



Affordable Housing Viability Assessment

Final Report – Addendum

Prepared on behalf of

Warwick District Council

May 2012

DTZ
1 Colmore Square
Birmingham
B4 6AJ

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL
www.dtz.com

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Affordable Rent Policy Background	4
3	Modelling Assumptions	6
4	Town Centre Results.	9
5	Suburban Area Results.	14
6	Deprived Areas Results	18
7	Rural Area Results	21
8	Urban Extension Results	25
9	Conclusions and Recommendations	31

Appendix A: Detailed Modelling Results.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 DTZ was commissioned by Warwick District Council (WDC) in the Summer of 2010 to carry out an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA) across the District. The work was undertaken to inform the development of an affordable housing policy to be contained in the Council's new Local Plan and to satisfy the requirement set out in PPS3: Housing, that affordable housing targets and thresholds should take into account the impact that these may have on the economic viability of development schemes.
- 1.2 During the autumn of 2010, the Government launched Affordable Rent as a new tenure available to Registered Providers. At the time the initial study was being completed, the uncertainty around the delivery of this tenure type meant that it could not be included in the original assessment. However, now that there is more certainty in respect of this tenure type and emerging thoughts from WDC and its partner Registered Providers (RP's) have lead to some initial analysis being possible. WDC have commissioned DTZ to undertake some further modelling work to consider the impact that Affordable Rent may have on development viability across Warwick District.
- 1.3 The results of this study should be considered alongside the results of the main Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and the two should not be read in isolation. Throughout this report we will refer back to the original study in terms of modelling assumptions and scenarios.

2 Affordable Rent Policy Background

Background

- 2.1 Nationally, the supply of housing has not kept up with demand and there is a requirement for additional affordable homes. There are an estimated 4.5 million people on waiting lists across the UK, many of whom have no realistic chance of being allocated a home and are locked out of the housing market due to unobtainable mortgages and unaffordable prices. The problem is further exacerbated as the system for providing new affordable homes is under strain whereby grant levels have been unsustainable in the current economic climate.
- 2.2 In autumn 2010, the Government announced a new social housing tenure called Affordable Rent. Affordable Rent is to be made available for the 2011 – 2015 Affordable Homes Programme with a view to allow Registered Providers (those providers of social housing regulated by the Tenant Services Authority) greater flexibility in the rents and tenancy terms that they could offer in order to help deliver up to 150,000 new affordable homes.
- 2.3 On the 9th December 2010, following the Spending Review, the Minister for Housing and Local Government, The Rt Hon Grant Shapps announced further details of the new Affordable Rent model to be offered by Registered Providers.
- 2.4 The new Affordable Rent tenure has been designed to increase the delivery of new affordable homes by making the best possible use of existing housing stock and constrained public subsidy, and to provide a diverse offer for the range of people who need to access affordable housing, providing alternatives to traditional social rent.
- 2.5 Affordable Rent will offer Registered Providers the flexibility to convert vacant social rented or new build properties to Affordable Rented properties (at a rental level of up to 80% of market rent) in certain circumstances. Registered Providers will be able to convert empty properties to the new Affordable Rent tenure when they have reached an agreement with the Homes and Communities Agency about how the additional income will be reinvested to deliver new affordable housing. It is envisaged that Affordable Rent properties will be allocated in the same way as social rent properties and the choice-based lettings allocation system will apply.
- 2.6 The new Affordable Rent tenure falls within the definition of affordable housing following an amendment to PPS3:Housing and therefore Section 68 of the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 applies.

Rent Setting

- 2.7 There is a degree of flexibility in the utilisation of Affordable Rents and Registered Providers may wish to exercise discretion in order to meet local needs and priorities in the most effective way possible. A property is considered to be Affordable Rent when it is linked to an agreement with the Homes and Communities Agency on investment of the income to deliver additional affordable housing in an area. Properties allocated

for the new Affordable Rent tenure will not be subject to the rent restructuring policy that currently applies to social rented properties (implemented in the Guide to Social Rent Reforms, March 2001).

- 2.8 The maximum level set for Affordable Rents should be no more than 80% of the gross market rent (inclusive of service charges) and the individual characteristics of the property such as location and size should be taken into account when assessing whether the rent is no more than 80%.
- 2.9 Registered Providers will be expected to charge rents at or as close to 80% of market rents in order to maximise their financial capacity and to increase the supply of new affordable homes. The maximum annual rental increase will be RPI (taken as at September of the previous year) + 0.5% in order to provide protection and certainty for providers, funders and tenants.
- 2.10 There may however be specific circumstances where Registered Providers can demonstrate the need to set rents at less than 80% of market rents whilst meeting local need and delivering best value. Examples of this could be where the local rental market is considered to be weak/fragile, or where a rent at 80% of market rent would exceed the relevant Local Housing Allowance cap or place the rent close to the cap.
- 2.11 Each time a new Affordable Rent tenancy is issued or renewed, the Registered Provider will be required to recalculate the rental level. The Registered Provider must ensure that the rent remains at no more than 80% of gross market rent as of the date the property is re-let, even if this means the new rent is lower than the Affordable Rent previously charged.

Emerging Approach to Delivering Affordable Rent in Warwick

- 2.12 Through consultation with WDC Partner Registered Providers it is clear that the delivery of Affordable Rent across Warwick District is still uncertain and subject to change and evolution. To date, discussion with the Homes and Communities Agency has established that 3 Registered Providers have applied to the Homes and Communities Agency to deliver Affordable Rented products in Warwick District. However, at this stage it is unclear what level of delivery this will result in.
- 2.13 To date, Warwick District Council has only dealt with one planning application to deliver Affordable Rent on a Section 106 scheme in Leamington Spa. There are a range of property types to be delivered on this scheme but it is anticipated that the Affordable Rent units will be sold at 60% of their market value to a Registered Provider. This is an increase in value from when the scheme was previously required to deliver Social Rented Units.
- 2.14 Anecdotal evidence suggests that rents in the region of 60 to 70% of market rent will be affordable for those in housing need across Warwick District. The strength of the District's housing market is such that market rents are high and therefore were Registered Providers seeking to charge 80% of market rent for affordable rent products these properties are likely to be out of reach for those in housing need.

3 Modelling Assumptions

- 3.1 In order to update the modelling undertaken as part of the original Affordable Housing Viability Assessment the same modelling assumptions and scenario as outlined in the main report have been used with the only variance being the tenure split for the affordable housing.
- 3.2 The market areas of Town Centres, Suburban Areas, Rural Areas and Deprived Wards have been tested at the Baseline, Mid Market and Improved Market Scenarios. Each of the market areas have been tested based on high, medium, and low value assumptions and at a range of densities. For full details please see Section 3 of the main Affordable Housing Viability Assessment report. In the Town Centres the key town centres of Leamington Spa, Warwick and Kenilworth have been tested independently, rather than high, medium, and low value as in the other market areas.
- 3.3 In the main Affordable Housing Viability Assessment report Intermediate housing was calculated at 60% of market value and Social Rented at 35% of market value and these assumptions have been used in the modelling for this addendum report. However, the addition of Affordable Rent in this study has led to a range of further analysis being undertaken in order to establish the market rent of each property type. This is explained in more detail below.
- 3.4 Affordable housing percentages of 0% to 50% have been modelled as follows:
- 0%
 - 10%
 - 20%
 - 25%
 - 30%
 - 35%
 - 40%
 - 50%
- 3.5 In this addendum report, the following tenure splits have been analysed:
- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
 - 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
 - 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

Market Rents in Warwick

- 3.6 In order to establish market rents in Warwick District, detailed analysis has been undertaken of the rental market in each of the areas tested and for each of the property types incorporated in the modelling work. This is undertaken by using a combination of primary market research, consultation with local agents and comparable evidence from DTZ's internal databases and data sources. A detailed methodology statement is included in Appendix A.
- 3.7 This has resulted in the following market rents being established for each property type:

Figure 3.1 Market Rental Values based on DTZ Research.

			Town Centre		
Unit Type	Value	Area sq ft	Monthly Rent	Annual Rent	Annual Rent £psf
1 Bed Flat	High Leamington Spa	500	£625	£7,500	£15.00
	Med Warwick		£525	£6,300	£12.60
	Low Kenilworth		£550	£6,600	£13.20
2 Bed Flat	High Leamington Spa	650	£700	£8,400	£12.92
	Med Warwick		£600	£7,200	£11.08
	Low Kenilworth		£625	£7,500	£11.54
2 Bed House	High Leamington Spa	700	£700	£8,400	£12.00
	Med Warwick		£650	£7,800	£11.14
	Low Kenilworth		£675	£8,100	£11.57
3 Bed House	High Leamington Spa	950	£1,000	£12,000	£12.63
	Med Warwick		£875	£10,500	£11.05
	Low Kenilworth		£900	£10,800	£11.37
4 Bed House	High Leamington Spa	1100	£1,200	£14,400	£13.09
	Med Warwick		£1,100	£13,200	£12.00
	Low Kenilworth		£1,000	£12,000	£10.91
5 Bed House	High Leamington Spa	1500	£1,600	£19,200	£12.80
	Med Warwick		£1,450	£17,400	£11.60
	Low Kenilworth		£1,200	£14,400	£9.60

			Suburban		
Unit Type	Value	Area sq ft	Monthly Rent	Annual Rent	Annual Rent £psf
1 Bed Flat	High Kenilworth (001C)	500	£575	£6,900	£13.80
	Medium - NE Leamington (007E)		£500	£6,000	£12.00
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£500	£6,000	£12.00
2 Bed Flat	High Kenilworth (001C)	650	£625	£7,500	£11.54
	Medium - NE Leamington (007E)		£600	£7,200	£11.08
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£575	£6,900	£10.62
2 Bed House	High Kenilworth (001C)	700	£725	£8,700	£12.43
	Medium - NE Leamington (007E)		£700	£8,400	£12.00
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£650	£7,800	£11.14
3 Bed House	Kenilworth	950	£950	£11,400	£12.00
	NE Leamington (007E)		£850	£10,200	£10.74
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£750	£9,000	£9.47
4 Bed House	High Kenilworth (001C)	1100	£1,100	£13,200	£12.00
	Medium - NE Leamington (007E)		£950	£11,400	£10.36
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£775	£9,300	£8.45
5 Bed House	High Kenilworth (001C)	1500	£1,400	£16,800	£11.20
	Medium - NE Leamington (007E)		£1,200	£14,400	£9.60
	Low Sydeham (covering 10b,10D, 10C)		£875	£10,500	£7.00

			Deprived Wards		
Unit Type	Value	Area sq ft	Rent	Annual Rent	Annual Rent £psf
1 Bed Flat	High 13D Whitnash	500	£500	£6,000	£12.00
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£475	£5,700	£11.40
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£450	£5,400	£10.80
2 Bed Flat	High 13D Whitnash	650	£600	£7,200	£11.08
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£575	£6,900	£10.62
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£500	£6,000	£9.23
2 Bed House	High 13D Whitnash	700	£625	£7,500	£10.71
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£600	£7,200	£10.29
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£600	£7,200	£10.29
3 Bed House	High 13D Whitnash	950	£675	£8,100	£8.53
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£650	£7,800	£8.21
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£625	£7,500	£7.89
4 Bed House	High 13D Whitnash	1100	£750	£9,000	£8.18
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£725	£8,700	£7.91
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£725	£8,700	£7.91
5 Bed House	High 13D Whitnash	1500	£825	£9,900	£6.60
	Med (13A- south of L.Spa TC)		£825	£9,900	£6.60
	Low (6A - NE Leam)		£800	£9,600	£6.40

			Rural		
Unit Type	Value	Area sq ft	Rent	Annual Rent	Annual Rent £psf
1 Bed Flat	High - Lapworth	500	£650	£7,800	£15.60
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£625	£7,500	£15.00
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£600	£7,200	£14.40
2 Bed Flat	High - Lapworth	650	£700	£8,400	£12.92
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£675	£8,100	£12.46
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£650	£7,800	£12.00
2 Bed House	High - Lapworth	700	£800	£9,600	£13.71
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£725	£8,700	£12.43
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£675	£8,100	£11.57
3 Bed House	High - Lapworth	950	£1,100	£13,200	£13.89
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£950	£11,400	£12.00
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£900	£10,800	£11.37
4 Bed House	High - Lapworth	1100	£1,300	£15,600	£14.18
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£1,100	£13,200	£12.00
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£950	£11,400	£10.36
5 Bed House	High - Lapworth	1500	£1,600	£19,200	£12.80
	Mid 005E - Radford Semele		£1,350	£16,200	£10.80
	Low - Bishops Tachbrook		£1,150	£13,800	£9.20

Calculation of Affordable Rent Values

- 3.8 In order to calculate the Affordable Rent transfer values which will be received by a developer from a Registered Provider on a Section 106 scheme the rents above have been discounted to reflect the rules of the Affordable Rent Tenure and then capitalised to produce a capital value.
- 3.9 Based on the anecdotal evidence received from WDC through their discussions with the HCA and partner Registered Providers, it has been established that Registered Providers are likely to seek in the region of 60-70% of market rent as a value for Affordable Rent. For the purposes of this study, DTZ have used a value of 70% of market rent.
- 3.10 This value has then been capitalised at a yield of 6.5% in order to establish a capital value for the property. The selection of a yield has been extremely difficult as there is little or no comparable evidence upon which to base this assumption and also no guidance or delivery of products in the tenure type to use as a benchmark. Instead, we have listened to the anecdotal evidence provided to WDC that transfer values will be in the region of 60% of market value for affordable rented products across Warwick District and selected a yield which matched this rate. On average the assumption of capital value received for an Affordable Rented unit on each of the sites tested is in the range of 54-61% of its market value averaging at 58%.
- 3.11 All other assumptions are the same as that used in the initial Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (See Section 3 of the main report).

4 Town Centre Results.

- 4.1 The Town Centre areas of Warwick District are identified as Warwick, Leamington Spa and Kenilworth town centres. Each of these areas has been tested at the Baseline, Mid Point and Improved Market Scenario.
- 4.2 Each of these town centres has been tested to determine what level of affordable housing can be viably delivered and then a summary position for all three town centres has been considered. Three scenarios have been tested and the results of each of these scenarios are recorded below. Detailed results tables can be seen in Appendix A which provides more information than the summary provided below.
- 4.3 In total 18 sites have been tested in each scenario. Viability is measured using a traffic light indicator system. Where a site is modelled and it produces a positive return of 20% or above the site is given a green light (wholly viable). Where the assumptions outlined in section 3 above result in a return of 17-19.9% this is given an amber light (marginally viable). Where the assumptions inputted into the model yield a return of less than 17% then the site is given a red light (unviable). The results of each of the 18 sites are combined in order to determine overall viability.
- 4.4 In order to determine the overall viability green and amber lights are combined. This is due to the fact that in certain circumstances a developer may deliver a scheme for less than a 20% return and therefore by merging the wholly viable and marginally viable schemes an overall picture of viability can be understood. Two measures are provided in this study. The first is the point at which the majority of sites (50% or more) are viable. The second measure is the point at which any viability (1 or more sites) can be seen and recording will only stop when all red lights are seen.
- 4.5 There is a significant identified need for affordable housing across Warwick District and the Council has a statutory obligation to deliver housing for those most in need. Therefore consideration needs to be given to whether a target for affordable housing should be set at a percentage where less than the majority of sites are viable. Even if one site tested is viable this could be regarded as a viable position to proceed. The results below therefore indicate the level of viability in each of the scenarios tested. At the end of this chapter summary results are presented demonstrating both viability on the majority of sites tested and viability where one or more site yields a green or amber light.

Baseline Position

- 4.6 The Baseline results for the Town Centres market area show that a level of 25% affordable housing is fully viable on all sites where Social Rented is not the highest tenure split (where Social Rented accounts for 60% of the affordable housing less than 50% of the sites tested are viable).
- 4.7 If we split the town centres into individual settlements the results are slightly different. Leamington Spa has the highest revenues of the three town centres tested and therefore the viability results seen here are far stronger here than in the other two centres. When testing 0-35% affordable housing percentages 100% of all sites tested were wholly viable (green light). Only at 40% affordable housing do amber lights start to appear

but overall viability is not affected. However a proportion of 50% Affordable Housing is not viable on any of the sites tested.

- 4.8 In Warwick, viability is not as strong as Leamington Spa. 10% Affordable Housing is deliverable at the tenures splits tested. Where anything greater than 10% is incorporated in the model, viability levels fall below 50% (the majority) of the sites being able to provide that level of affordable housing. Viability has been seen on scenarios up to 25% affordable housing but often on a low percentage of the site tested.
- 4.9 In Kenilworth, a similar viability picture to that of Warwick is seen. Although levels of viability are higher here than in Warwick, Kenilworth schemes show lower proportions of viable schemes than Leamington Spa. Up to 30% affordable housing would be viable dependent upon the percentage and tenure types assumed and 25% affordable housing is viable on the majority of sites in this area at the baseline position.

Mid Point Market Position

- 4.10 In the Mid Market Position revenues are increased by 10% from the Baseline Position, build periods are reduced and an adjustment for higher Code for Sustainable Homes(CSH) costs are made. Given the change in assumptions, it is clear that in the Mid Market Position schemes can more viably deliver affordable housing.
- 4.11 In Leamington Spa, as expected given the results of the Baseline Position, all scenarios tested in the Mid Market Position for Leamington Spa were viable in the majority of schemes.
- 4.12 In Warwick, viability is not as strong as Leamington Spa. 30% Affordable Housing is viable on the majority of sites at the tenures splits tested. Anything beyond this is not viable on the majority of sites but in some sites in certain circumstances there is some evidence of viability up to a level of 40% affordable housing.
- 4.13 In Kenilworth, a similar viability picture to that of Warwick is seen. Although levels of viability are higher here than in Warwick, Kenilworth schemes show lower proportions of viable schemes than Leamington Spa. Up to 40% affordable housing would be deliverable dependent upon the percentage and tenure types assumed and 35% affordable housing is deliverable on the majority of sites in this area at the Mid Point Market position.

Improved Market Position

- 4.14 In this scenario revenues have been inflated by 20% from the Baseline Position and build rates have been doubled so developments now take half the time to complete when compared to the Baseline Position and adjustment as also been made for increased CSH levels. The results for the Town Centres as a whole show strong viability in this scenario. 50% affordable housing would be viable on the majority of the sites tested.
- 4.15 Leamington Spa and Kenilworth generated 100% green lights (complete viability) for each of the percentages of affordable housing and tenure splits tested. In Warwick more amber lights were seen at 40% affordable housing.

Summary

- 4.16 The following table sets out the level of affordable housing at which schemes would become viable assuming a viability cut-off-point of 50% of schemes:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Town Centre	25% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Leamington Spa	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Warwick	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	30% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Kenilworth	25% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int)	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

- 4.17 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered deliverable, as this is the majority of the sites. However, in areas of high housing need, consideration of a lower cut off (tipping) point is required to be analysed. If we consider the result where viability is recorded if just 1% of the sites tested show a green or amber light, this changes the results as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Town Centre	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Leamington Spa	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Warwick	25% Affordable Housing (40% SR/ 60% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Kenilworth	30% Affordable Housing (40% SR/ 60% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

- 4.18 It should be noted at this point that this is the level of viability which is deliverable assuming no abnormal development costs or allowance for site preparation and demolition. Both of these elements have the potential to reduce the delivery of affordable housing, and on any site specific negotiations both of these factors will need to be taken into account.

The Impact of Affordable Rent

4.19 In the main AHVA Report, Affordable Rent was not incorporated as a tenure assumption. This section of the report compares the results of this study, with the introduction of Affordable Rent, to those of the previous study in order to determine its overall impact. In the original study tenure splits of

- 50% Social Rented 50% Intermediate
- 66% Social Rented, 34% Intermediate
- 80% Social Rented 20% Intermediate

were tested in order to look at tenure variance across the market areas. As a reminder in this addendum study the following tenure splits have been tested.

- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
- 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
- 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

4.20 The results of the original study, assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes, produced viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Town Centre	35% Affordable Housing (50% SR/ 50% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)

4.21 The results of this study which introduces Affordable Rent shows that viability, as measured by levels of affordable housing that can be viably supported, is enhanced in the improved market scenario (by 10%), though reduced by 10% in the baseline market position. The main impact on the viability in this particular study is the relevant transfer values associated with the tenure types. For these studies these values are as follows:

- Social Rented 35% of Market Value
- Intermediate 60% of Market Value
- Affordable Rent 58% of Market Value ¹

4.22 Therefore, in scenarios where there are greater levels of Intermediate and Affordable Rent products viability should be greater. This is certainly the case in the Town Centre scenarios at the Improved Market position, where viability increased by 10% as a result of the introduction of Affordable Rent. However, at the baseline position viability decreased by 10%, this is due mainly to the fact that the delivery of a tenure split of 50%

¹ On average the assumption of capital value received for an Affordable Rented unit on each of the sites tested is in the range of 54-61% of its market value averaging at 58%.

Social Rented, 50% Intermediate yields a higher level of viability than 60% Affordable Rent 40% Social rented due to the higher transfer values associated with the Intermediate tenure product.

- 4.23 Across the three separate market areas the viability when delivering Affordable Rent product again alters between five and ten percent dependent upon the tenure split tested. However, what is clear from the results is that where tenures are more in favour of Intermediate and Affordable Rented product greater viability can be seen particularly where there are low levels of Social Rented accommodation being delivered. Had the social rented tenure be replaced with affordable rent in the same percentages as the original study this would have increased overall viability.

5 Suburban Area Results.

- 5.1 The Suburban Areas of Warwick District are identified as the built up areas of the towns outside of the town centres. The Suburban Areas have been split into High, Medium and Low value areas with Beacon Lower Super Output Areas established in which market research into property prices have been undertaken. Each of these areas has been tested at the Baseline, Mid Market and Improved Market Scenario.
- 5.2 The Suburban Areas have been tested to determine what level of affordable housing can be viably delivered. Three scenarios have been tested and the results of each of these scenarios are recorded in summary below. Detailed results tables can be seen in Appendix A.
- 5.3 In total 18 sites have been tested in each scenario. Viability is measured using a traffic light indicator system. Where a site is modelled and it produces a positive return of 20% or above the site is given a green light (wholly viable). Where the assumptions outlined in section 3 above result in a return of 17-19.9% this is given an amber light (marginally viable). Where the assumptions inputted into the model yield a return of less than 17% then the site is given a red light (unviable). The results of each of the 18 sites are combined in order to determine overall viability.
- 5.4 In order to determine the overall viability green and amber lights are combined. This is due to the fact that in certain circumstances a developer may deliver a scheme for less than a 20% return and therefore by merging the wholly viable and marginally viable schemes an overall picture of viability can be understood. Two measures are provided in this study. The first is the point at which the majority of sites 50% are viable and the point at which viability stops (all red lights).
- 5.5 There is a significant identified need for affordable housing across Warwick District and the Council has a statutory obligation to deliver housing for those most in need. Therefore consideration needs to be given as to whether a target for affordable housing should be set at a percentage where less than the majority is viable. Even if one site tested is viable this could be regarded as a viable position to proceed. The results below therefore indicate the level of viability deliverable in each of the scenarios tested, at the end of this chapter summary results are presented demonstrating both viability on the majority of sites tested and viability where one or more site yields a green or amber light.

Baseline Position

- 5.6 The Baseline results for the Suburban Areas, taken as one market area, show that 10% affordable housing would be deliverable on the majority of sites at the revised tenure splits tested.
- 5.7 In High value suburban areas delivery of up to 20% affordable housing was viable on the majority of sites, in Medium value areas this fell to 10% and in the Low value areas of the suburbs no viability was seen. Viability across the Suburban Areas therefore is much more variable than that seen in the Town Centres, and this is

reflective of the more diverse character of the suburban neighbourhoods. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A.

Mid Point Market Position

5.8 In the Mid Point Market Position, revenues are increased by 10% from the Baseline Position and build periods are reduced and adjustment for higher CSH costs made. The results show a slight improvement from the Baseline Position. 20% affordable housing can be achieved on the majority (more than 50%) of the sites tested in this market. In the high value areas, 40% affordable housing was deliverable on the majority of sites, 20% affordable housing was deliverable in the medium value areas and 0% affordable housing was deliverable in the low value areas. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A.

Improved Market Position

5.9 In this scenario revenues have been inflated by 20% from the Baseline Position and build rates have been doubled, so developments now take half the time to complete when compared to the Baseline. An adjustment has also been made for increased CSH costs. In this scenario, 40% affordable housing can be achieved on the majority (more than 50%) of the sites tested in this market. In the high value areas, 50% affordable housing was deliverable on the majority of sites, 35% affordable housing was deliverable in the medium value areas and 10% affordable housing was deliverable in the low value areas. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A

Summary

5.10 The following table sets out the level of affordable housing at which schemes would become viable assuming a viability cut-off-point of 50% of schemes:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Suburban	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	20% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
High Value	25% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Medium Value	0% Affordable Housing	20% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Low Value	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing

5.11 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered deliverable, as this is the majority of the sites. However, in areas of high housing need, consideration of a lower cut off (tipping) point is required to be analysed. If we consider the result where viability is recorded if just 1% of the sites tested show a green or amber light, this changes the results as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Suburban	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
High Value	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Medium Value	10% Affordable Housing (40% SR/ 60% AR)	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Low Value	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

5.12 It should be noted at this point that this is the level of viability which is deliverable assuming no abnormal development costs or allowance for site preparation and demolition. Both of these elements have the potential to reduce the delivery of affordable housing, and on any site specific negotiations both of these factors will need to be taken into account.

The Impact of Affordable Rent

5.13 In the main AHVA Report, Affordable Rent was not incorporated as a tenure assumption. This section of the report compares the results of the introduction of Affordable Rent to those with previous study in order to determine its overall impact. In the original study tenure splits of

- 50% Social Rented 50% Intermediate
- 66% Social Rented, 34% Intermediate
- 80% Social Rented 20% Intermediate

were tested in order to look at tenure variance across the market areas. As a reminder in this addendum study the following tenure splits have been tested.

- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
- 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
- 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

- 5.14 The results of the original study, assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes, produced viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Overall Suburban	20% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)	25% Affordable Housing (65% SR/ 35% Int)	35% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)
High Value Areas	30% Affordable Housing (80% SR/20% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/20% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/20% Int)
Medium Value Areas	0% Affordable Housing	30% Affordable Housing (50% SR/50% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/20% Int)
Low Value Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	10% Affordable Housing (80% SR/20% Int)

- 5.15 Again it is clear that in this market area, the impact of introducing Affordable Rent gives a variance of 10% to the percentage of affordable housing dependent upon the tenure splits tested. In the baseline market position the introduction of affordable rent saw viability fall by 10%. This is due to the fact that the replacement of the intermediate product with affordable rent reduces overall scheme viability as affordable rent is transferred to a Registered Provider for a lower value than intermediate tenure. Had affordable rent replaced social rented units and intermediate tenure been maintained the overall deliverable level of affordable housing would have increased. Therefore, in scenarios where there are greater levels of Intermediate and Affordable Rent products viability should be greater.
- 5.16 Across the three separate market areas the viability when delivering Affordable Rent product again alters between five and ten percent dependent upon the tenure split tested. However, what is clear from the results is that where tenures are more in favour of Intermediate and Affordable Rented products greater viability can be seen particularly where there are low levels of Social Rented accommodation being delivered.

6 Deprived Areas Results

- 6.1 The Deprived Areas of Warwick District are identified as those areas which have the greatest levels of socio-economic deprivation in the District. They are typically located on the outskirts of the town centre and bordering the suburban areas. These areas consist of Census Output Areas which are amongst the worst 30% nationally in the English Indices of Deprivation 2007 (CLG). Each of these areas has been tested at the Baseline, Mid Market and Improved Market Scenario.
- 6.2 In total 18 sites have been tested in each scenario. Viability is measured using a traffic light indicator system. Where a site is modelled and it produces a positive return of 20% or above the site is given a green light (wholly viable). Where the assumptions outlined in section 3 above result in a return of 17-19.9% this is given an amber light (marginally viable). Where the assumptions inputted into the model yield a return of less than 17% then the site is given a red light (unviable). The results of each of the 18 sites are combined in order to determine overall viability.
- 6.3 In order to determine the overall viability green and amber lights are combined. This is due to the fact that in certain circumstances a developer may deliver a scheme for less than a 20% return and therefore by merging the wholly viable and marginally viable schemes an overall picture of viability can be understood. Two measures are provided in this study. The first is the point at which the majority of sites 50% are viable and the point at which viability stops (all red lights).
- 6.4 There is a significant identified need for affordable housing across Warwick District and the Council has a statutory obligation to deliver housing for those most in need. Therefore consideration needs to be given as to whether a target for affordable housing should be set at a percentage where less than the majority is viable. Even if one site tested is viable this could be regarded as a viable position to proceed. The results below therefore indicate the level of viability deliverable in each of the scenarios tested, at the end of this chapter summary results are presented demonstrating both viability on the majority of sites tested and viability where one or more site yields a green or amber light.

Baseline Position

- 6.5 The Baseline results for the Deprived Areas show that no affordable housing in these areas is deliverable. The main reason for this is that house prices in these areas are considerably lower than other areas of the district and not at a level at which housing delivery can be sustained at the Baseline Position. Some of these areas have high levels of rented housing and low turnover of owner occupation, so property prices are difficult to accurately calculate. Parts of these areas are showing signs of housing market failure and decline and may be in need of intervention in order to deliver development.

Mid Point Market Position

6.6 In the Mid Point Market Position, revenues are increased by 10% from the Baseline Position and build periods are reduced and adjustment for higher CSH costs made. The position seen in the Baseline scenario is replicated in the Mid Market Position with little deliverability or viability in this scenario. Again, all scenarios recorded 100% red lights.

Improved Market Position

6.7 In this scenario revenues have been inflated by 20% from the Baseline Position and build rates have been doubled, so developments now take half the time to complete when compared to the Baseline. An adjustment has also been made for increased CSH costs. However, based on the tenure splits tested in this addendum report in the Improved Market Position no level of viability is seen.

Summary

6.8 The following table sets out the level of affordable housing at which schemes would become viable assuming a viability cut-off-point of 50% of schemes:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Overall	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing
High Value Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing
Medium Value Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing
Low Value Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing

6.9 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered deliverable. However, no viability was recorded in any of the scenarios tested and therefore even if a threshold lower than 50% was selected the results will match those above.

The Impact of Affordable Rent

6.10 In the main AHVA Report, Affordable Rent was not incorporated as a tenure assumption, this section of the report compares the results of the introduction of Affordable Rent to those with previous study in order to determine its overall impact. In the original study tenure splits of

- 50% Social Rented 50% Intermediate
- 66% Social Rented, 34% Intermediate
- 80% Social Rented 20% Intermediate

were tested in order to look at tenure variance across the market areas. As a reminder in this addendum study the following tenure splits have been tested.

- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
- 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
- 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

6.11 The results of the original study assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes produced viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Overall Deprived Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing

6.12 The introduction of Affordable Rent tenures made no difference to the results for this market areas as values are such that delivery of any residential development is difficult.

7 Rural Area Results

- 7.1 The Rural Areas of Warwick District constitute the largest geographical area of the District. The rural areas have been split into High, Medium and Low value areas with Beacon Lower Super Output Areas established upon which market research into property prices has been undertaken. The Rural area has been tested at the Baseline, Mid Point Market and Improved Market Scenario. Full results can be seen in Appendix A, however a summary of findings under each market scenario is provided below.
- 7.2 In total 18 sites have been tested in each scenario. Viability is measured using a traffic light indicator system. Where a site is modelled and it produces a positive return of 20% or above the site is given a green light (wholly viable). Where the assumptions outlined in section 3 above result in a return of 17-19.9% this is given an amber light (marginally viable). Where the assumptions inputted into the model yield a return of less than 17% then the site is given a red light (unviable). The results of each of the 18 sites are combined in order to determine overall viability.
- 7.3 In order to determine the overall viability green and amber lights are combined. This is due to the fact that in certain circumstances a developer may deliver a scheme for less than a 20% return and therefore by merging the wholly viable and marginally viable schemes an overall picture of viability can be understood. Two measures are provided in this study. The first is the point at which the majority of sites 50% are viable and the point at which viability stops (all red lights).
- 7.4 There is a significant identified need for affordable housing across the Warwick District and the Council has a statutory obligation to deliver housing for those most in need. Therefore consideration needs to be given to whether a target for affordable housing should be set at a percentage where less than the majority is viable. Even if one site tested is viable this could be regarded as a viable position to proceed. The results below therefore indicate the level of viability deliverable in each of the scenarios tested, and at the end of this chapter summary results are presented demonstrating both viability on the majority of sites tested and viability where one or more site yields a green or amber light.

Baseline Position

- 7.5 The Baseline results for the Rural Areas, taken as one market area, show that 30% affordable housing would be deliverable on the majority of sites at the revised tenure splits tested.
- 7.6 In High value suburban areas delivery of up to 50% affordable housing was viable on the majority of sites, in Medium value areas this fell to 35% and in the low value areas of the rural markets no viability was seen. Viability across the Rural areas therefore is much more variable than that seen in the Town Centres but far more viable than the Suburban areas. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A.

Mid Point Market Position

7.7 In the Mid Point Market Position, revenues are increased by 10% from the Baseline Position and build periods are reduced and adjustment for higher CSH costs made. The results show a slight improvement from the Baseline Position. 40% affordable housing can be achieved on the majority (more than 50%) of the sites tested in this market. In the high value areas, 50% affordable housing was deliverable on the majority of sites, 40% affordable housing was deliverable in the medium value areas and 30% affordable housing was deliverable in the low value areas. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A.

Improved Market Position

7.8 In this scenario revenues have been inflated by 20% from the Baseline Position and build rates have been doubled, so developments now take half the time to complete when compared to the Baseline. An adjustment has also been made for increased CSH costs. In this scenario, 50% affordable housing can be achieved on the majority (more than 50%) of the sites tested in this market. In the high value areas, 50% affordable housing was deliverable on the majority of sites, 50% affordable housing was deliverable in the medium value areas and 35% affordable housing was deliverable in the low value areas. Results for the High, Medium and Low value areas can be seen in Appendix A.

Summary

7.9 The following table sets out the level of affordable housing at which schemes would become viable assuming a viability cut-off-point of 50% of schemes:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Rural	30% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
High Value	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Medium Value	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Low Value	0% Affordable Housing	30% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

7.10 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered deliverable, as this is the majority of the sites. However, in areas of high housing need, consideration of a

lower cut off (tipping) point is required to be analysed. If we consider the result where viability is recorded if it is just 1% of the sites tested show a green or amber light, this changes the results as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Rural	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
High Value	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Medium Value	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%INT)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Low Value	30% Affordable Housing (40% SR/ 60% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

7.11 It should be noted at this point that this is the level of viability which is deliverable assuming no abnormal development costs or allowance for site preparation and demolition. Both of these elements have the potential to reduce the delivery of affordable housing, and on any site specific negotiations both of these factors will need to be taken into account.

7.12 For the purposes of this addendum study, it is not our intention to consider site Thresholds again, the reason being is that the results of the previous study adequately test the threshold requirement and the level of viability as a result of introducing affordable rented units is not significantly improved and therefore the threshold testing remains valid.

The Impact of Affordable Rent

7.13 In the main AHVA Report, Affordable Rent was not incorporated as a tenure assumption, this section of the report compares the results of the introduction of Affordable Rent to those with previous study in order to determine its overall impact. In the original study tenure splits of

- 50% Social Rented 50% Intermediate
- 66% Social Rented, 34% Intermediate
- 80% Social Rented 20% Intermediate

were tested in order to look at tenure variance across the market areas. As a reminder in this addendum study the following tenure splits have been tested.

- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
- 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
- 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

7.14 The results of the original study assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes produced viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Rural	35% Affordable Housing (50% SR/ 50% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)	50% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)

7.15 The results of this study which introduces Affordable Rent shows that, in the baseline scenario, viability falls slightly (by 5% overall), driven by changes in viability in the medium (down 5%) and low value areas (down 10%) due to the fact that the replacement of the intermediate product with affordable rent reduces overall scheme viability as affordable rent is transferred to a registered provider for a lower value than intermediate tenure. In the mid market and improved market scenarios, higher overall values mean viability is less sensitive to the changes, with overall viability in the rural area of the District remaining broadly the same. Notwithstanding this, low value areas show a 10% fall in viability in the mid and improved market positions (from 50% affordable housing achievable to 40%, and from 40% affordable housing to 30%, respectively) with the introduction of affordable rent, whilst medium value areas show a 10% fall in viability (from 50% to 40%) in the mid market scenario.

7.16 The main impact on the viability in this particular study is the relevant transfer values associated with the tenure types. For these studies these values are as follows:

- Social Rented 35% of Market Value
- Intermediate 60% of Market Value
- Affordable Rent 56% of Market Value²

7.16 Therefore, in scenarios where there are greater levels of Intermediate and Affordable Rent products viability should be greater. The results show that in the Rural Area the introduction of affordable rent results in some variance in overall affordable housing delivery though to a lesser degree than in the town centre and suburban areas.

² On average the assumption of capital value received for an Affordable Rented unit on each of the sites tested is in the range of 54-61% of its market value averaging at 58%.

8 Urban Extension Results

- 8.1 Warwick District Council has produced a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which assess the suitability for housing of a number of sites including some urban extension sites.. In order to consider the viability and deliverability of the smaller urban extension sites additional analysis has been undertaken. Rather than considering each individual site in isolation, the hypothetical approach taken in the assessment of viability of other areas has been continued and the sites tested against a range of set assumptions.
- 8.2 As the Urban Extension Sites neighbour the Suburban areas of the District a number of the assumptions have remained the same. However, the area has not been split into high, medium and low value areas but rather a blended rate has been selected as it is anticipated the Urban Extension Sites will be market making and therefore perform in a similar way across the District. These sites are felt to be market making as there is currently little development in this area against which to benchmark sales revenues. A new development of this scale will create its own market and revenues will be achieved based on the quality, type and mix of product delivered on these sites. Given the ability of the Urban Extension sites to deliver high numbers of new homes, the first phases of these developments only have been considered during this analysis due to the length of time involved with the delivery of these sites and the uncertainty in how the market will perform. We would expect a reassessment of viability to be undertaken part way through the development of these schemes.
- 8.3 Sites up to 600 units have been tested in each scenario. Viability is measured using a traffic light indicator system. Where a site is modelled and it produces a positive return of 20% or above the site is given a green light (wholly viable). Where the assumptions outlined in section 3 above result in a return of 17-19.9% this is given an amber light (marginally viable). Where the assumptions inputted into the model yield a return of less than 17% then the site is given a red light (unviable). The results of each of the sites are combined in order to determine overall viability.
- 8.4 In order to determine the overall viability green and amber lights are combined. This is due to the fact that in certain circumstances a developer may deliver a scheme for less than a 20% return and therefore by merging the wholly viable and marginally viable schemes an overall picture of viability can be understood. Two measures are provided in this study. The first is the point at which the majority of sites (50% or more) are viable and the second is the point at which viability stops (all red lights).
- 8.5 There is a significant identified need for affordable housing across Warwick District and the Council has a statutory obligation to deliver housing for those most in need. Therefore consideration needs to be given as to whether a target for affordable housing should be set at a percentage where less than the majority is viable. Even if one site tested is viable this could be regarded as a viable position to proceed. The results below therefore indicate the level of viability deliverable in each of the scenarios tested, and at the end of this

chapter summary results are presented demonstrating both viability on the majority of sites tested and viability where one or more site yields a green or amber light.

Baseline Position

- 8.6 The Baseline results for the Urban Extension sites, as a whole market area, show that up to 10% affordable housing would be deliverable, at a split of 60% Social Rent, 25% Affordable Rent, and 15% Intermediate. The results can be seen in Appendix A

Mid Point Market Position

- 8.7 In the Mid Point Market Position, revenues are increased by 10% from the Baseline Position and build periods are reduced and adjustment for higher CSH costs made. The results show a slight improvement from the Baseline Position- 30% affordable housing can be achieved on sites, at a split of 60% Affordable Rent, 40% Social Rent. Results can be seen in Appendix A.

Improved Market Position

- 8.8 In this scenario revenues have been inflated by 20% from the Baseline Position and build rates have been doubled, so developments now take half the time to complete when compared to the Baseline. An adjustment has also been made for increased CSH costs. In this scenario, 35% affordable housing (60% Affordable Rent, 40% Social Rent) can be achieved on the majority (more than 50%) of the sites tested in this market and 40% (60% Social Rent, 25% Affordable Rent, 15% Intermediate) can be achieved on some sites. Results can be seen in Appendix A.

Summary

- 8.9 The following table sets out the level of affordable housing at which schemes would become viable assuming a viability cut-off-point of 50% of schemes:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Urban Extension Sites	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)

- 8.10 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered deliverable, as this is the majority of the sites. However, in areas of high housing need, consideration of a

lower cut off (tipping) point is required to be analysed. If we consider the result where viability is recorded if it is just 1% of the sites tested show a green or amber light, this changes the results as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Urban Extension Sites	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR / 25% AR / 15% Int)	30% Affordable Housing (60% AR / 40% SR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR/ 15% Int)

8.11 It should be noted at this point that this is the level of viability which is deliverable assuming no abnormal development costs or allowance for site preparation and demolition. Both of these elements have the potential to reduce the delivery of affordable housing, and on any site specific negotiations both of these factors will need to be taken into account.

The Impact of Affordable Rent

8.13 In the main AHVA Report, Affordable Rent was not incorporated as a tenure assumption, this section of the report compares the results of the introduction of Affordable Rent to those with previous study in order to determine its overall impact. In the original study tenure splits of

- 50% Social Rented 50% Intermediate
- 66% Social Rented, 34% Intermediate
- 80% Social Rented 20% Intermediate

were tested in order to look at tenure variance across the market areas. As a reminder in this addendum study the following tenure splits have been tested.

- 60% Affordable Rented 40% Social Rented
- 40% Affordable Rented 60% Social Rented
- 60% Social Rented 25% Affordable Rented 15% Intermediate

8.14 The results of the original study assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes produced viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Urban Extension sites	0% Affordable Housing	30% Affordable Housing (50% SR / 50% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (80% SR/ 20% Int)

- 8.15 The results of this study which introduces Affordable Rent shows that, in the baseline scenario, viability remains ostensibly the same as the scenario testing without affordable rent, in that apparently no affordable housing can be delivered .
- 8.16 In the mid market scenario a significant fall in viability is shown, from 30% to 0%. This 30% fall might seem quite surprising, yet it is broadly consistent with the performance of the component suburban value areas (the values of which are blended to arrive at a composite value for the Urban Extensions) under the tenure mix incorporating affordable rent.
- I. The medium value suburban market area showed a significant fall (10%) under this tenure mix, and the low value suburban market area would have shown an even greater fall were viability not already at 0% with the original(ex affordable rent) tenure mix.
 - II. In the suburban modelling, these falls were then part offset by the viability rise in the high value suburban areas. In the case of the Urban Extension modelling, this offsetting does not occur as the suburban value tiers (which the study adopts for the Urban Extension modelling) are blended prior to the modelling.
- 8.17 In the improved market scenario, higher overall values mean viability is less sensitive to the changes, with only a 5% fall in the level of affordable housing supported shown.
- 8.18 The main impact on the viability in this particular study is the relevant transfer values associated with the tenure types. For these studies these values are as follows:
- Social Rented 35% of Market Value
 - Intermediate 60% of Market Value
 - Affordable Rent 56% of Market Values
- 8.19 Therefore, in scenarios where there are greater levels of Intermediate and Affordable Rent products viability should be greater. The results show that in the Urban Extension Areas the introduction of affordable rent results in variance in overall affordable housing delivery, to a greater degree than the other town centre and suburban values due to the lower overall “blended” values used in the modelling, which would reflect the market making nature of the sites.

Sensitivity Analysis

- 8.20 The modelling behind the results presented in the preceding sections has been undertaken based on the stakeholder consultation process recorded and set out in Appendix A (Statement of Common Ground) to the

³ On average the assumption of capital value received for an Affordable Rented unit on each of the sites tested is in the range of 54-61% of its market value averaging at 58%.

original report published in July 2011, which is a record of the process by which the modelling assumptions were proposed, amended and finally agreed with stakeholders.

8.21 With specific regard to the Urban Extension Modelling, the model results produced using these assumptions have been noted as being at significant variance to agreements recently made with developers of urban extensions. We understand that agreements have recently been reached that achieve up to 40% affordable housing (50% Social Rent, 30% Affordable Rent and 20% Shared Ownership), whilst the baseline modelling of this Addendum Report suggests 10% Affordable Housing at best.

8.22 We would suggest that this inconsistency may be derived from a number of possible factors:

- The Urban Extension modelling is based on a straightforward statistical blend of the three suburban price bands (low, medium and high), whilst Urban Extensions are inherently market making by their very large scale, and on this basis a developer is unlikely to base pricing on low value suburban comparable price data, even if the scheme falls within a traditionally relatively low value ward.
- Sales rates based on one sales outlet (as is the case for a smaller, typical, suburban scheme), and two completions a month, whilst Urban Extensions typically have at least two sales outlets, and one stakeholder suggested six completions per month was possible in the current “baseline” market. (An increased build and sales rate has the effect of reducing scheme finance costs and hence improving viability)
- The appraisal modelling does not account for any degree of net price growth, even though it is likely that there is reasonable scope for at least a modest level of growth given the long development period and the general attractiveness of the District to housebuilders.

8.23 On this basis we have carried out sensitivity analysis based on:

- A blend of medium and high suburban price bands
- Six completions per month in the baseline scenario (12 in the Improved market scenario)

8.24 The results of the sensitivity analysis assuming a viability cut-off point of 50% of schemes produces viability as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Urban Extension sites	25% Affordable Housing (60% SR / 25% AR / 15% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (60% AR / 40% SR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR 15% Int)

8.25 These summary results have been determined by using a cut off point (tipping point) where 50% (or above) of the sites tested must be viable in order for that percentage of affordable housing to be considered

deliverable, as this is the majority of the sites. However, in areas of high housing need, consideration of a lower cut off (tipping) point is required to be analysed. If we consider the result where viability is recorded if it is just 1% of the sites tested show a green or amber light, this changes the results as follows:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Point Market Position	Improved Market Position
Urban Extension Sites	30% Affordable Housing (60% SR / 25% AR / 15% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR / 25% AR / 15% Int)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR/ 15% Int)

8.26 It should be noted at this point that this is the level of viability which is deliverable assuming no abnormal development costs or allowance for site preparation and demolition. Both of these elements have the potential to reduce the delivery of affordable housing, and on any site specific negotiations both of these factors will need to be taken into account.

9 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 9.1 The purpose of this addendum report was to consider the impact of the introduction of Affordable Rent tenure on development viability across Warwick District. The introduction of this tenure type by Homes and Communities Agency has resulted in the requirement to consider this approach, however, it is important to consider in advance of reading the recommendation of this additional work that the Homes and Communities Agency have only committed to the delivery and the funding of this tenure type until 2015 and it is uncertain whether this tenure will be provided following this date. This makes its incorporation into any local authority Local Plan policy extremely difficult as the adoption of such an approach may make the policy invalid across the lifetime of the plan if this tenure type ceases to exist.
- 9.2 From the results of our research it is clear that the transfer values for Affordable Rent units on Section 106 schemes are anticipated to be higher than those being paid for Social Rented units. In Warwick District it is also clear that as Section 106 schemes will not attract grant the types of units delivered will be considered on a scheme by scheme basis with the tenure splits reflecting the needs of the specific area. Therefore, Affordable Rent products are unlikely to be delivered as a like for like replacement for Social Rented units as Warwick District still has a high level of need for this tenure type.
- 9.3 The tenure splits selected for this study are selected to be in line with market delivery expectations and the requirement of WDC housing need. If the tenure splits from the original study had been used, and the Social Rented units substituted with Affordable Rental units, an improvement in viability from the original study would have been seen. However, it is a strategic objective of the Council to continue to deliver additional social rented units across the District from both Section 106 schemes and other development sources and hence the selection of tenure splits for this study incorporates all their prevalent tenure types.
- 9.4 The results of each of the market scenarios tested above show that the distinct markets, namely Town Centres, Suburban Areas, Rural Areas, Urban Extensions, and Deprived Areas, perform differently in the current market conditions and the summary results are shown below.
- 9.5 If we look first at the District as a whole by combining the average results of each of the market areas⁴ we can see the following headline results.

Baseline Market Position	Mid (Point) Position	Improved Market Position
13% Affordable Housing	20% Affordable Housing	35% Affordable Housing

⁴ Excluding sensitivity testing on Urban Extensions

- 9.6 These results are calculated taking the viability on the majority of sites (50% or more) for each of the market sectors, combining them, and giving an average for Warwick District as a whole. If we look at the position where sites start to show viability (1 or more sites yield a viable result) the following results can be seen.

Baseline Market Position	Mid (Point) Position	Improved Market Position
28% Affordable Housing	36% Affordable Housing	38% Affordable Housing

- 9.7 When analysing the results above, it is important to consider that over the 15 year lifespan of the Local Plan the property market will fluctuate and it is important that any subsequent affordable housing policy which is drafted is flexible enough to deal with these changing market cycles.

- 9.8 Given the level of need for affordable housing across the District it is clear that setting a policy for 15 years based on the current market conditions is not sustainable and will not support WDC in meeting its statutory requirement to provide housing for those in need. It is also important to consider here that this document only forms one part of the evidence base for the Affordable Housing Policy and the results of the SHMA need to be considered alongside these results before concluding on an acceptable way forward. Also given the range of scenario modelling undertaken this averaging approach for the whole District is unlikely to give enough clarity to any future Affordable Housing Policy. Therefore analysis of Warwick District has been undertaken in the five distinct market areas in order to gauge differences in site viability between areas in terms of their ability to deliver different proportions of affordable housing.

Overall Average Results

- 9.9 If we take the overall average for each of the market areas the following position can be seen:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Market Position	Improved Market Position
Town Centre	25% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Suburban	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	20% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Deprived Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing
Rural Areas	30% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%Int)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Urban Extension Sites	0% Affordable Housing (25% (60%SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int) based on sensitivity testing)	0% Affordable Housing (40% (60%AR/ 40% SR) based on sensitivity testing)	35% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR) (50%(60%SR/ 25% AR/15% Int) based on sensitivity testing)

9.10 The above results reflect the situation where the majority of sites are viable. If we review this position to record viability where any sites are viable the following results can be seen:

Market Area	Baseline Market Position	Mid Market Position	Improved Market Position
Town Centre	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Suburban	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Deprived Areas	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing	0% Affordable Housing
Rural Areas	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR 25% AR 15%Int)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)	50% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 40% AR)
Urban Extension Sites	10% Affordable Housing (60% SR / 25% AR / 15% Int) (30% (60%SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int) based on sensitivity testing)	30% Affordable Housing (60% AR / 40% SR) (40% (60%SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int) based on sensitivity testing)	40% Affordable Housing (60% SR/ 25% AR/ 15% Int) (50% (60%SR/ 25% AR / 15% Int) based on sensitivity testing)

Percentage of Affordable Housing

9.11 The results above show that a range of 0%- 50% affordable housing is deliverable depending upon the scenario, area tested, tenure split and the tipping point selected. Given that sites in certain areas of the District perform far better than others, it would be possible to justify a zoned affordable housing policy which has different affordable housing percentages by area.

9.12 There is the ability from the analysis undertaken to further segregate these markets into High, Medium and Low value areas though given the complexity that this would bring, DTZ would suggest that the policy is not further segmented as the results would be unmanageable and difficult to interpret. Rather, the information provided above should be used to aid site specific viability discussions.

9.13 Given that it is difficult to predict the future of the housing market and the likelihood of reaching the Improved Market Scenario before the end of the 15 year Local Plan Policy, DTZ would suggest that setting a target assuming this scenario would be ambitious for a policy set in 2011. Equally, setting a 15 year policy based on the current market conditions would also be inappropriate.. Any policy drafted would ideally be flexible to deal with the specific market circumstances prevailing at the time of the application and the specific

conditions of the site – particularly in relation to abnormal development cost as all of the results above exclude any allowance for abnormal development costs.

- 9.14 In order for WDC to consider which market scenario they are closest to at a particular point in time they could undertake primary market research at the time of a particular planning application, and compare this to the assumptions used in the AHVA to determine which market scenario they are closest to. The Council could either utilise the skills of it's own officers in either Development Control or Asset Management teams, who will have an understanding of current market dynamics, or appoint a third party provider to supply this information. This may be done alongside a site specific viability assessment.

Appendix A

Detailed Modelling Results

Town Centres – Baseline Results

Town Centre Sites Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	89%	11%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	22%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	78%	22%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	55%	11%	33%	66%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	39%	28%	33%	67%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	22%	44%	56%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	11%	56%	44%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	11%	50%	50%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	6%	61%	39%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	6%	61%	39%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	6%	67%	33%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	6%	67%	33%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centre Sites - Leamington Spa Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	83%	17%	83%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	33%	17%	83%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centre Sites - Warwick
Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	50%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	33%	67%	33%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centre Sites - Kenilworth
Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	50%	33%	67%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	50%	50%	50%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	33%	50%	50%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centres – Mid Market

Town Centre Sites Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	94%	6%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	78%	11%	11%	89%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	11%	11%	89%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	6%	11%	89%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	83%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	61%	17%	22%	78%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	83%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	45%	28%	28%	73%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	28%	39%	61%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	28%	33%	67%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	45%	28%	28%	73%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	28%	39%	61%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	28%	33%	67%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	33%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	11%	6%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	33%

Town Centre Sites - Leamington Spa Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	50%	0%	100%

Town Centre Sites - Warwick
Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centre Sites - Kenilworth
Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	33%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	67%	17%	84%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	50%	50%	50%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	67%	33%	67%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Town Centres – Improved Market

Town Centre Sites Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	22%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	22%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	39%	33%	28%	72%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	6%	56%	45%

Town Centre - Leamington Spa Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%

Town Centre Sites - Warwick
Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	67%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	50%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	50%	17%	83%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%

Town Centre - Kenilworth
Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	83%	17%	83%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Suburban – Baseline Results

Suburban Sites

Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	39%	17%	44%	55%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	6%	61%	39%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	11%	61%	39%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	11%	56%	44%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	22%	0%	78%	22%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	6%	78%	22%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	22%	0%	78%	22%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	11%	11%	78%	22%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	11%	11%	78%	22%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	11%	11%	78%	22%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	6%	6%	89%	11%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	6%	6%	89%	11%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	11%	0%	89%	11%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	6%	6%	89%	11%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	6%	94%	6%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	6%	94%	6%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	6%	6%	89%	11%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	6%	94%	6%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	6%	94%	6%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Suburban Sites - High Value

Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	83%	17%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	33%	33%	66%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

**Suburban Sites - Med Value
Baseline Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	33%	33%	33%	66%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

**Suburban Sites - Low Value
Baseline Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	0%	0%	100%	0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Suburban – Mid Market Results

Suburban Sites Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	56%	17%	28%	72%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	56%	6%	39%	61%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	56%	0%	44%	56%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	56%	6%	39%	61%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	22%	44%	55%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	28%	11%	61%	39%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	11%	61%	39%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	28%	11%	61%	39%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	22%	11%	67%	33%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	22%	11%	67%	33%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	28%	6%	67%	34%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	22%	6%	72%	28%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	22%	0%	78%	22%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	22%	6%	72%	28%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	22%	6%	72%	28%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	22%	0%	78%	22%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	22%	6%	72%	28%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	6%	0%	94%	6%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	6%	94%	6%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	6%	94%	6%

Suburban Sites - High Value Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	33%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	84%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	50%	33%	67%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	50%	33%	67%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%

**Surban Sites - Med Value
Mid Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	84%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	0%	17%	83%	17%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Suburban – Improved Market Results

Suburban Sites Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	72%	6%	22%	78%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	72%	6%	22%	78%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	72%	6%	22%	78%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	56%	11%	33%	67%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	11%	39%	61%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	56%	0%	44%	56%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	56%	0%	44%	56%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	6%	44%	56%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	39%	17%	44%	56%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	6%	44%	56%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	22%	6%	72%	28%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	11%	72%	28%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	22%	0%	78%	22%

Suburban Sites - High Value Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	84%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%

**Suburban Sites - Med Value
Improved Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	33%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	0%	33%	67%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	0%	33%	67%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	33%	33%	66%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

**Suburban Sites - Low Value
Improved Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Deprived Wards – All Results.

Deprived Wards Sites

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	0%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	0%	0%

Rural Area – Baseline Results

Rural Sites Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	72%	17%	11%	89%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	11%	22%	78%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	11%	22%	78%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	11%	22%	78%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	61%	6%	33%	67%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	56%	17%	28%	72%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	44%	22%	33%	67%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	39%	28%	33%	67%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	28%	33%	67%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	39%	17%	44%	56%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	39%	11%	50%	50%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	11%	50%	50%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	28%	17%	56%	44%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	11%	61%	39%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	28%	11%	61%	39%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	28%	17%	56%	44%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	28%	11%	61%	39%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	28%	11%	61%	39%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	33%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	11%	11%	78%	22%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	11%	72%	28%

Rural Sites - High Value Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%

**Rural Sites - Med Value
Baseline Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	83%	17%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	33%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	33%	17%	83%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	50%	17%	83%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	50%	17%	83%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	50%	17%	83%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	50%	50%	50%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	33%	67%	33%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%

**Rural Sites - Low Value
Baseline Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	33%	33%	33%	66%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Rural Area – Mid Market Results

Rural Sites

Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	89%	11%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	89%	11%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	89%	11%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	89%	6%	6%	95%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	72%	11%	17%	83%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	72%	11%	17%	83%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	72%	11%	17%	83%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	83%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	17%	17%	83%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	83%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	11%	22%	78%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	11%	22%	78%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	11%	22%	78%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	17%	33%	67%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	17%	33%	67%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	11%	56%	45%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	6%	61%	39%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	39%	6%	56%	44%

Rural Sites - High Value

Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%

**Rural Sites - Med Value
Mid Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	33%	17%	83%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	50%	0%	50%	50%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%

**Rural Sites - Low Value
Mid Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	84%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	17%	50%	50%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	17%	50%	50%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	33%	50%	50%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	33%	50%	50%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	33%	50%	50%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	33%	50%	50%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	33%	50%	50%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	33%	50%	50%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%

Rural Area – Improved Market Results

Rural Sites

Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	0%	0%	0%	0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	94%	6%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	94%	6%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	94%	0%	6%	94%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	94%	0%	6%	94%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	94%	0%	6%	94%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	89%	6%	6%	94%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	89%	6%	6%	94%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	89%	6%	6%	94%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	17%	6%	94%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	11%	6%	95%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	89%	6%	6%	94%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	78%	17%	6%	94%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	11%	6%	95%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	61%	6%	33%	67%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	56%	11%	33%	67%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	61%	11%	28%	72%

Rural Sites - High Value

Improved Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%

**Rural Sites - Low Value
Improved Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	67%	17%	17%	84%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	67%	17%	84%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	17%	67%	34%

**Rural Sites - Med Value
Improved Market Position**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	0%	17%	83%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	17%	17%	84%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	0%	17%	83%

Urban Extension Sites – All Scenarios

Urban Extension Sites Baseline Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Urban Extension Sites Mid Market Position

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	0%	67%	33%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	0%	67%	33%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	17%	67%	34%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	17%	0%	83%	17%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	0%	83%	17%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Urban Extension Sites – All Scenarios (Sensitivity Testing)

Urban Extension Sites Baseline (Sensitivity)

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	33%	17%	83%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	33%	33%	66%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	50%	33%	67%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	50%	50%	50%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	17%	33%	50%	50%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	17%	83%	17%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	17%	83%	17%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

**Urban Extension Sites
Mid Market (Sensitivity)**

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			Total Including Amber
		Green	Amber	Red	
0%	n/a				0%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	83%	17%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	67%	33%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	83%	17%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	50%	50%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	33%	33%	33%	66%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	33%	50%	33%	83%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	17%	50%	33%	67%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	33%	67%	33%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	33%	67%	33%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	0%	100%	0%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	0%	100%	0%

Urban Extension Sites
Improved Market Position (Sensitivity)

% AH	Tenure Split	Number of Sites			
		Green	Amber	Red	Total Including Amber
0%	n/a	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
10%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
20%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
25%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
30%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
35%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60%AR 40%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	40%AR 60%SR	100%	0%	0%	100%
40%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	100%	0%	0%	100%
50%	60%AR 40%SR	33%	67%	0%	100%
50%	40%AR 60%SR	0%	50%	50%	50%
50%	60% SR 25% AR 15%INT	0%	83%	17%	83%