

# Louch Shacklock and Partners LLP Chartered Surveyors

The Barn, 16 Warren Yard, Warren Park, Stratford Road, Milton Keynes, MK12 5NW

Tel: 01908 224 760 Web: louchshacklock.com

## LAND AND PREMISES AT ROMAN PARK RESIDENTS' CLUB, BANCROFT PARK, MILTON KEYNES

## **MARKET APPRAISAL**

PREPARED FOR ROMAN PARK MANAGEMENT LTD

BY JONATHAN WHITTLE MRICS

9<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2025

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared for Roman Park Management Ltd following my initial report in April 2024 to provide a more detailed assessment of the potential value if the site were to be sold for redevelopment for residential use. This report is not a formal valuation and is a market appraisal undertaken for estate agency purposes only.
- 1.2 Since the April 2024 report we have commissioned a legal report, topographical survey, architectural design study and town planning appraisal.
- 1.3 I am a Partner of Louch Shacklock & Partners LLP and I have worked as a commercial property agent in Milton Keynes for over 25 years. I am a Chartered Surveyor, RICS Registered Valuer and a qualified Expert Witness.

## 2.0 LEGAL REPORT

- 2.1 Howes Percival Solicitors provided the legal report which considered matters within the freehold title (BM104638) that may conflict with redevelopment proposals. Issues identified included subterranean mining rights, restrictive covenants, rights reserved in favour of adjoining land and a legal charge.
- 2.2 Subterranean Mining and Minerals Rights
- 2.2.1 The freehold title excludes from the property any mining and minerals rights beneath the surface. These rights are reserved for neighbouring land under titles BM254815 and BM90922 which are edged red and green on the following page.
- 2.2.2 There is no evidence for the existence of mining or mineral deposits beneath the property, but if they were discovered in the future this would disrupt any development programme. It is also possible that development activity, including digging, laying pipework and other ground intrusive activities, could cause the beneficiaries of the mineral rights to raise an action for trespass. If we were selling the site to a property developer their legal team would raise these issue and require a solution. On this basis it is recommended that mines and minerals indemnity insurance cover, which would cover both a claim for trespass and losses incurred due to excavation, should be purchased as part of the marketing strategy and prior to marketing the site.







## 2.3 Restrictive Covenants

- 2.3.1 There are covenants in the title that may be breached in the event of redevelopment, including restrictions on cutting down trees, use of commercial vehicles, prohibition of aerials and granting of leases longer than 7 years (e.g. long leasehold interests that may be granted upon the sale of residential apartments). The beneficiaries of the covenants are the successors to Milton Keynes Development Corporation, now Homes England.
- 2.3.2 These covenants date back to 1987 and are relatively historic, but it is recommended that title indemnity insurance against enforcement of any restrictive covenants is purchased and, similar to the mining and minerals rights, this will be required by any property developer interested in purchasing the site.

## 2.4 Rights Reserved

- 2.4.1 There are rights reserved in favour of the adjoining land (shown in the plan above) in respect of maintaining service media that may run though the property, including telecom, water, drainage, gas and electricity.
- 2.4.2 These rights are described in the legal report as not being of "material concern" but should be considered as part of any potential redevelopment of the property.



## 2.5 Legal Charge

- 2.5.1 There is a Legal Charge in favour of the Homes & Communities Agency (now Homes England) dated 25<sup>th</sup> January 1989.
- 2.5.2 We understand that Homes England have confirmed to Roman Park Management that the terms of the Legal Charge has been satisfied, however, a formal application has not been made to the Land Registry to remove it from the freehold title.
- 2.6 The overall conclusion of the legal report is that, if the recommended pre-emptive steps are taken, the preceding issues raised will not preclude potential residential development of the site.

## 3.0 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN STUDY

- 3.1 Following completion of the topographical survey by MK Surveys, to provide the requisite level of detail about the dimensions, levels, structures, vegetation and materials of the site in its existing configuration, we instructed V4 Architects to undertake a design study. The aim of the study was to understand what options might be considered in terms of the scale and form of a future residential development.
- 3.2 V4 submitted three designs, as follows:
  - i. Adaptation of the existing building by replacement of the roof with an additional first floor of eight new apartments (existing ground floor commercial space retained and refurbished).
  - ii. Demolition of the existing building and replacement with 3 new apartment blocks.
  - iii. As above but with replacement with 5 new detached dwellings.
- 3.3 The scale and form of the three development options were as follows:
  - i. 4,650 sq ft (gross internal area) of new residential 1<sup>st</sup> floor area (+ common parts) and 4,500 sq ft (net internal area) of ground floor commercial space. 25 car parking spaces.
  - ii. 13,853 sq ft (gross internal area) of new residential apartments; 24 dwellings in total, arranged in 3 x three-storey blocks. 38 car parking spaces.
  - iii. 7,212 sq ft (gross internal area) of new detached houses; 5 dwellings in total, with large gardens and detached garages.
- 3.4 The V4 design options are reproduced on the following pages.



Option 1 – Upward Extension to Provide 8 Apartments Above Existing Ground Floor





## Option 2 – Redevelopment as 24 Apartments





Page **5** of **12** JW 11/09/25



Option 3 – Redevelopment as 5 Detached Houses





## 4.0 TOWN PLANNING APPRAISAL

- 4.1 Smith Jenkins completed a town planning appraisal of the principle of change of use to residential, with reference to local and national planning policies, with an evaluation of the prospects for securing planning consent for each of the three development options drafted by V4.
- 4.2 The key conclusions of the town planning appraisal were as follows:
  - i. Whilst not formally identified as a community facility in the policy maps in the Local Plan, the property could be considered as a community facility, which would be protected by Policy CC3 Protection of Community Facilities. The demolition and redevelopment proposals in Options 2 and 3 would be less likely to secure planning consent, on this basis, than Option 1.
  - ii. Change of use to residential in this location is aligned with Policies DS1 and DS2 of the Local Plan and so if evidence for the underutilisation of the facility can be provided then Options 2 and 3 are viable.
  - iii. Options 1 and 2 meet the Local Planning Authority car parking requirements, whilst Option 3 falls one car parking space short of the standard. Option 1 is considered to be the favoured scheme in terms of highways and transport, as it will have the least impact upon the surrounding highway network.
  - iv. Option 1 has environmental pollution (Policy NE6) issues created by noise and disturbance from the ground floor use to the residential apartments above.
  - v. Option 1 lacks outdoor amenity provision for the apartments, which is also in conflict with Policy NE6.
  - vi. Biodiversity Net Gain ('BNG') standards would have to be met by Options 2 and 3 which would require a 10% net gain of green space or habitat to be achieved to secure planning permission. Option 1 would lead to minimal disturbance of the existing vegetation or habitat on the site.
  - vii. Bancroft Villa is within close proximity to the site and the design of Options 2 and 3 would have to satisfy Policies HE1 and ECP5 in terms of impact upon heritage assets resulting from a significant change to the visual form of development in the area.
- viii. Policies HN1 and HN2 would require the inclusion of at least 31% of the 24 apartments to be delivered as affordable housing under Option 2, as the number of proposed apartments exceeds the affordable housing threshold of 11 dwellings. This will have an impact upon the net development value of the site for Option 2, whereas Options 1 and 3 would not trigger an obligation to provide affordable housing.
- ix. Options 1 and 3 provide a density and built form of development that is consistent with the surrounding area, whereas Option 2 is of higher density and of a different form.
- x. The number of dwellings in Option 2 is likely to lead to a formal obligation to enter into an agreement with the Local Authority to make a capital contribution towards local infrastructure (known as a s.106 agreement) under Policy INF1. Options 1 and 3 are not likely to trigger this requirement. This additional cost will have an impact upon the net development value of Option 2.



- 4.3 Overall, Option 1 is considered by Smith Jenkins to be the optimal approach to developing the site and most likely to result in a successful planning application. Planning consent could be secured for Options 2 and 3 but these options have more constraints, which will need to be satisfied if an application is to be successful.
- 4.4 All options will require careful preparation and pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority.

## 5.0 EXISTING TENANCIES

- 5.1 1<sup>st</sup> Choice Properties notice served to end the lease effective in November. Rent payable under existing lease £9,000 pa. Expected rent receivable following re-letting £10,000 pa exclusive.
- 5.2 Snipaholix a new lease is being negotiated with a proposed term expiring  $1^{st}$  July 2029, which can be terminated by either party serving no less than 6 months' notice during the lease term.
- 5.3 Roman Crown a lease has been granted to Silver Street Pubco Ltd for a term expiring  $1^{st}$  July 2029 at a rent payable of £26,000 pa exclusive. The lease can be terminated by either party serving no less than 6 months' notice during the lease term.
- 5.4 The existing lease arrangements provide flexibility for gaining vacant possession, if required, for the purposes of redevelopment.

## 6.0 DEVELOPMENT APPRAISAL

- 6.1 I have researched construction costs and sale values for the proposed residential development options. I have undertaken an appraisal of market value for the freehold interest in the land if sold for development, using the residual method of valuation.
- 6.2 My assessment of market value for the three options is as follows:

Option 1 £835,0000 (£335,000 for the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension + £500,000 for the existing ground floor)

Option 2 £500,000

Option 3 £465,000

- 6.3 My initial assessment of market value of the land if sold for residential development was £2,000,000. Following this more detailed exercise, the values for all three options are considerably lower. The reasons for this are as follows:
  - For Option 3 the density of development is roughly 50% less than my initial forecast for detached housing.
  - The net development value of Option 2 has been reduced by 30% to meet the affordable housing quota.
  - Construction costs have increased by 25%.
  - Sale values have remained static.
- 6.4 Please find my calculations on the following pages.



# <u>Residual Valuation</u> Redevelopment of Roman Park Residents' Club for Residential Use



							and partners LLP
Value Of Project Upon Completion							
Gross Internal Area			4,650	saft			
Sale Value		£		per sq ft			
Gross Development Value		£	1,860,019	£	400.00 p	er sq ft	
Pre Development Costs							
Ground work		£					
Demolition and disposal of materials		£	-				
Surveys and Planning Application		£	50,000				
Construction Costs							
Gross External Area (Sq Ft)			4,883				
Build Cost Per Sq Ft		£	200.00				
Construction Cost		£	976,510	1.0			
Contingency	5.00%	£	48,826				
,	0.00.0	£	1,025,336	£	220.50 p	er sq ft	
Fees	Dept. Street, except						
Architect and Planning	3.50%	£	35,887				
Quantity Surveyor	1.50%	£	15,380				
Structural Engineer	1.50%	£	15,380				
Mechanical and Electrical Engineer	1.00%	£	10,253				
Project Management and CDM	1.50%	£	15,380				
Other	1.00%	£	10,253				
Sub-total	10.00%		t and a second				
		£	102,534	£	22.05 p	er sq ft	
Finance Costs							
Pre Development Costs	£	50.000					
Interest Rate/Months	7.50%	β £	1,875				
Construction Costs	£ 10	25,336					
Interest Rate/Months (averaged)	Commence of the Commence of th	₿ £	19,225				
		00.504					
Professional Costs Interest Rate/Months (averaged)		02,534 6 £	1,923				
	1. 1000000	- 0.00					
Roll-Up Holding Period		77,869					
Interest Rate/Months	7.50%	8 £	44,170 67,193	£	14.45 p	er sa ft	
Madestine and Discount Costs			01,100	-	11.10	2411	
Marketing and Disposal Costs Selling Agent	1.50%	£	27,900				
Legal Costs	1.50%	£	27,900				
	1.50/6	£	15,000				
Marketing Budget		£	70,801	£	15.23 p	er sq ft	
Appraisal							
NET DEVELOPMENT VALUE		£	1,860,019				
Pre Development Costs		£	50,000				
Construction Costs		£	1,025,336				
Professional Fees		£	102,534				
Finance Costs		£	67,193				
Marketing and Disposal Costs		£	70,801				
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS		£	1,315,862				
GROSS RESIDUAL VALUE		£	544,157				
DEVELOPER'S PROFIT @	15.00%	£	197,379				
SALDENIAGE OFFICE CONTROL OF	10.00%						
NET RESIDUAL VALUE		£	346,777				
Purchaser's Acquisition Costs							
Stamp Duty		£	6,839				
Professional Fees		£	6,936				
NET REALISATION PRICE		£	333,003				OPTION 1
		_					OF HON I



Residual Valuation
Redevelopment of Roman Park Residents' Club for Residential Use



Value Of Project Upon Completion						
Gross Internal Area (Private Sale)			9,697			
Sale Value		£		per sq ft		
GIA (Affordable Housing) Sale Value		£	4,156 200.00			
Gross Development Value		£	4,952,543	£	510.71	per sq ft
Pre Development Costs Ground work		£	50.000			
Demolition and disposal of materials		£	50,000			
Surveys and Planning Application		£	50,000 150,000			
Construction Costs						
Gross External Area (Sq Ft)		0	14,546			
Build Cost Per Sq Ft		£	200.00	l <sub>e</sub>		
Construction Cost	E noor	£	2,909,186			
Contingency	5.00%	£	3,054,646	£	315.00	per sq ft
Fees						
Architect and Planning	3.50%	£	106,913			
Quantity Surveyor	1.50%	£	45,820 45,820			
Structural Engineer Mechanical and Electrical Engineer	1.00%	£	30,546			
Project Management and CDM	1.50%	£	45,820			
Other	1.00%	£	30,546			
Sub-total	10.00%	E	305,465	· c	31.50	per sq ft
F Ct-		- 6	303,403	L	31.00	per sq n
Finance Costs Pre Development Costs	£ 150	.000				
Interest Rate/Months	7.50% 6	£	5,625			
Construction Costs	£ 3,054		57.075			
Interest Rate/Months (averaged)	7.50% 6	£	57,275			
Professional Costs Interest Rate/Months (averaged)	£ 305 7.50% 6	i,465 £	5,727			
Roll-Up Holding Period Interest Rate/Months	£ 3,510 7.50% 6	1,110 £	131,629			
Interest Rate Months	7.50% 6	£	200,256	£	20.65	per sq ft
Marketing and Disposal Costs		943				
Selling Agent	1.50%	£	61,820			
Legal Costs	1.50%	£	61,820			
Marketing Budget		£	15,000	£	14.30	per sq ft
Appraisal						
NET DEVELOPMENT VALUE		£	4,952,543			
Pre Development Costs		£	150,000			
Construction Costs		£	3,054,646			
Professional Fees		£	305,465			
Finance Costs		£	200,256			
Marketing and Disposal Costs TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS		£	138,640 3,849,007	6		
GROSS RESIDUAL VALUE		£	1,103,537			
DEVELOPER'S PROFIT @	15.00%	£	577,351			
NET RESIDUAL VALUE		£	526,186			
Purchaser's Acquisition Costs						
Stamp Duty		£	15,809			
Professional Fees		£	10,524			OPTION 2
NET REALISATION PRICE		£	499,853			



Residual Valuation
Redevelopment of Roman Park Residents' Club for Residential Use



Value Of Project Upon Completion			
Gross Internal Area		7,212 sq ft	
Sale Value		£ 450.00 per sq f	t.
Gross Development Value		£ 3,245,346 £	450.00 per sq ft
Pre Development Costs			
Ground work		£ 50,000	
Demolition and disposal of materials		£ 50,000	
Surveys and Planning Application		£ 50,000	
		£ 150,000	
Construction Costs			
Gross External Area (Sq Ft)		7,572	
Build Cost Per Sq Ft		£ 230.00	
Construction Cost		£ 1,741,669	
Contingency	5.00%	£ 87,083	
		£ 1,828,752 £	253.58 persqft
Fees			
Architect and Planning	3.50%	£ 64,006	
Quantity Surveyor	1.50%	£ 27,431	
Structural Engineer	1.50%	£ 27,431	
Mechanical and Electrical Engineer	1.00%	£ 18,288	
Project Management and CDM	1.50%	£ 27,431	
Other	1.00%	£ 18.288	
Sub-total	10.00%	£ 10,200	
Sub-total	10.00%	£ 182,875 £	25.36 per sq ft
Finance Costs			
Pre Development Costs	£ 150,000	)	
Interest Rate/Months	7.50% 6	£ 5,625	
Construction Costs	£ 1,828,752	2	
Interest Rate/Months (averaged)	7.50% 6	£ 34,289	
ancres (decraged)	7.00%	2 01,200	
Professional Costs	£ 182,875	5	
Interest Rate/Months (averaged)	7.50% 6	£ 3,429	
Rell Un Halding Regard	C 2 181 820		
Roll-Up Holding Period Interest Rate/Months	£ 2,161,628 7.50% 6		
interest Rate/Months	7.50% 6	£ 81,061 £ 124,404 £	17.25 persqft
Machatina and Disposal Costs			
Marketing and Disposal Costs	1.50%	£ 48,680	
Selling Agent			
Legal Costs	1.50%	£ 48,680	
Marketing Budget		£ 15,000	2222000000000
		£ 112,360 £	15.58 persqft
Appraisal			
NET DEVELOPMENT VALUE		£ 3,245,346	
Pre Development Costs		£ 150,000	
Construction Costs		£ 1,828,752	
Professional Fees		£ 182,875	
Finance Costs		£ 124,404	
Marketing and Disposal Costs TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS		£ 112,360 £ 2,398,392	
GROSS RESIDUAL VALUE		£ 846,954	
GROSS RESIDUAL VALUE		£ 846,934	
DEVELOPER'S PROFIT @	15.00%	£ 359,759	
NET RESIDUAL VALUE		£ 487,195	
Purchaser's Acquisition Costs			
80.000.0000000		ge III (140/00/00/00/00	
Stamp Duty		£ 13,860	
Professional Fees		£ 9,744	OPTION 3
NET REALISATION PRICE		£ 463,591	an namada.
enough Websited Double measure (VECT-ROCK)			



## 7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 My view of the market value of the site if sold for residential development is £500,000-£800,000. The market value of the site with its existing use is £500,000. On this basis, pursuing residential development does not appear to be a strategy that is worthwhile in financial terms, unless the operation of the Roman Crown by the new tenant proves to be no longer viable in the future.
- 7.2 There are, however, a number of issues that can be investigated in order to see if the value of the proposed residential options can be maximized in terms of both cost reduction and design.
- 7.3 The following actions are recommended:
  - Obtain quotes for title indemnity insurance covering the restrictive covenant and other legal constraints referred to in this report.
  - Instruct Howes Percival to apply to Homes England to ensure that the Land Registry formally discharge the Legal Charge.
  - Discussion with V4 Architects to establish if the density of development can be increased for Options 2 and 3, perhaps a mixed scheme of apartments and houses.
  - Discussion with V4 regarding cost reduction, for example, by joining apartment blocks, semi-detached houses, or conversion of existing ground floor accommodation to residential use.
- 7.4 With further refinement of the development options, it may be possible to increase the value to £750,000-£1,000,000. V4 have confirmed that they would not charge for this additional viability work.

**JONATHAN WHITTLE MRICS** 

Partner

Louch Shacklock and Partners LLP Email: jonathan@louchshacklock.com