

Portsmouth City Council's Response to the Inspectors' questions for Matter 15 Viability and monitoring



Matter 15 Viability, delivery and monitoring

Issue 1: Whether the Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective, and consistent with national policy in relation to viability

- 1) **Is the DVA proportionate and up-to-date having regard to relevant national policy and guidance, and has it taken full account of and appropriately influenced the policy requirements of the Plan? In particular:**
 - a. **Does the Addendum [KD02] introduce any changes that would affect the conclusions of the DVA?**
 - b. **Have there been any material changes in circumstances since the Plan's submission that would affect the conclusions of the DVA?**
- 15.1.1 Yes the 2024 DVA [HO15] is proportionate and up-to-date having regard to relevant national policy and guidance. HDH Planning & Development Ltd (HDH) carried out the Development Viability Assessment 2020 [HO12] to inform the development of the emerging Local Plan. HDH were then commissioned to prepare the 2024 DVA in July 2024 as a comprehensive update to the 2020 DVA. Due to the changes in the planning system and the passage of time, the 2024 DVA was presented as a fresh piece of work, albeit one that built on the 2020 report, in line with the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
- 15.1.2 The 2024 DVA was prepared in line with the requirements of the NPPF and the PPG (Chapter 10 - Viability), follows the Harman Guidance and conforms with the RICS Guidance (HDH is regulated by the RICS). The 2020 DVA work included a period of consultation with the development industry. Comments made through the Regulation 18 consultation were also reviewed and changes made where appropriate.
- 15.1.3 The 2024 DVA is based on the approach set out in the PPG. There were several minor changes to the PPG in 2025, however these do not alter the requirements to consider viability as part of the plan-making process or alter the approach or methodology.
- 15.1.4 The 2024 DVA is based on the 'Existing Use Value (EUV) Plus' approach. It is based on modelling a set of residential 24 typologies (see Chapter 9). These typologies are representative of the type of development that is anticipated to come forward in the Plan area over the plan period. These range from large scale flatted schemes through to smaller greenfield sites. As set out in the second part of Chapter 9, typologies were developed to represent specialist older people's housing, student housing and a range of employment uses. The typologies are representative of the types of development being planned for.
- 15.1.5 The values of market housing (including specialist older people's housing and student housing) were researched, based on published data sources, price paid data from the Land Registry and asking prices of newbuild and existing homes. The values of affordable housing were also derived. The values of non-residential uses are also researched, as were land values. The Council's area was divided into three broad value areas for residential development (Table 4.7) as follows:
 - Higher Value: Old Portsmouth, Port Solent, Gunwharf, Southsea Waterfront;
 - Medium Value: Inland Southsea, Drayton, Farlington;
 - Lower Value: Elsewhere.
- 15.1.6 The details of the residential research are set out in Chapter 4 of the 2024 DVA, the details of the non-residential research are set out in Chapter 5 of the 2024 DVA and the details of the land value research is set out in Chapter 6 of the 2024 DVA.

15.1.7 As set out in Chapter 5 of the 2024 DVA, the costs of development were estimated, as per the 'standardised inputs' set out in the PPG. The costs of construction were based on the BCIS costs, and allowances made for site costs, abnormal costs, contingencies, fees, finance costs etc. An allowance was also made for developer's return (i.e. profit) which is treated as a cost.

15.1.8 The 2024 DVA has taken full account of and influenced the policy requirements of the Plan. The purpose of the 2024 DVA was to consider and inform the development of the Local Plan and, to assess the cumulative impact of the policies on the planned development. The impact of the policies in the emerging Local Plan were considered, in the context of changing national policy in Chapter 8. A core aspect of the assessment was to consider development's ability to bear the costs of strategic infrastructure and mitigation, the main source of funding used by the Council is CIL, although use is also made of S106 contributions. The Council has a long track record of working with other public sector organisations to deliver development.

15.1.9 As set out in Chapter 10 of the 2024 DVA, sets of appraisals were run, and through an iterative process the following policy requirements were developed (see paragraph 10.33 of the 2024 DVA):

- Affordable Housing: 20% on sites of 10 units and larger as 70% Affordable Rent, 30% Intermediate.
- Design Nationally Described Space Standards:
 - Optional water efficiency standard of 110 LPPPD.
 - 5% of market housing as Wheelchair Adaptable (M4(3)a) and 10% of affordable housing as Wheelchair Accessible (M4(3)b) and the balance as Accessible and Adaptable (M4(2))
 - Future Homes Standards,
 - 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (20% on Council owned sites).
- Developer Contributions:
 - CIL (£179.39 per sqm)
 - s106 – Bird Aware payment as per calculator, nutrient neutrality mitigation of £2,500 per payment,
 - £1,000 per unit for other items.

15.1.10 In summary, the 2024 DVA was prepared in line with the requirements of the NPPF and PPG. It is consistent with the subsequent updated NPPFs and updated PPG. Its preparation included informal technical consultation and then was subject to formal consultation through the Regulation 18 process. The policies in the Local Plan have been informed by the viability process.

a. Does the Addendum [KD02] introduce any changes that would affect the conclusions of the DVA?

15.1.11 The Addendum [KD02] does not introduce changes that would affect the conclusions of the DVA. The Addendum considered several discrete points. The main change was the amendment to the Tipner West site and the subsequent updates to other parts of the Plan that flowed from this, as well as updates relating to the 2024 NPPF. Tipner West was not considered in the DVA. The Addendum does not introduce new general policies that apply widely and will have an impact on viability, for example development management policies or additional requirements for developer contributions.

b. Have there been any material changes in circumstances since the Plan's submission that would affect the conclusions of the DVA?

15.1.12 There have not been any material changes in circumstances since the Plan's submission that would affect the conclusions of the DVA. There have been subsequent changes to national policy, including the December 2024 NPPF, and the new August 2026 NPPF. The August 2026 NPPF includes national decision making policies, however, these do not mandate standards or requirements that are above those set out in the submitted Local Plan. Whilst some of the changes may apply straight away, for example flexibility on the market size mix in Policy HO8(3) of the 2026 NPPF, they do not undermine the DVA. It is not considered proportionate or necessary to further update the DVA. A summary of some of the key policy changes since the Plan's submission are listed below:

- HO8(3) of the 2026 NPPF concerns the mix of housing and suggests that a flexible approach to the size mix of market housing – although HO5 does ask that a mix is set out.
- The Government announced in March 2026 that it will be implementing the Future Homes Standard and Future Building Standard through Building Regulations in March 2027. This aligns with the approach taken by the Council and was anticipated in the DVA.
- In July 2026 the Government announced that from August 2026, BNG should only be sought from sites that are larger than 0.2ha. This would have a small impact on viability – improving the situation on the smallest sites.
- In March 2025, the Government announced that the Building Safety Levy (BSL) will be introduced in Autumn 2026. In Portsmouth, the Levy, will be £15.52 per sqm for brownfield land and £31.05 per sqm for greenfield land (Building Safety Levy: Guidance - Section 2: Levy rates and calculations - Guidance - GOV.UK) and would apply to Major Development. This is an additional cost that was not anticipated in the DVA. However, given that most sites are brownfield sites, this is a relatively small cost being about 1% of the BCIS construction costs for housing and 0.7% of the cost of flatted development and it is not considered proportionate to update the DVA in this regard. It is not considered proportionate to update the DVA in this regard.

15.1.13 The impact of changes in costs and values was considered under Question 18 (page 209) of the Council's Response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions (IQR) [PCC06]. This opportunity has been taken to refresh the response, as even more up-to-date information is now available.

15.1.14 The residential value assumptions in the 2024 DVA were researched and gathered in the February 2024. Since then, house prices have increased. There are a range of data sources that can be referenced; however, the Land Registry is the most complete.

Change in Average Newbuild House Prices

	Newbuild	Existing
February 2024	£398,837	£240,475
April 2026	£420,008	£248,235
Change	£21,171 5.31%	£7,760 3.23%

Source: Land Registry (September 2026)

15.1.15 The Land Registry's latest data suggests that the average newbuild sale price in Portsmouth has increased by about 5.3% since the 2024 DVA was undertaken. The build costs in the 2024 DVA, as suggested in the PPG, were derived from the BCIS data. The cost figure for Portsmouth for 'Estate Housing – Generally' was £1,510 per sqm at that time (February 2022 – see Appendix 11). The equivalent figure now (September 2026) has increased to £1,559 per sqm. This data suggests that the cost of construction has increased by about 3.2% since the 2024 DVA was undertaken.

15.1.16 If newbuild house prices have increased more than build costs then viability will have improved, conversely if build costs have increased more than new build house prices then viability will have worsened. Newbuild values have increased by 5.3% since the 2024 DVA was undertaken, and the BCIS based construction costs have increased by about 3.2% since the 2024 DVA was undertaken suggesting that the since the 2024 DVA (HO15) viability may have

improved a little and that the DVA can continue to be relied on and provides a true picture of viability in Portsmouth.

2) Are the policy requirements set at a level such that the cumulative costs would not undermine the deliverability of the development supported by the Plan?

- 15.2.1 Other than the level of the affordable housing requirement, which the Council has set at 30%, whereas the DVA [HO15] advises setting this at 20%, the Council has followed the advice set out in the DVA. The justification for setting the affordable housing level higher is set out in sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Affordable Housing Topic Paper [TP06]. The requirements assumed in the DVA are set out in the Council's answer to Question 1 of this matter.
- 15.2.2 It is important to consider the planned development in the round and that the 2024 DVA is just one part of the evidence base. There is no doubt that the delivery of affordable housing development in Portsmouth is challenging, however, the Council has a good track record of delivering affordable housing, and whilst the findings of the DVA have been carefully considered, consideration has also been given what is happening more widely, and bearing in mind the priority for the delivery of affordable housing, the Council has maintained the 30% requirement in the Plan. To ease the delivery of affordable housing as far as possible, other policy requirements, such as moving to zero carbon, have been minimised.
- 15.2.3 A large proportion of the sites proposed in the Plan are subject to a pending planning application or already have planning permission. It is fair to assume that the promoters/ landowners/ developers of these sites would not pursue these if they did not consider development to be viable.
- 15.2.4 A large proportion of the planned development from the Plan is on sites owned by the Council or by the wider public sector (see Table 19.1 in the Council's answer to Question 19 in the IQR [PCC06], amended version of this is in Appendix 1 to this Matter Statement). This is a significant element of the planned development. Whilst the DVA makes standard assumptions regarding developer return, the Council and wider public sector may take a different approach to this than developers, meaning that sites a developer might consider unviable, the public sector may continue to progress.
- 15.2.5 The Council would like to highlight the ministerial letter from Matthew Pennycook MP to the Interim Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate from July 2026 regarding Local Plan examinations [PCC27] in which Mr Pennycook writes 'to emphasise the importance of taking an appropriately pragmatic and proportionate approach in respect of deliverability and viability when examining local plans.' The Council considers that it has taken a proportionate approach to viability in line with the letter.

3) How were the residual value figures for each site presented in Table 19.1 of IQR identified?

15.3.1 The following multi-stage process was followed to complete Table 19.1 of the IQR:

Columns 1 to 5	The starting point was a table of the allocations showing the site name, the planned number of units, the site area, the density and the ward.
Column 6	To this basic information the Value Area was added, as per the three broad value areas (Table 4.7 of the 2024 DVA). Note these only apply to residential developments.
Column 7	Each site was then related to one of the typologies based on the descriptions in Table 9.2 and 9.3 of the 2024 DVA. This involved a degree of judgement as the typologies are broadly representative.
Columns 8 and 9	These were populated with the EUV and BLV from the appropriate typologies (these do not vary by value area). A convenient place to see these is in 4 th and 5 th columns

Column 10

of the tables in Appendix 17 of the 2024 DVA for residential typologies, Table 11.1 on page 175 of the DVA for employment typologies.

The Residual Value is then taken from the 0% change columns of Appendix 17 of the 2026 DVA, where the results from the sensitivity testing of the suggested policy requirements are set out at 10.33 of the 2024 DVA (see also the response to 1 above).

- 4) **Sites PLP13, EC14 and EC11 in Table 19.1 of the IQR appear to be identified in the incorrect property value area set out in the DVA. Will this affect any other columns within the table, particularly the residual value outputs for these sites?**

15.4.1 The Council has checked sites PLP13, EC14 and EC11 and believes that they are in the correct property value area set out in the DVA.

- 5) **The Lakeside North Harbour and Land West of Portsdown Technology Park site allocations are not included in Table 19.1 of the IQR. Please provide information on the viability of these sites in a similar manner to the other site allocations in the table.**

15.5.1 The Lakeside North Harbour and Land West of Portsdown Technology Park site allocations were not included in Table 19.1 of the IQR as the Council had only included housing allocations in that table. The Council has produced a revised version of Table 19.1, now including Lakeside North Harbour and Land West of Portsdown Technology Park which is appended to this matter statement at Appendix 1.

Issue 2: Whether the monitoring indicators identified within the Plan are effective

- 6) **Are the proposed monitoring indicators, targets, triggers and actions specified in Table 12.1 of the Plan relevant, measurable and clearly time related so they can be monitored during the plan period?**

15.6.1 Yes, as noted in paragraph A233 of the Plan, careful consideration was taken when formulating the indicators and targets to ensure that they are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) and can therefore be monitored on a yearly basis in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). The targets align with the policy requirements (where applicable), the monitoring and delivery frameworks for the site allocations and appropriate evidence base, including but not limited to the HELAA Report and Appendices 2025 [HO04] and various statements of common ground. The triggers and actions are also relevant as they provide mechanisms for the Council to intervene where necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the policies in the Plan. Overall, the indicators, targets, triggers and/or actions are proportionate to what the policy seeks to achieve.

15.6.2 Please note that the Council has proposed modifications MM178 - MM180 in the Main Modifications [PCC03] to Table 12.1. The Council also proposes supplementary modifications [PCC15] to Table 12.1 for Policies PLP6 and PLP12 so that it aligns with the updated housing trajectory and/or changes to the employment figures. Please see below:

Modifications to Table 12.1 Local Plan Monitoring

Policy		Targets	Indicators	Partners, delivery mechanisms, triggers and actions required if policy not being achieved.
PLP6	Portsmouth City Centre	11,600 m² <u>3,600m²</u> of office floorspace	Outline & reserved matters permissions granted Number of net	Development progress will be monitored through the AMR. If

		completed between 2025-30 <u>-15,754m² of office floorspace completed between 2030-2035</u> 10,000m² of Office floorspace completed between 2030-40 957 <u>701</u> homes completed 2025-30 4,976 <u>1,877</u> homes completed between 2030-35 525 <u>777</u> homes completed 2035-40	additional homes and commercial floorspace m² completed Overview of development within the City Centre, including regard to delivery milestones arising from targets identified in any relevant masterplan(s)	there is a lack of progress further work will be undertaken to ascertain the reason and propose interventions
PLP12	St John's College	Delivery of 212 <u>149</u> homes between 2030-35	Outline & reserved matter permissions granted Number of net additional homes and m² commercial floorspace completed.	Ongoing liaison with The developer and close cooperation to identify potential sources of delay and deliver timescales more precisely.
PLP16	Housing Target	At least 589 <u>562</u> new homes delivered in the City each year for the years 2025-30 At least 843 <u>828</u> new homes delivered in the City each year for the years 2030-40	Number of net additional homes with extant permission Number of net additional homes completed Summary of delivery milestones for strategic sites and allocations arising from targets identified in relevant policies Five year housing land supply and trajectory looking forward to the remainder of the plan period	Housing Delivery Test consequences including the tilted balance and implementing the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan
PLP25	Employment Target	Targets: Office 60,248 <u>51,330</u>m²	Amount of floorspace delivered by use class	Liaison with PCC Economic Growth & Skills team

		R&D/Industrial processes 14,118m ² B2/B8 64,380m ² <u>64,780m²</u>		
--	--	---	--	--

7) **Is it sufficiently clear how the triggers and potential actions for each Monitoring and Delivery Framework for the site allocations is intended to interact with the monitoring indicators Table 12.1?**

15.7.1 The Council proposes a supplementary modification [PCC15] to paragraph A223 of the Plan to make it clear how the triggers and potential actions for each Monitoring and Delivery Framework for the site allocations is intended to interact with the monitoring indicators in Table 12.1. Please see below:

A223. Table 12.1 sets out the Local Plan policies and the targets they seek to achieve. In order to monitor whether or not these targets are being met, indicators are used to assess each policy's yearly performance. The indicators take into account the triggers and potential actions (where applicable) detailed in the monitoring and delivery frameworks for the site allocations in chapters 4 and 5. This information will be gathered using an array of methods and will be reliant upon a number of stakeholders and bodies to provide key data. Careful consideration has been taken when formulating these indicators to ensure that they are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) and can therefore be monitored on a yearly basis.

15.7.2 For example, a number of sites have been allocated for residential use, with the relevant monitoring and delivery frameworks stating that 'development progress will be monitored through the AMR. If there is a lack of progress further work will be undertaken to ascertain the reason and propose interventions' as the trigger and potential action. This aligns with the corresponding indicators in Table 12.1, whereby outline and reserved matters permissions serve as the main indicator to monitor progress with housing delivery, which are also captured in the AMR.

15.7.3 A column is also included in Table 12.1, namely 'Partners, delivery mechanisms, triggers and actions required if policy not being achieved' which aligns with the monitoring and delivery frameworks where appropriate.

8) **Are any other indicators necessary for monitoring purposes to ensure the soundness of the Plan?**

15.8.1 The Council does not consider any other indicators are necessary for monitoring purposes to ensure the soundness of the Plan. Please see paragraph A224 of the Plan for justification.

15.8.2 The Council acknowledges that not all policies have been included in the monitoring framework, however this does not undermine the soundness of the Plan. For some policies, the Council considered that there were no appropriate indicators to monitor their performance. For example, as noted in the Soundness & Quality Assessment of the Plan [KD31], Policy PLP37 Contaminated Land has not been included; the presence of contamination depends on the context and location of sites and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Appendix 1 Typologies for sites allocated and identified in the Plan (revised Table 19.1 from the IQR [PCC06])

Site name	Dwelling No.s	Site Area (hectares)	Density (dwellings per gross hectare)	Ward	Property Value Area	Typology	Existing Use Value/£	Benchmark Land Value/£	Residual Value/£	Comments	Relevant SCG	Public Sector owner
PLP3: Tipner West	1,000	29.39	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not covered by DVA	SCG49	PCC
PLP4: Tipner East	1,056	12.13	87	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not covered by DVA	SCG37 re Bellway/Homes England parcel; SCG42 re PCC land, remaining parcel under construction	PCC - transport hub element only
PLP6: Portsmouth City Centre (see below CD16 to CD50)												
CD16 - Matalan Outlet & Car Park	300 <i>Note this site is no longer available for housing</i>	0.92	652 (assuming half the site is for residential)	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	No
CD17: City Centre North	1600-2300	13.14	175	-	-	-	-	-	-	Not covered by DVA	SCG51	Mostly owned by PCC
CD18: Debenhams, Commercial Road	569	0.79	720	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise 600 (1ha)	2,000,000	2,400,000	-17,868,536	Unviable	-	No
CD25: Portsmouth Mail Centre	102	0.49	208	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 100	2,000,000	2,400,000	-326,598	Unviable	SCG29	No
CD26: Land adjacent Catherine House	147	0.21	700	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	No
CD28: 2-10 Edinburgh Road	20	0.03	627	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	-	No
CD30: 41-47 Arundel Street	40	0.07	571	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	-	No
CD31: 194-198 Commercial Road	80	0.13	615	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	SCG50	No
CD32: 200-204 Commercial Road	40	0.06	667	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	SCG30	No
CD34: Tesco/NCP, Craswell Street	160	0.89	180	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 100	2,000,000	2,400,000	-326,598	Unviable	-	No
CD36: 12-28 Arundel Street	249*	0.14	1,779	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	No
CD37: Arundel St - Shopmobility	76	0.04	1,900	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	SCG47	PCC
CD50: Greggs - Nationwide, Commercial Road	70	0.11	583	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	-	No
PLP5: Lakeside North Harbour	N/A	49.72	N/A		Low	Offices	1,250,000	1,500,000	-9,947,615	Unviable	SCG34	PCC
PLP7: Fratton Park & the Pompey Centre	710	12.6	56	Milton	Medium	Low Density 120	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,767,227	Viable	SCG44 re Fratton Park parcel	No
PLP8: St James' and Langstone Campus	417 (405 excluding 12 completions)	33.03	13	Milton	Medium	Low Density 120	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,767,227	Viable	SCG31 re Homes England parcel; SCG32 re PJ Livesey parcel; SCG39 re University of Portsmouth parcel	Part owned by Homes England

PLP10: Land West of Portsdown Technology Park	N/A	9.43	N/A		Low	Large Industrial	1,250,000	1,500,000	638,103	Unviable	SCG45	No
PLP11: Port Solent	900	10.50	86	Paulsgrove	High	Flats 250	2,000,000	2,400,000	384,831	Unviable	SCG52	PCC, but on long term lease
PLP12: St John's College	149	1.97	75	St Jude	Medium	Mid Density 100	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,999,944	Viable	SCG36	No
PLP13: Fraser Range	134	6.34	21	Eastney & Craneswater	Low	Low Density 120	1,250,000	1,500,000	846,159	Unviable	SCG43	No
PLP14: The News Centre, Hilsea	100	2.55	39	Hilsea	Low	Low Density 120	1,250,000	1,500,000	846,159	Unviable	SCG46	No
PLP15: Somers Orchard	566	3.37	168	St Thomas	Low	Flats 250	2,000,000	2,400,000	-320,801	Unviable	SCG48	PCC
COP01: Brynwell Builder's Yard	25	0.10	193	Copnor	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	-	No
COS01: Cosham Health Centre	70	0.33	215	Cosham	Medium	Mid Density 50	1,250,000	1,500,000	295,914	Unviable	-	NHS
CS06: 227-231 Goldsmith Avenue	25	0.09	278	Central Southsea	Medium	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	270,649	Unviable	-	No
EC14: Eastney Swimming Pool	6	0.88	7	Eastney & Craneswater	Low	Low Density 6	1,250,000	1,500,000	514,521	Unviable	-	PCC
FR06: St Wildfrids Church	8	0.09	92	Fratton	Low	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	-1,638,725	Unviable	-	No
MI07: 185-192 Highland Road	8	0.04	200	Milton	Medium	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	1,298,452	Unviable	-	No
ST03: Open space at Stone Street	18	0.28	64	St Thomas	Medium	Mid Density 12	1,250,000	1,500,000	484,125	Unviable	-	PCC
BA01: Coniston Avenue	11	0.28	39	Baffins	Low	Low Density 12	1,250,000	1,500,000	-76,601	Unviable	-	No
BA02: West of Milton Road	8	0.19	42	Baffins	Low	Low Density 6	1,250,000	1,500,000	514,521	Unviable	-	No
CD01: Wardroom	200	2.71	74	Charles Dickens	Low	Mid Density 200	1,250,000	1,500,000	158,984	Unviable	-	MOD
CD04: The Invincible	40**	0.03	1333	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	-	No
CD07: Bridge Centre	115	0.38	304	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	PCC
CD10: Maxstoke Close Car Park	5	0.12	42	Charles Dickens	Low	Low Density 6	1,250,000	1,500,000	514,521	Unviable	-	PCC
CD15: Hertford Place	17	0.16	106	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,313,746	Unviable	-	PCC
CD35: Groundlings Theatre	20	0.12	167	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	-	No
CD65: 117-127 Fratton Road	30	0.18	167	Charles Dickens	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	-	No
CD75: Venture Tower	41*	0.09	456	Charles Dickens	Low	High Rise Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-4,954,352	Unviable	-	No
COS03: Westmoors	10	0.07	143	Cosham	Medium	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	391,763	Unviable	-	No
COS04: Former Cosham Police Station	60	0.28	214	Cosham	Medium	Mid Density 50	1,250,000	1,500,000	295,914	Unviable	-	Police
COS05: Clockhouse Centre	18*	0.08	225	Cosham	Medium	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	391,763	Unviable	-	No
DF02: Karen Avenue	6	0.45	13	Drayton & Farlington	Medium	Greenfield 6	50,000	1,250,000	2,890,901	Viable	-	No
ECO2B: Land at Halliday Crescent	5	0.03	167	Eastney & Craneswater	Medium	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	1,298,452	Unviable	-	No
EC11: Southsea Marina	12	4.49	3	Eastney & Craneswater	Low	Low Density 12	1,250,000	1,500,000	-76,601	Unviable	-	No
HI01: Hilsea Lodge	34	0.48	71	Hilsea	Low	Mid Density 30	1,250,000	1,500,000	-1,823,712	Unviable	-	PCC
HI02: Land of former supermarket	20	0.18	111	Hilsea	Low	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,313,746	Unviable	-	No

HI04: Land at Pompey Health and Fitness	10	6.89	33 (based on developable area of land of 0.3ha)	Hilsea	Low	Low Density 12	1,250,000	1,500,000	-76,601	Unviable	-	No
HI13: TA Centre, Peronne Road	28	1.34	21	Hilsea	Low	Low Density 30	1,250,000	1,500,000	-250,157	Unviable	-	MOD
MI05: Goldsmith Avenue	20	0.33	61	Milton	Medium	Mid Density 200	1,250,000	1,500,000	1,711,484	Viable	-	No
NE01: Connect Centre	191	0.53	360	Nelson	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	No
NE03: Former Police Station	60	0.41	146	Nelson	Low	Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	-353,407	Unviable	-	Police
NE05: 205 London Road	5 (8 gross)	0.02	400 (based on gross)	Nelson	Low	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	-1,638,725	Unviable	-	No
NE06: Blue Anchor PH	6	0.03	200	Nelson	Low	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	-1,638,725	Unviable	-	No
NE09: 98 London Road	30	0.18	167	Nelson	Low	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,178,824	Unviable	-	No
NE22: Land at Heathfield Road	18	0.08	225	Nelson	Low	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,313,746	Unviable	-	No
PA03: 140 Southampton Road	20	0.16	125	Paulsgrove	Low	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,313,746	Unviable	-	No
PA16: Amenity land off Newbolt Rd & Bodmin Rd	8	0.17	47	Paulsgrove	Low	Low Density 6	1,250,000	1,500,000	514,521	Unviable	-	PCC
SJ04: 61-63 Marmion Road	5	0.06	83	St Jude	Medium	Mid Density 6	1,250,000	1,500,000	2,048,256	Viable	-	No
SJ12: 82-88 Clarendon Road	20	0.04	500	St Jude	Medium	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	391,763	Unviable	-	No
SJ16: Wimbledon Park Sports Centre	30	0.23	130	St Jude	Medium	Flats 30	2,000,000	2,400,000	270,649	Unviable	-	PCC
SJ17: Queen's Hotel and Casino	104	0.95	109	St Jude	Medium	Flats 100	2,000,000	2,400,000	1,986,242	Unviable	-	No
ST01: City Records Office	45	0.35	129	St Thomas	Medium	Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	1,978,489	Unviable	-	PCC
ST02: 32-60 Middle Street	163	0.24	869	St Thomas	Low	High Rise 150	2,000,000	2,400,000	-9,481,569	Unviable	-	Mostly owned by PCC
ST04: Wightlink Car Park	60	0.35	171	St Thomas	High	Flats 60	2,000,000	2,400,000	386,101	Unviable	-	No
ST07: Derelict Land	14*	0.04	350	St Thomas	Low	Flats 12	2,000,000	2,400,000	-2,313,746	Unviable	-	No
ST12: Cathedral House	8	0.07	114	St Thomas	High	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	-723,444	Unviable	-	No
ST13: 62 Middle Street	8*	0.03	266	St Thomas	Low	Flats 6	2,000,000	2,400,000	-1,638,725	Unviable	-	No
ST17: Clarence Pier	200	1.58	127	St Thomas	High	Flats 25-	2,000,000	2,400,000	384,831	Unviable	-	No