value of the modelled apartment.
Houses and apartments £/sqm	Taking a blend of all the houses (where floorspace is known) the average £/sqm is £3,600, which is marginally above that used in the modelling, which is to be expected given that advertised process are often slightly above sale price. Given there were only 3 apartments a £/sqm figure could be misleading.

Values - Affordable housing

4.19 Initial estimates of the value of affordable housing were produced using a capitalised net rent approach i.e. the notional amount the provider of the unit can borrow against the net income received. The rents are derived from the Local Housing Allowance, which varies according to which Broad Rental Market Areas (BRMA) applies. Whilst two BRMAs operate across Bury (Bolton and Bury BRMA and Central Greater Manchester BRMA), the majority of the area i.e. north of the M60/M62 SW/NE bound, is within the Bolton and Bury BRMA, so this is the basis of the affordable housing rents used to inform the affordable housing rented tenures. However, as JPA1.2 is entirely within the Central Greater Manchester BRMA it seems reasonable to use those rents for informing the affordable housing rented tenures within that site specific testing.

4.20 The assumptions used to derive affordable housing transfer values were initially based on known industry standards and an analysis of annual reports for actively developing registered providers The assumptions are set out in the following table:

Table 4.6 Assumptions used for calculating affordable housing values

Assumption	Amount	Note
Management & maintenance	£1,250	Rented units, per annum
Voids/bad debts	2.5%	Rented units
Repairs reserve	£600	Rented units, per annum
Capitalisation	4.5%	Rented and shared ownership
Service charges - apartments	£15	Per week
Service charges - houses	£5	Per week

4.21 The affordable housing assumptions were discussed at the developer workshop. Discussion was also undertaken individually with locally active RPs who all provided a range of transfer values for affordable and social rent affordable housing tenures. These were used as a cross check with the values suggested through the capitalised net rent approach set out above. Through this combined process it was considered reasonable that a transfer value of 35% of market value for social rent, 50% for affordable rent and 75% of market value for discount market sale should be used for the main testing – noting that for the PfE allocation a different set of affordable housing values are used based on the different BRMA that applies in that location (please see later section for details).

4.22 The table below summarises the values attributed to the affordable housing property types included in the standard residential testing.

Table 4.7 Affordable homes values

Unit type	Social rent	Affordable rent	Discount market sale
1 bed flat	£60,200	£86,000	n/a
2 bed flat	£73,444	£104,920	£154,800
2 bed terrace	£98,987	£141,410	£197,974
3 bed terrace	£116,529	£166,470	£233,058
4 bed semi	£132,818	£189,740	£265,636

Values – other residential products

Build to rent values

4.23 The BtR values are calculated by using market rental data, adjusting for operation/management, sinking fund and voids and then capitalised. The market rents and yields are based on a range of Bury private rent data, including from Promark, site specific viability appraisals, consultation and agents reports. As with the flatted development, a blended rate is used with the proportions of different unit sizes being drawn from Bury BtR schemes as a reasonable proxy for potential future development. These figures were adjusted following consultation.

Table 4.8 Build to rent values £/sqm

Input	Assumption – MFU (apartments)	Assumption – SFU (houses)
Annual rent per sq. m	£220	£187
Less operating costs, sinking funds & voids	25%	19%
Capitalisation rate	4.75%	5%
Market value/unit	£209,000	£279,000
Affordable value/unit	£168,000	£224,000

Older persons residential market

4.24 Values for retirement housing are based on the Retirement Housing Group (RHG) guidance which recommends that “In high value areas with a high proportion of flats the price of a 1 bed sheltered property is linked to the price of high value flats, normally with a 10-15% premium” (p8). There is a limited volume of sales of retirement housing schemes in Bury but by way of comparison 2 bed sheltered apartments range from £285,000 to £325,000 and 1 bed sheltered apartments £150,000 to £255,000 – noting these are all resales and not first sale.

4.25 Using information from providers, RHG guidance and scheme specific information the unit values are set out in Table 4.8. Separate value areas are not identified for older person housing on the basis of the value areas, but the most likely location for new development is likely to be in accessible locations at the edge of existing town centres across Bury, when land is available.

Table 4.9 Older persons market values

Type	1 bed apartment	2 bed apartment
Sheltered	£235,000	£315,000

Extra care	£315,000	£395,000

4.26 At the time of writing, a sheltered scheme in Prestwich was in the pipeline with indicative prices advertised of £300,000 for a 1 bed apartment and £425,000 for a 2 bed apartment. These figures have been used to inform a higher value sensitivity test for older persons housing, alongside adjustments to the non-saleable floorspace and return.

Development costs

Build costs

4.27 Build costs will vary due to location, development type, proposed tenure type, proposed tenure mix, storey height, and building use. Given concerns with data availability from BCIS in respect of 'tall' buildings and in-line with PfE, cost consultants with experience of operating within the Greater Manchester area have been engaged to provide build cost data. Build costs have been provided by Currie and Brown (C&B) for the different forms of development tested as part of this viability assessment. These costs including the recent changes to building regulations (parts F,L,O,S), meeting PfE net zero[3] requirements and vary between different types/heights of development as well as scale of development for houses.

4.28 In March 2026 the government published new statutory guidance in Approved Document L and Approved Document F of the Building Regulation. The Regulations come into force in 2027 and implement the Future Homes and Buildings Standard. Greater Manchester Combined Authority have confirmed that policy JP-S2: Carbon and Energy in Places For Everyone is already set for standards beyond the recently published requirements for Future Homes and Buildings and that no additional cost allowances are required to these changes to building regulations, for those Greater Manchester Authorities that have adopted Places For Everyone as part of their Local Plan.

4.29 Build costs are applied to gross floor areas. For the town centre typologies, two build cost figures have been provided by our cost consultant, the first figure is the cost without a contractor return (assumes that developer and contractor are essentially the same) and with the contractor return which assumes the developer is contracting the building works. Whilst both are provided for completeness, the former is often the case with BtR and so is used for the purposes of the BLP testing but the higher inclusive figure is used for standard sale apartments.

[3] Please note that C& B have advised that on £/sq.m basis the costs for achieving PfE net zero policy reduces as the amount of total floorspace increases as the costs are borne over more floorspace.

4.30 In respect of parking and bicycle storage - for housing led schemes, following a review of recent planning applications garages are assumed on 20% of market units, of which 15% are single garages and 5% double garages. The cost of garages is verified by a cost consultant at £10,400 for a single garage and £16,800 for a double garage. For properties without a garage it is assumed that plot costs include provision for cycle storage. In respect of apartment led schemes, it is anticipated that the majority will be car free, with bicycle storage within ground floor areas and thus part of the build cost. However, should some car parking be provided it is anticipated that this will be on a cost recovery basis or will be surface parking, and will already be covered by plot and site cost allowances.

Table 4.10 Dwelling build costs used in testing

Development type	£/sq. m
Houses for sale	
House 1-9	£1,959
House 10-50	£1,861
House 51-250	£1,763
Town centre apartments for sale	
3 - 4 storey	£2,206 / £2,308
5 - 6 storey	£2,184 / £2,289
Town centre apartments build to rent	
3 - 4 storey	£2,305 / £2,413
5 - 6 storey	£2,284 / £2,394
Older persons	
Older persons standalone	£2,569

Other residential development costs

4.31 A range of other standard costs have been used in the viability testing. These were discussed with the development industry at the workshops and are based on PPG and experience of other high level plan making viability testing.

Table 4.11 other development costs

Type	Cost	Metric
Plot costs and site infrastructure[4]- houses	1-100 dwellings - 15% 101 – 250 dwellings – 20% 251+ dwellings - 25%	of build costs
External public realm/landscaping/UGF - apartments	Hard landscaping £270/sq. m Soft landscaping £220/sq. m	on 50% of site area on 20% of site area
Contingency	None required for generic plan-wide testing	
Sales and marketing costs Affordable legal costs	3% £500	of market dwellings GDV per affordable unit
Professional fees	1-100 units 8% 101+ units 6%	of build cost
Debit interest rate	1-100 units 7.5% 101+ units 6.5%	of cash flow negative balances
Credit interest rate	0%	of cash flow positive balances
Developer return	17.5% 6% 10%	market GDV (mid point of the range set out in the PPG) affordable homes GDV BtR/DMS GDV
Agents & legal	1.75%	Land cost (BLV)
Stamp duty	prevailing rate	land cost (BLV)

4.32 In respect of phasing and cashflow, this will vary according to the size and type of development, but the basis is completion rates of 4 per month (including any affordable housing provision) per flag. Lead times are 3 months on small sites and 6 months on large sites, with sales following on 6 months from build. Costs associated with build, such as plot costs and accessibility are in line with build phasing, other more general

[4] Plot costs includes gardens, fencing, walls, drainage, external services trench; and site infrastructure includes highways, drainage, lighting, utilities, landscaping, adoption + 'normal' site clearance and preparation

s.106 such as open space, sports and recreation are in line with sales phasing. Infrastructure costs are frontloaded and phased in line with land purchase.

National and local policy requirements

4.33 National policy, PfE and the draft BLP include policies with cost implications, and these are included within the viability testing as set out in the following table:

Table 4.12 Policy costs

Type	Cost	Metric
BNG/tree planting - brownfield	£242	per dwelling
BNG/tree planting - greenfield	£1,137	per dwelling
S.106 allowance includes habitat mitigation, transport/travel, education and open space/recreation	£14,000 £12,000 £3,000	per house per flat per older persons unit
Accessibility: Part M4(2) Part M4(3)	£1,400 £10,000	applied to 96% of dwellings applied to 4% of dwellings
Wildlife features	£100	per dwelling
Health s106	£700	per dwelling
Building Safety Levy: Brownfield Greenfield	£12.14 £24.29	per sq. m GIA per sq. m GIA

National and local policy requirements

4.34 Biodiversity net gain – In line with the national policy requirement for 10% BNG, the allowance for biodiversity net gain (BNG) is drawn from the government's impact assessment[5] which was published with the consultation on the amendments to the Environment Act. A cross typology allowance, split by greenfield and brownfield is used. However, it should be noted that, as biodiversity net gain is site specific depending on both the existing site characteristics and the ability of development form to both mitigate and provide additional gain, it is difficult to gauge a suitable allowance for meeting the requirements. It is also of note that the NHBC with the RSPB have issued guidance on

[5] MHCLG, 2019, Biodivesity net gain and local nature recovery strategies impact assessment

how to achieve net gain within new development. At the launch of the guidance both the authors and one of the major housebuilders (Barratt Homes) emphasised that incorporating measures for biodiversity net gain during the design phase meant additional costs were minimal[6]. This suggests that, whilst an allowance is included, the actual cost could be much lower and therefore the testing allowances are a conservative estimate. Where possible most allocations would be expected to deal with BNG on site, with the response designed in at the outset. Also important to note that the allowances can also be used to meet other similar policy requirements such as encouraging tree planting without further costs.

4.35 **Habitat mitigation** – mitigation is required from large scale development within Bury if it will generate a qualifying increase in traffic flows on the M62, to reduce/offset impact on Holcroft Moss. A Greater Manchester-wide joint SPD (May 2025) has been published and sets out the mitigation strategy and associated costs, calculated at £37/dwelling. Although in many circumstances this contribution will not be required, a cautious approach is taken, and this cost is included within the s.106 package.

4.36 **Education** – an allowance is made for education on the basis of Bury Council's SPD (September 2024). The allowance (which has been indexed to Q3 2025) assumes that there is no existing capacity and that, where new residential development generates a need for places, these will need to be met in full. However, Bury Council have indicated that in many circumstances the requirements will not be needed to be met in full as there will likely be existing capacity across the age groups and type of provision. Therefore, while the full amount is tested as part of the s.106 package, it is likely that the cost to development will be much reduced, adding further viability headroom, which will need to be a consideration in making policy recommendations where these relate to viability.

4.37 **Open space, sport and recreation** – an allowance (which has been indexed to Q3 2025) is made for this provision based on Bury Council's SPD and associated 'calculator' (2015). This is included within the s.106 package.

4.38 **Transport and travel** – as there is no SPD or other guidance on potential costs, the Council have provided s.106 information on past contributions as a guide to the potential cost that could be expected to be requested. This is at £700/dwelling and included within the s.106 package.

[6] Biodiversity in new housing developments RSPB / NHBC April 2021

4.39 **Part M Accessibility** - The accessibility cost for M4(2) at £1,400 per dwelling is applied to 96% units and are based on the government impact assessment and verified by cost consultants. The costs for Part M4(3) are based on cost consultant advice at £10,000/dwelling and applied to 4% of the dwellings.

4.40 **Wildlife features** – an allowance of £100/dwelling is included within the testing for the provision of wildlife features such as bird and bat bricks or hedgehog friendly boundary treatment. This is based on a search that indicates that costs can range from £15 - £40 per brick and minimal costs for enabling hedgehogs to move between gardens.

4.41 **Health** – the Council have indicated that they intend to prepare an SPD to provide further guidance on provision of health contributions relating to new development – at time testing there was not a figure available and therefore for the purposes of this assessment £700 per dwelling is used, based on allowances used elsewhere.

4.42 **Building Safety Levy** - the Building Safety Act 2022 introduced powers to impose a levy on all new residential buildings requiring certain building control approvals in England, to raise revenue to be spent on building safety. The Government has now determined that the levy will come into effect in October 2026. This provided all local government, the Building Safety Regulator, Registered Building Control approvers, and housing developers who will pay the levy around 18 months (from when this was announced in March 2025) to factor levy cost into their financial planning.

4.43 For the purposes of calculating the levy charge applicable to a new development, floorspace should be measured using gross internal area. Where 75% or more of the land within the planning permission redline boundary falls within the definition of PDL all levy-chargeable development on the site will qualify for the discount rate. The rates proposed for Bury as set out in the Government response to the consultation are as follows:

- Previously developed land levy rate £12.14 sq. m GIA new development
- Non-previously developed land levy rate £24.29/sq. m GIA new development

Approach to Green Belt testing and the 'Golden Rules'

4.44 The national guidance as set out in NPPF 2024 is not clear as to how viability and Green Belt development should be considered, especially in respect to setting policy towards Green Belt in plan making.

4.45 There is reference in para 156, NPPF 2024, that released Green Belt through plan preparation or subject to a planning application should contribute to affordable housing provision, necessary improvements to infrastructure and provision or improvements to accessible green space. In terms of the affordable housing para 156 NPPF 2024 reference back to para 67/68 of NPPF 2024, which states that the affordable housing should:

"*a) be set at a higher level than that which would otherwise apply to land which is not within or proposed to be released from the Green Belt; and*

b) require at least 50% of the housing to be affordable, unless this would make the development of these sites unviable (when tested in accordance with national planning practice guidance on viability)." *para 67 NPPF 2024*

4.46 The PPG on viability has a specific section on land situated in or released from the Green Belt in para 030 (ID: 10-030-20251216). The opening statement is clear in that:

"*Site specific viability assessment should not be undertaken for the purpose of reducing developer contributions, including affordable housing*" *para 030 Viability PPG*

4.47 It goes on to provide guidance on viability considerations in respect of affordable housing, prior to development plan policies being in place. However , it offers no further advice as to how policy towards Green Belt should be considered in respect of other requirements (such as those outlined in para 156 NPPF 2024), nor does it provide any guidance as to what should be considered in terms of setting a policy towards development in the Green Belt within a local plan (e.g. achieving a balance between the cumulative impact of planning policies such as affordable housing and delivery). So, whilst it is clear about not challenging viability through site specific assessments to reduce contributions it lacks clarity as to how those assessments should be done in the first place for plan making.

4.48 Given the uncertainty within the NPPF and PPG, it is assumed (as the government would have been clearer on this matter otherwise) that it is for the decision maker (i.e. the local authority preparing the plan in the first instance) to take a view as to what a suitable test for viability may be in respect of plan making and policy towards development in Green Belt locations, whether on land within or to be released from Green Belt.

4.49 The approach to Green Belt policy in local plans will vary according to the individual circumstances of the area. A local authority relying on Green Belt release in order to meet its housing need will have a different view to those providing a policy to help the decision maker in coming to a view about 'windfall' development proposals in the Green Belt.

4.50 In Bury, the Council has stated it is not reliant on development coming forward within the Green Belt to meet its housing need in respect of preparing the local plan. It is therefore proposing that its interpretation of the Golden Rules is that in order for a permission to be secured it will require both a higher amount of affordable housing than other greenfield sites are required to achieve and that this should be at a minimum of 50% affordable housing as well as providing required infrastructure and accessible open space.

4.51 As previously stated, there is no clear guidance as to how this position needs to be demonstrated in respect of viability. Therefore, in the context of Bury Council's position, Three Dragons has taken the approach that the testing will demonstrate what assumptions are required to illustrate how a 50% affordable housing requirement could be considered as viable. It will be up to the decision maker to decide as to whether this would mean it would still be or is necessary to be deliverable.

4.52 A series of viability modelling has already been undertaken to demonstrate viability of greenfield sites with an affordable housing requirement of 25%. An analysis of this testing has suggested that in order for a greenfield site to be viable at 50%, a range of adjustments to the assumptions will be required as follows:

- developer return for market housing to be reduced from the mid point set out in PPG of 17.5% to the lower threshold in PPG of 15%
- the incentive for a land owner to sell the land for development will need reducing – there is no guidance within PPG or NPPF as to what an acceptable uplift on existing use should be, however for the purposes of exploring viability within the exceptional circumstances of Green Belt, we have suggested this should be no lower than 5 x EUV (see

4.53 If viability is negative after these adjustments, then viability modelling will make the following assumptions:

- a reduced or nil s.106 (not including affordable housing) allowance – on a similar basis to the main testing in that the full amount may not be required on all sites
- increasing sales values to improve viability to a positive position, including sufficient headroom to meet the minimum uplift on EUV – given Green Belt is an exceptional release of land, it is reasonable to assume some exclusivity and that values could be higher than the Bury average

4.54 In all the Green Belt testing the affordable housing is maintained at 50% of the dwellings with a tenure mix of 60% affordable rent and 40% discount market sale. The mix and unit sizes are consistent with other standard typologies as are all other assumptions, except those discussed above.

PfE allocation JPA1.2 Siminster & Bowlee

PfE allocation approach

4.55 The assumptions to inform the testing at JPA1.2, as discussed earlier in this report are based on the same approach to the testing undertaken for PfE to provide a consistency with the previously examined and found sound Plan. It is important to note that, at this stage, there is still limited detail as to the form of development proposed at Simister & Bowlee and therefore a high-level approach, consistent with PfE, has needed to be taken, as there is insufficient detail on key areas such as site infrastructure costs.

4.56 PPG indicates that site specific viability testing on sites important to delivery should be undertaken to demonstrate that the policies within a local plan would not put at risk the delivery of the site. Whilst PfE already sets out the majority of requirements for development at JPA1.2, it does not indicate the expected proportion of affordable housing – this is to be set out in BLP and is therefore the focus of this high-level test. Note that the affordable housing required by the BLP for JPA1.2 is the same as set by PfE for the other PfE allocations in Bury and was included within the PfE testing for JPA1.1 and JPA1.2.

4.57 However, it is acknowledged that there is also scope within local and national, existing and proposed policy that allows for a review of viability at a later date, to take into account any significant changes, which in this case could include a greater understanding of development costs, when these are understood in more detail at the point of application.

PfE allocation proposed development

4.58 The original testing for PfE was undertaken on the basis of the total allocation being assessed – however the allocation crosses local plan area boundaries, with the majority of the site within Bury and a smaller area within Rochdale. Given that Bury and Rochdale requirements differ, and in consultation with both councils and site promoters, it was decided that a reasonable approach would be to limit the testing to the area within Bury and to apportion shared infrastructure costs on the basis of dwelling numbers in the two council areas.

4.59 The promoters suggested that the Bury part of the allocation is currently 60.78 hectares gross, 37.39 hectares net with 1,325 dwellings anticipated. However, the Development Framework identifies around 1,350 dwellings for the same site. It is not for the viability assessment to make a judgment, so both figures are tested. In line with the PfE approach, 25% affordable housing is tested, with a tenure split of 60% rented and 40% discount market sale. The promoters suggested a development period of 16 years, with sales (including affordable housing) peaking at 120 units per annum, which assumes c2or3 market outlets/flags. All these figures regarding the scale, tenure and pace of development are used within the testing, although it is acknowledged that these figures are an estimate, without the benefit of detailed planning and could be subject to change in the future.

4.60 It should be noted that for the purpose of this high-level strategic testing, the full site area within Bury i.e. 60.78h has been attributed to the strategic/large site benchmark land values. When more detailed work has been undertaken, it maybe found that there are areas of undevelopable land that should have a lower benchmark land value applied.

PfE allocation values

4.61 Given this is large site in an area of undeveloped, former Green Belt it was agreed with the Council and the site promoters that the 'Bury' average used elsewhere in the testing should be reviewed and updated with more locally based information, including values from developments that maybe in different local authority areas, given this site is on the edge of Bury's local plan area.

4.62 It is considered that the most relevant development currently building out relatively close to the JPA1.2 allocation are those at Whittle Brook Park, Hopwood Meadow and Whittle Rise. The developers of those schemes are national (Bellway) and more regionally based (Alwyn and Ecclestone), which are representative of the mix of developers that may come forward at JPA1.2 in the future.

4.63 Due to the delays in registering new build properties with Land Registry, a combination of Land Registry data where available, research from Promark on 'Sold subject to contract' (SSTC) agreements and advertised prices (these are applied to the total scheme to properly reflex the mix) have been used to assess market values for the scheme. Note that there is an industry reluctance to share sold prices prior to Land Registry publication, due to concerns around collusion. In all cases, as is the standard approach, the £/sqm for each source is calculated by adding up total value and dividing it by total floorspace. The following table sets out the analysis of this data:

Table 4.13 'Sold' residential values (figures rounded)

Unit type	Dwellings	Av. £/sq. m
Land Registry (last 12 months)	9	£3,608
SSTC	16	£3,673
Land Registry and SSTC	25	£3,650
Advertised price	214	£3,675

4.64 A cautious approach of using £3,600/sq. m in the testing is taken forward. Whilst the SSTC and advertised prices are somewhat higher, there is potential for these to reduce through negotiation and therefore setting a figure for testing that is lower is considered a reasonable approach. As part of the review of the schemes, it was found that the dominant house types are detached and semi detached. However, to create a reasonable market mix the testing includes 81 sq.m terraces at 5% of market housing, 95 sq. m semi-detached at 45% of the market mix and 120 sq.m detached at 50% of the market mix. This provides a blended average market housing unit size (107 sq. m) that is the same as that used within the original PfE testing, and therefore a consistent approach. Garages are included as per the generic testing. 5% of the dwellings are included in the mix as self build and custom units – they are the same size as the detached properties with values 5% higher, than standard housing.

4.65 Affordable housing values, based on the LHA rates set for the Central Greater Manchester BRMA are set out below:

Table 4.14 Affordable homes values

Unit type	Social rent	Affordable rent	Discount market sale
1 bed flat	£110,000	£143,000	n/a
2 bed flat	£130,000	£169,000	n/a
2 bed terrace	£130,000	£181,000	£213,300
3 bed terrace	£144,000	£200,000	£251,100
4 bed semi	£222,000	£303,000	£286,200

PfE allocation costs

4.66 Where costs differ from the generic testing or specific costs are used, they are outlined in the following table – where costs are related to the number of units, two costs are shown, with the first relating to 1,350 dwellings and the second to 1,325 dwellings:

Table 4.15 other development costs

Type	Cost	Metric
Build costs - houses	£1,488	per sq. m
M4(2) and M4 (3)	£2,354,400 / £2,310,800	allowance
Wildlife features	£135,000 / £132,500	allowance
Plot costs and site infrastructure	32%	of build costs
Site preparation	£3,298,450	allowance
BNG	£1,534,950 / £1,506,525	allowance
Self build and custom dwellings: Build cost Professional fees	 5% 12.5%	uplift on house build cost of build cost
Contingency	3%	build cost
s.106 education	£11,925,352 / £11,704,512	allowance
s.106 open space, sports & recreation	£5,537,700 / £5,435,150	allowance
s.106 health	£945,000 / £927,500	allowance
s.106 Holcroft Moss mitigation	£49,950 / £49,025	allowance
Strategic transport cost	£16,999,705	allowance
Active travel and transport	£945,000 / £927,500	
Building Safety Levy	£2,781,047 / £2,729,546	allowance

4.67 The site preparation and build costs use the same basis as PfE but include uplifts for meeting building regulations 2021 (parts F,L,O&S) and PfE policy towards net zero (which as previously noted also accounts for meeting Future Homes standard). The same percentage of build costs for plot and site infrastructure is used as was accepted as an appropriate approach for large site allocation in PfE.

4.68 Building Safety Levy, accessibility, wildlife features and BNG use the same basis as the generic testing but are shown as total costs within the table. Contingency is introduced as per PPG which suggests its inclusion for site specific testing.

4.69 The s.106 costs and those identified for active travel and transport are based on the same approach described in the costs section for the generic testing. The strategic transport costs are those used for the PfE testing as this is the latest available information at time of testing – noting that the identified cost within PfE has been apportioned to the Bury dwellings only and indexed using BCIS AITPI to bring in line with the base testing date.

PfE allocation development programme

4.70 The testing uses the promoters' development period of 16 years, with market and affordable completions peaking at 120 units per annum combined.

- Land payments are phased with 50% year 1, 25% year 5 and 25% year 10
- Site preparation and infrastructure costs follow the land purchase, with 45% years 1-3, 27.5% years 5-7 and 27.5% years 10-12
- Dwelling build starts in month seven with sales running 6 months behind
- Strategic transport costs are spread evenly between years 2 and year 14, with the balance (1.4%) in year 15
- BSL, habitat bricks, BNG, accessibility are cashflowed with dwelling build costs
- s106, health and Holcroft Moss costs are cashflowed with sales

Benchmark land value

4.71 Benchmark land values (BLVs) are based upon estimates of existing use value (EUV) with a range of premiums applied. The BLVs relate to the types of sites expected to come forward in the new local plan, including the PfE allocations and the planned Bury town centre regeneration sites.

4.72 The benchmark land values used for this assessment draw upon the PfE viability evidence, which was found sound at examination in 2024. These BLVs also form the core of this LPVA. Testing also makes use of other Bury-specific BLVs based on a review of current evidence in order to explore the impact of different land values.

PfE benchmark land value (BLV 4)

4.73 The PfE benchmarks were based upon information drawn from MHCLG (Manchester and Bolton industrial, central business district office and out of town office land), site-specific viability appraisals, HIF bid site valuations, land sale listings, SHLAA reviews, consultation and a review of other area wide viability studies.

Table 4.16 Summary of PfE benchmark land values used to inform this LPVA

Site type	BLV/gross ha
Strategic greenfield	£250,000
Edge of settlement greenfield	£310,000
Brownfield industrial site - lower	£430,000
Brownfield industrial site - upper	£660,000
Town centre/high value existing use brownfield	£1,038,000

4.74 The brownfield benchmarks were based upon the following:

- Brownfield industrial site lower value - £430,000/ha. This was based on the lower value area benchmarks from the site-specific viability work (which already includes a landowner premium).
- Brownfield industrial site higher value - £660,000/ha. This was based on a premium over industrial land estimates from MHCLG and is close to the higher value brownfield values in the HIF bid valuations (£0.68m/ha)
- Town centre/high value existing use brownfield - £1,038,000/ha. This was based on a 20% premium over the lower CBD office land value estimate and is similar to the higher value brownfield land site values from the site-specific viability assessments reviewed at the time.

4.75 The greenfield benchmarks were based upon the following:

- Strategic greenfield - £250,000/ha. This was based upon a premium of 12.5 times the existing use value of approximately £20,000/ha, and was discussed at the PfE workshop sessions as the minimum options threshold.
- Edge of settlement greenfield - £310,000/ha. This was based upon a higher premium of 15 times the agricultural existing use values (EUVs).

Alternative benchmark land values (BLV 1, BLV 2 & BLV 3)

4.76 As part of this study the estimates of EUV and the premiums applied have been reviewed:

- Brownfield land:
    - A set of 8 North West commercial/brownfield land sales from EGi 2017-2022 had an average value of £203,000/ha (see appendix E)

  - The 2019 estimate of industrial land value in Bury by MHCLG was £600,000/ha
  - The 2019 estimate of CBD office land value in Bolton by MHCLG was £865,000/ha (no MHCLG estimate for Bury)
- Greenfield land:
  - The average value of agricultural land in the North West in 2024/2025 is £21,000/ha, based on a review of agents' assessments (see appendix E)
  - A review of paddock land for sale in the North West suggests an average value of £60,000/ha (see appendix E)

4.77 It is acknowledged that there will be variations around the estimates of existing use value for both greenfield and brownfield land. The value of existing uses will be particularly apparent for brownfield land and we note that there are market reports suggesting that in some cases the rental values for older dilapidated commercial units in Bury can be as low as £16/sq. m (£1.50/sq ft)[7] while space on newer higher value locations can achieve up to £134/sq. m (£12.50/sq ft)[8] – these variations will have a significant impact on EUvs. It would not be expected residential development would come forward on higher value industrial sites because of viability reasons as well as the policy protection for established employment areas. A generic residual value exercise for a refurbished commercial unit at £65/sq. m also supports the lowest brownfield BLV[9].

4.78 The premiums over existing use value are drawn from the Homes and Communities Agency, 2010, Annex 1 (Transparent Viability Assumptions) - "Benchmarks and evidence from planning appeals tend to be in a range of 10% to 30% above EUV in urban areas. For greenfield land, benchmarks tend to be in a range of 10 to 20 times agricultural value". (page 9)

Greenbelt land value

4.79 The NPPF 2024 Golden Rules are engaged, as set out in para 4.44 onwards. These represent a deliberate shift away from market led land value expectations towards policy led land value capture. It is understood that the Government's position is that release from the Green Belt is the value creating event, and that a greater proportion of this uplift should be captured through affordable housing, infrastructure and open space

---

[7] https://www.placenorthwest.co.uk/bury-plans-overhaul-of-dilapidated-25-acre-industrial-estate/#:~:text=9%20July%202025%2014:48,1.50/sq%20ft%20at%20present.
[8] https://www.b8re.com/download-latest-market-report/
[9] 5,500 sq. m on 1ha at £65/sq. m (VOA/Propdev data for Bury) with 8.5% yield estimate and £512/sq. m refurb costs (BCIS) gives £206k/ha – see appendix E

rather than reflected in land value. The Golden Rules policy requirements therefore take precedence over land value, and site-specific viability assessments cannot be used to reduce policy obligations, including affordable housing, on Golden Rules sites. Consequently, landowners may be required to absorb policy costs through reduced land receipts.

4.80 BLVs for Green Belt sites are therefore assumed to be far closer to existing use value than has historically been the case. On this basis, the EUV for Green Belt land is assumed to align with the strategic/large greenfield EUV. In order to align lower BLVs associated with EUV plus for Green Belt sites, it is anticipated that there is sufficient headroom in the viability to enable a maximum reduction of 50% of the current lowest premium used in the testing i.e. a minimum of EUV x 5.

Proposed benchmark land values

4.81 Based on these existing use values and the HCA premiums, as well as the PfE BLVs already found sound, the following benchmarks are used in this study.

Table 4.17 Benchmark land values used in the viability testing

Site type	EUV/ha	Premium	BLV/ha	Application	EUV Source
Strategic/large greenfield 1	£21,000	10 times	£210,000	Greenfield sites>1ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Strategic/large greenfield 2	£21,000	15 times	£315,000	Greenfield sites>1ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Strategic/large greenfield 3	£21,000	20 times	£420,000	Greenfield sites>1ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Strategic/large greenfield 4 (PfE)	-	-	£250,000	Greenfield sites>1ha	PfE
Edge of settlement/small greenfield 1	£60,000	10 times	£600,000	Greenfield sites < 1 ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Edge of settlement/small greenfield 2	£60,000	15 times	£900,000	Greenfield sites < 1 ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Edge of settlement/small greenfield 3	£60,000	20 times	£1,200,000	Greenfield sites < 1 ha	EUV based on agents' assessment of regional agricultural values
Edge of settlement/small greenfield 4 (PfE)	-	-	£310,000	Greenfield sites < 1 ha	PfE

Site type	EUV/ha	Premium	BLV/ha	Application	EUV Source
Brownfield industrial lower 1	£203,000	+10 %	£223,300	Brownfield sites >1ha	EUV based on EGi land for sale in Greater Manchester area, RV exercise
Brownfield industrial lower 2	£203,000	+20 %	£243,600	Brownfield sites >1ha	EUV based on EGi land for sale in Greater Manchester area, RV exercise
Brownfield industrial lower 3	£203,000	+30 %	£263,900	Brownfield sites >1ha	EUV based on EGi land for sale in Greater Manchester area, RV exercise
Brownfield industrial lower 4 (PfE)	-	-	£430,000	Brownfield sites >1ha	PfE
Brownfield industrial site - upper 1	£600,000	+10 %	£660,000	Brownfield sites <1ha	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton industrial land
Brownfield industrial site - upper 2	£600,000	+20 %	£720,000	Brownfield sites <1ha	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton industrial land
Brownfield industrial site - upper 3	£600,000	+30 %	£780,000	Brownfield sites <1ha	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton industrial land
Brownfield industrial site - upper 4 (PfE)	-	-	£660,000	Brownfield sites <1ha	PfE
Town centre/high value existing use brownfield 1	£865,000	+10 %	£951,500	Town centre	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton CBD land
Town centre/high value existing use brownfield 2	£865,000	+20 %	£1,038,000	Town centre	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton CBD land
Town centre/high value existing use brownfield 3	£865,000	+30 %	£1,124,500	Town centre	EUV based on MHCLG Bolton CBD land
Town centre/high value existing use brownfield 4 (PfE)	-	-	£1,038,000	Town centre	PfE

4.82 These benchmarks are applied to the different typologies as follows.

Table 4.18 Benchmark land values used for each typology per hectare

Typology	BLV 1	BLV 2	BLV 3	BLV4 PfE
GBF 1	£660,000	£720,000	£780,000	£660,000
GGF 2	£600,000	£900,000	£1,200,000	£310,000
GBF 3	£660,000	£720,000	£780,000	£660,000
GGF 4	£600,000	£900,000	£1,200,000	£310,000
GBF 5	£223,300	£243,600	£263,900	£430,000
GGF 6	£210,000	£315,000	£420,000	£250,000
GBF 7	£223,300	£243,600	£263,900	£430,000
GGF 8	£210,000	£315,000	£420,000	£250,000
TC 1	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
TC 2	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
TC 3	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
TC 4	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
TC 5	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
TC 6	£951,500	£1,038,000	£1,124,500	£1,038,000
GB 1	n/a*	n/a	n/a	n/a
GB 2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
GB 3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
OP1	£660,000	£720,000	£780,000	£660,000
OP2	£660,000	£720,000	£780,000	£660,000
JPA 1.2 S&B	£210,000	£315,000	£420,000	£250,000

*Green Belt sites are tested without a BLV to explore what land value can be supported

Chapter 5 Viability testing results

Introduction

5.1 This chapter summarises results of the residential viability testing. As noted in the testing assumptions earlier, the modelling includes the affordable housing required, s106, and additional national and local policy costs.

5.2 These modelling results are presented as headroom or net residual value per dwelling, after all costs including developer return, land value and finance have been deducted from gross development value, as per PPG guidance. The per unit headroom is presented across four different benchmark land values. PPG advice is that it is up to the decision maker to consider which benchmark land value is appropriate to draw upon for setting policy. The benchmark land values are set at different uplifts on existing use value (uplifts used are based on standard and tested practice), with a further benchmark land value (4) which is that used for PfE.

5.3 The results are split by broad development type – i.e. generic typologies, greenbelt typologies, town centre typologies, older persons housing and JPA1.2 Simister & Bowlee PfE allocation.

5.4 All the testing has considered the 'sound' PfE viability testing and draws upon consultation with development industry including a workshop and 1to1 discussions with RPs and site promoters. Further consultation has been undertaken with Bury officers from planning, housing and regen/estates.

5.5 The testing includes a review of draft Reg19 plan, PfE and national policy for cost implications arising, with typologies tested reflecting SHLAA, emerging policy, town centre masterplans and frameworks.

5.6 Two of the key factors impacting viability are affordable housing and other s.106 requirements. In terms of affordable housing this has been tested at 0%, 10%, 15% and 25% depending on the emerging policy preferences and the viability of differing forms of development. The tenure split where affordable housing is tested and with (£14,000/house and/or £12,000/apartment) s.106 or without s.106, is as follows:

- social rent 30%, affordable rent 30% & discount market sale 40% - s.106 included
- social rent 60% & discount market sale 40% - s.106 excluded
- social rent 30%, affordable rent 30% & discount market sale 40% - s.106 excluded
- affordable rent 60% & discount market sale 40% - s.106 excluded

5.7 Where there is a positive 'headroom' this could be made available for s.106 (for those tests where none has been included), greater returns for the developer/landowner or to provide further contingency for negative changes in market conditions.

Generic typologies

5.8 These are tested at 5 dwellings, 30 dwellings and 75 dwellings on greenfield and brownfield sites with variances in tenure and other s.106 requirements. The first table shows the benchmark land values used, the second table the 'headroom' per dwelling. Please note that BLV4 (PfE) is shown first in each table but it may be either lower or higher than BLV 1-3.

5 dwelling typologies

Table 5.1 Testing results for 5 dwelling typologies

No.	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	Other s106	BLV 4 PfE Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwlg
GBF1	BF 0% AH - with s106	5	35 dph	Brownfield	0%	Yes	-£1,362	-£1,362	-£3,167	-£4,971
GBF1	BF 0% AH - no s106	5	35 dph	Brownfield	0%	No	£13,499	£13,499	£11,694	£9,890
GGF2	GF 0% AH - with s106	5	35 dph	Greenfield	0%	Yes	£9,165	£443	-£8,581	-£8,581
GGF2	GF 0% AH - no s106	5	35 dph	Greenfield	0%	No	£24,026	£15,304	£6,280	-£2,743

15 dwelling typologies

Table 5.2 Testing results for 15 dwelling typologies – alternative approaches to affordable housing

No.	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	Other s106	BLV 4 PfE Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwlg
GBF 3	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	15	40 dph	Brownfield	10%	Yes	-£17,831	-£17,831	-£19,804	-£21,778
GBF 3	BF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Brownfield	10%	No	-£4,186	-£4,186	-£6,159	-£8,133

GBF 3	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Brownfield	10%	No	-£2,955	-£2,955	-£4,929	-£6,903
GBF 3	BF 60%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Brownfield	10%	No	-£1,725	-£1,725	-£3,698	-£5,672
GGF 4	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	15	40 dph	Greenfield	10%	Yes	-£8,804	-£18,069	-£27,939	-£37,808
GGF 4	GF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Greenfield	10%	No	£4,841	-£4,424	-£14,293	-£24,162
GGF 4	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Greenfield	10%	No	£6,071	-£3,194	-£13,063	-£22,932
GGF 4	GF 60%AR / 40% DMS - no s106	15	40 dph	Greenfield	10%	No	£7,302	-£1,963	-£11,832	-£21,701

30 dwelling typologies

Table 5.3 Testing results for 30 dwelling typologies

No.	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	Other s106	BLV 4 PfE Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwelling
GBF 5	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	30	33 dph	Brownfield	25%	Yes	-£18,065	-£9,240	-£10,155	-£11,016
GBF 5	BF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	-£6,239	£2,586	£1,671	£809
GBF 5	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	-£3,139	£5,686	£4,771	£3,909
GBF 5	BF 60%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	-£39	£8,786	£7,871	£7,010
GGF 6	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	30	33 dph	Greenfield	25%	Yes	-£12,943	-£11,219	-£15,702	-£20,158
GGF 6	GF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	-£616	£1,109	-£3,375	-£7,830
GGF 6	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	£2,484	£4,209	-£274	-£4,730
GGF 6	GF 60%AR / 40% DMS - no s106	30	33 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	£5,584	£7,309	£2,826	-£1,630

75 dwelling typologies

Table 5.4 Testing results for 75 dwelling typologies

No.	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	Other s106	BLV 4 PfE Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwelling
GBF 7	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	75	40 dph	Brownfield	25%	Yes	-£6,022	£2,478	£1,643	£808
GBF 7	BF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	£6,099	£14,599	£13,764	£12,929
GBF 7	BF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	£9,283	£17,783	£16,948	£16,113
GBF 7	BF 60%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Brownfield	25%	No	£12,467	£20,967	£20,132	£19,297
GGF 8	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - with s106	75	40 dph	Greenfield	25%	Yes	-£708	£937	-£3,381	-£7,699
GGF 8	GF 60%SR / 40%DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	£11,413	£13,058	£8,740	£4,423
GGF 8	GF 30%SR / 30%AR / 40%DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	£14,597	£16,242	£11,924	£7,606
GGF 8	GF 60%AR / 40% DMS - no s106	75	40 dph	Greenfield	25%	No	£17,781	£19,426	£15,108	£10,790

Generic sites analysis

- Small site typologies of 5 dwellings are generally viable and there is no affordable housing requirement. Some brownfield sites may require a reduced other s.106 requirement from that generally sought, especially at higher benchmark land values – noting that the Council have indicated that in most circumstances, it is unlikely they will seek s.106 from small sites
- With the lowest BLV, the introduction of 10% affordable housing for typologies with 15 dwellings is viable on greenfield sites but less so with the brownfield sites typologies tested, although GBF3 is marginal. This testing also assumes a reduced or zero s.106 requirement and flexible approach to tenure, especially so with the brownfield typology.
- The 30 dwelling typologies include 25% affordable housing and generally achieve stronger residual values than the smaller sites – both the greenfield and brown field

typologies. But positive viability does require lower benchmark land values, a reduced or zero other s.106 requirement and flexible approach to tenure mix

- The larger typologies (75 dwellings) are generally more viable than the smaller sites – preferred tenure mixes can be achieved although a reduced other s.106 requirement and/or lower benchmark land values may be needed to allow for the preferred affordable housing mix

Town centre typologies

5.9 These are tested at 150 dwellings (75 apartments/75 houses), 40 dwellings (houses), 100 BtR dwellings (apartments) and 200 BtR dwellings (apartments). A further two typologies of 100 dwellings (apartments) and 50 dwellings (apartments) have been tested with a future uplift in sales values (and cost inflation), 5 years hence. In all the testing with affordable housing, in the town centres and elsewhere, it is assumed that public subsidy is not available

5.10 Initial testing (unpublished) indicated that the affordable housing needs to be reduced to 15% for 'sale' typologies with a tenure mix of 40% affordable rent and 60% discount market. For BtR, the PPG advised rate of 20% of units at a discount market rent of 80% is used. In all circumstances no other s.106 requirements are included.

5.11 The first table shows the benchmark land values used, the second table the 'headroom' per dwelling. Please note that BLV4 (PfE) is shown first in each table but it may be either lower, same or higher than BLV 1-3.

Table 5.5 Testing results for town centre typologies

No	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	AH tenure	Other s106	BLV4PfE Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwlg
	Town centre										
TC 1	150 - 75 Apts 5st / 75 Houses - 15% AH no s106	150	86 dph	Brownfield	15%	60%AR 40% DMS	No	£171	£1,319	£171	-£1,051
TC 2	40 Houses - 15% AH - no s106	40	60 dph	Brownfield	15%	60%AR 40% DMS	No	£1,509	£3,233	£1,509	-£215
TC 3	BtR 100 Apts 6st - 20% DMR no s106	100	220 dph	Brownfield	20%	100% DMR	No	£4,885	£5,337	£4,885	£4,432

TC 4	BtR 200 Apts 6st - 20% DMR nos106	200	202 dph	Brownfield	20%	100% DMR	No	£5,927	£6,429	£5,927	£5,425
	Future forecasts										
TC 5	Future (5yrs) 50 Apts 6st - 15% no s106	50	220 dph	Brownfield	15%	60%AR 40% DMS	No	£1,552	£1,993	£1,552	£1,058
TC 6	Future (5yrs) 100 Apts 6st - 15% no s106	100	220 dph	Brownfield	15%	60%AR 40% DMS	No	£5,821	£6,268	£5,821	£5,374

Town centre typologies analysis

- Market sale dwellings are viable but require an element of houses as well as flats, reduction in affordable housing to 15% (and no social rent) and a lower ‘other s.106’ requirement
- BtR apartments are viable with 20% discount market rent but will need a reduced ‘other s.106’ requirement
- In the future, if forecasts are correct for values and costs then higher density apartment development maybe possible, although it will likely still need a reduced level of ‘other s.106’ requirements

Older persons housing

5.12 Sheltered and extra care housing is tested on brownfield sites, with no affordable housing.

5.13 The first table shows the benchmark land values used, the second table the ‘headroom’ per dwelling. Please note that BLV4 (PfE) is shown first in each table but it may be either lower, same or higher than BLV 1-3.

Table 5.6 Testing results for older persons housing

No.	Typology	Dwlgs	Net density	Site type	AH %	AH tenure	Other s106	BLV4PfE Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwlg	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwlg
	Sheltered										
OP 1	50 units sheltered 100% Mkt - with s106	50	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	Yes	-£114,636	-£114,636	-£115,594	-£116,552
OP 1	50 units sheltered 100% Mkt - no s106	50	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	No	-£110,321	-£110,321	-£111,279	-£112,237
	Extra care										
OP 2	60 units extracare 100% Mkt - with s106	60	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	Yes	-£153,008	-£153,008	-£153,963	-£154,918
OP 2	60 units extracare 100% Mkt - no s106	60	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	No	-£148,693	-£148,693	-£149,648	-£150,603
	Sheltered sensitivity										
OP 1	50 units sheltered 100% Mkt - with s106	50	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	Yes	-£7,853	-£7,853	-£8,744	-£9,635
OP 1	50 units sheltered 100% Mkt - no s106	50	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	No	-£3,839	-£3,839	-£4,730	-£5,622
	Extra care sensitivity										
OP 2	60 units extracare 100% Mkt - with s106	60	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	Yes	-£6,826	-£6,826	-£7,714	-£8,603
OP 2	60 units extracare 100% Mkt - no s106	60	100 dph	Brownfield	0%	n/a	No	-£2,812	-£2,812	-£3,701	-£4,589

Older persons housing typologies analysis

5.14 The testing shows that neither sheltered nor extra care housing in Bury is viable as tested, even with no affordable housing or other s106 contributions. The sensitivity tests reduce the viability deficit, but the schemes remain marginal at best. However, these are necessarily assuming speculative development – Bury Council has previously been successful in securing s.106 contributions from older persons housing schemes and this may continue to be the case, so policy should not necessarily exclude this possibility.

Green Belt typologies

5.15 Green Belt typologies are tested with 15, 75 and 200 dwellings at 50% affordable housing (as per the Council's interpretation of the 'Golden Rules').

5.16 The modelling presents the results as headroom per dwelling, excluding any land value. The final column shows the headroom as a multiple of EUV. The results are shown with a) the full amount of s.106 (£14,000/house and £12,000/flat); b) a reduced level of s.106 (£5,000/house and £3,000/flat); and c) no s.106. Where the models did not achieve headroom equivalent to the minimum land value of 5X EUV, then values were increased until that threshold was reached. The percentage increase in value used is shown at the end of the typology model name in the first column (e.g. GB 1a – 14.5%).

Table 5.7 Testing results for Green Belt typologies

No	Typology	Dwlgs	Residual value £/dwelling	Residual value multiplier of EUV
GB 1a	GB 50% AH - 30 units, full s106 + 14.5% mkt	30	£4,043	5.5
GB 1b	GB 50% AH - 30 units, reduced s106 + 8% mkt	30	£4,344	5.4
GB 1c	GB 50% AH - 30 units, no s106 15% return + 5.5% mkt	30	£3,660	5.8
GB 2a	GB 50% AH - 75 units, full s106 +7.5% mkt	75	£4,065	5.2
GB 2b	GB 50% AH - 75 units, reduced s106 +2% mkt	75	£6,554	5.8
GB 2c	GB 50% AH - 75 units, no s106 15% return + 0% mkt	75	£4,655	9.4
GB 3a	GB 50% AH - 200 units, full s106 +10.5% mkt	200	£4,392	5.5
GB 3b	GB 50% AH - 200 units, reduced s106 +4% mkt	200	£4,196	5.2
GB 3c	GB 50% AH - 200 units, no s106 15% return + 0%mkt	200	£4,043	5.0

Green Belt typologies analysis

- At the Council's preferred 50% affordable housing, the typologies tested suggest that development is viable if there are adjustments to return, land value, s.106 and in some circumstances an increase in value
- For the larger typologies of 75 and 200 dwellings viability can be achieved with no or sub 5% value increases with reduced s.106 allowances
- For the smaller typology of 30 dwellings an increase in values is required, even when there is no additional s.106

JPA 1.2 Simister and Bowlee

5.17 The delivery of this site allocation was found 'sound' at the Examination for PfE. However, this site differs from the other PfE allocations within Bury as the affordable housing requirement (whilst tested as part of PfE) was not set out in PfE policy (due to the site being cross boundary with Rochdale) and is therefore a consideration for the Bury Local Plan, thus requiring testing as part of this work. The starting point is that the PfE site was found to be deliverable through an Examination process and therefore, for consistency with that process, there is no reason to move significantly away from the previous testing approach.

5.18 In discussion with the Council and the site promoters it is clear that the detailed design work and associated costing is at an early stage and therefore the previous approach of high level cost and value assumptions should continue to be the most appropriate approach for the purposes of testing the impact of local plan policies on the PfE allocation. Costs are split proportionately for the Bury part of the allocation – as described by the promoter.

Table 5.8 Testing results for JPA1.2 Simister and Bowlee (greenfield)

Typology	Units	Net density	AH %	AH tenure	Other s106	BLV 4 PfE Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 4 PfE Headroom % GDV	BLV 1 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 2 Headroom £/dwelling	BLV 3 Headroom £/dwelling
1,350 dwgs Base model - SR AR DMS	1,350	35 dph	25%	30%SR 30%AR 40%DMS	Yes	£6,601	1.9%	£8,397	£2,143	-£4,415
1,350 dwgs Base model - AR DMR	1,350	35 dph	25%	60%AR 40%DMS	Yes	£12,105	3.5%	£13,901	£7,669	£1,260
Future (5yrs) 1,350 dwgs Base model - SR AR DMS	1,350	35 dph	25%	30%SR 30%AR 40%DMS	Yes	£95,338	19%	Not tested	Not tested	Not tested
Future (5yrs)1,350 dwgs Base model - AR DMR	1,350	35 dph	25%	60%AR 40%DMS	Yes	£102,952	20%	Not tested	Not tested	Not tested

JPA1.2 Simister and Bowlee analysis

- Assuming standard development assumptions in line with PfE testing, the allocation remains viable, with some scope to deal with higher infrastructure or other costs should these arise, especially with a flexible approach to tenure – the headroom as a percentage of GDV also suggests that flexibility regarding tenure is required as including social rent as part of the tenure mix is considered marginal at best - with only a very small drop in values or cost increasing, it would move from marginal to unviable
- As it is likely that the majority of the development will come forward after 5 years, it is reasonable to consider a potential future scenario for the purposes of plan making - if 5yr forecasts are used for all costs and values (not BLV) then the allocation is clearly viable with a significant headroom

Chapter 6 Summary and conclusions

Introduction

6.1 This LPVA has been undertaken to indicate whether the development and policies proposed in the draft BLP are viable. The study has therefore reviewed the national and local policy requirements and developed a set of typologies representative of the proposed type and location of development.

6.2 Data and consultation with the development industry have been used to generate and refine the values and costs of development. Whilst it is accepted there will be variances in GDV both above and below the figures used for testing, it is considered using a Bury-wide average for the majority of the testing is a reasonable and proportionate response to the requirements of viability testing outlined in PPG. The use of localised set of values for the tested PfE allocation responds to the specific location.

6.3 The viability testing approach is considered cautious, with conservative assumptions e.g. no vacant building credit allowances or remediation/infrastructure grants in the brownfield testing, and no affordable housing grant assumed in any qualifying typology.

Is the plan viable?

6.4 At the time of this report, the supporting evidence for the Plan identifies just over 10,000 homes in the supply, for the period 2025-2043. Around 2,000 homes (c20%) are already under construction or permitted and as a proportionate response, as advised within the PPG are assumed to be viable. The draft BLP assumes that of the remaining supply, 66% will be from already adopted PfE allocations, with 27% in the town centres and 7% at other locations across the plan area.

6.5 Given that the PfE sites have already been tested, allocated, examined and found sound in PfE, the focus of the Bury LPVA is on the remaining 34% to be delivered in the town centres and smaller sites across the local plan area.

6.6 The Council is not intending to allocate specific housing sites but through the BLP and the SHLAA they have identified the broad location and types of site sizes likely to come forward over the plan period. The PfE sites have been included for completeness but as described previously it is not considered necessary to reconsider these, with the exception of setting the affordable housing percentage for JPA1.2. The broad breakdown of site types and their attributed typology are set out in the tables below:

Table 6.1 Number of dwellings by site size categories

Category of site size	PfE allocations	Town centres	Elsewhere in Bury
1 – 9 dwellings	-	22	101
10 – 50 dwellings	-	164	319
51 – 100 dwellings	59	74	150
101 – 250 dwellings	200	775	-
251 – 500 dwellings	-	400	-
501 – 1000 dwellings	-	700	-
1001+ dwellings	5020		-
Total	5,279	2,135	570

Table 6.2 Planned delivery (dwellings) by site size category and typology

Category of site size	PfE typologies	Town centre typologies	Elsewhere in bury typologies
1 – 9 dwellings	-	GBF 1	GBF 1 & GGF 2
10 – 50 dwellings	-	GBF 3/5, TC 2, TC 5, OP1	GBF 3/5 & GGF 4/6
51 – 100 dwellings	GGF 8	GBF 7, TC 3, TC 6, OP2	GBF 7 & GGF 8
101 – 250 dwellings	GGF 8	All TC typologies*	-
251 – 500 dwellings	-	All TC typologies*	-
501 – 1000 dwellings	-	All TC typologies*	-
1001+ dwellings	JSA1.2	-	-

*For the larger town centre site size categories over 100 units, it is likely that these will be broken down into different types and forms of development – e.g. part flats for sale, part BtR and therefore the typologies presented will be component parts of the larger site.

6.7 The generic typology viability testing results detailed in Chapter 5 show that there are viable forms of development within each of the site size categories and across the different locations of supply. Therefore, overall, it can be seen the majority of development planned in the draft BLP is viable.

6.8 The testing for JPA1.2 shows that it is deliverable and able to support the 25% affordable housing set out in PfE for the other strategic allocations in Bury. The progress of other PfE allocations through the planning system also supports the deliverability of these strategic sites.

Appendix A – F see separate appendices document