Neil Powling DipBE FRICS DipProjMan(RICS)

PROOF OF EVIDENCE

FOR PUBLIC ENQUIRY COMMENCING ON 1 DECEMBER 2020

APPEAL SITE

135-149 Shaftsbury Avenue, London WC2H 8AH

APPELLANT

Capitalstart Limited

APPEAL

Appeal against London Borough of Camden's refusal of planning permission for;

The comprehensive refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed building and the provision of a new two storey roof extension and new basement level, providing a new four screen cinema (Class D2) and spa (sui generis) as basement levels, a restaurant/bar (Class A3/A4) at ground floor level, a 94-bed hotel (Class C1) at part ground and first to sixth floors and associated terrace and bar (Class A4) at roof level, together with associated public realm and highways improvements.

Planning Inspectorate Reference Nos.

APP/X5210/W/19/3243781 & APP/X5210/Y/19/324782

London Borough of Camden Application Reference

2017/7051/P & 2018/0037/L

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

I am Neil P. Powling DipBE FRICS DipProjMan(RICS). I became an Associate of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) in 1971 and a Fellow in 1984 and have 49 years post qualification experience. Following a 4 year (6 month) sandwich course I was awarded a Diploma in Building Economics by Willesden College of Technology in 1970. I was awarded the RICS Diploma in Project Management by the College of Estate Management in 1984. My initial training was with Northcroft Neighbour & Nicholson Chartered Quantity Surveyors during the period 1966 to 1974. I established my own practice of Chartered Quantity Surveyors Neil Powling & Partners in 1974 and merged with another practice in 1980 to form The Badenoch Powling Partnership. In 1986 I was a Director of an Interior Design Group specialising in hotels (both new build and refurbishment) and left in 1992 to establish PDM - Project Development & Management – a company specialising in Project Management, contract administration and quantity surveying.

I was a founder member of the Project Management Association of the RICS and Chairman in 1989/1991. I was the principal author of the first RICS Standard Conditions of Engagement for Project Management. I served on a number of RICS committees and have represented the RICS on other committees or working groups. I was the elected member for the South East of the RICS Project Management Faculty until 2002.

I act as a cost consultant to BPS Chartered Surveyors providing construction cost advice in advising local authorities. I have advised on the cost aspects of viability on over 600 projects over the last 12 years.

I have experience of housing costs in the organisations I have worked with over the last 50+ years both with direct authority for quantity surveying and as a project manager with overall project responsibility. I was the project manager during the period 1993 to 2002 for all project stages for the refurbishment, conversion and sale and post-sale activities of Nrs 1-9 Cambridge Gate in Regents Park. This was a major and complicated project for conversion of a listed building developed under a license arrangement granted by The Crown Estate.

Statement of truth

I confirm that I have made clear which facts and matters referred to in this report are within my own knowledge and which are not. Those that are within my own knowledge I confirm to be true. The opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinions on the matters to which they refer.

Signed Neil Powling DipBE FRICS DipProjMan(RICS)
Principal PDM

1 Scope

1.1 I have been instructed to review and report on the feasibility construction costs estimated by Gardiner & Theobald with reference to the Test Fit Report Rev 02 issued by Charcoal Blue dated October 2019.

1.2 I have considered the Feasibility Conversion to a 1000 Theatre (Version 1) for Capital Start Ltd issued by Gardiner & Theobald dated 09 September 2019.

2 Methodology – BCIS

2.1 The objective of the review of the construction cost element of the assessment of economic viability is to benchmark the Applicant's costs against RICS Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) average costs. I use BCIS costs for benchmarking because it is a national and independent database. Many cost consultants prefer to benchmark against their own data which they often treat as confidential. Whilst this is understandable as an internal exercise, in my view it is insufficiently robust as a tool for assessing viability compared to benchmarking against BCIS. A key characteristic of benchmarking is to measure performance against external data. Whilst a cost consultant may prefer to use its own internal database, the danger is that it measures the consultant's own projects against others of its projects with no external test. Any differences to BCIS costs will not be identified and checked to determine if the consultant's costs are reasonable and can stand up to independent scrutiny.

2.2 Before starting the process of benchmarking, the Applicant's costs must be arranged into the form of a BCIS elemental analysis; ideally a full elemental analysis but if the level of detail is insufficient then into Group Elements as has been done for this project. The objective of this analysis is to provide the information in the same form recommended by the BCIS so that each of the Applicant's elements can be compared to BCIS data for that element or group element so that comparisons can be made between the costs of achieving various building functions in a project with those of achieving equivalent functions in other projects.

2.3 BCIS average costs are provided at mean, median and upper quartile rates (as well as lowest, lower quartile and highest rates). I generally use mean average data for benchmarking. Levels of specification in excess of mean BCIS levels are considered as part of the adjusted benchmarking exercise. BCIS Average cost information is available on a default basis which includes all historic data with a weighting for the most recent, or for a selected maximum period ranging from 5 to 40 years. The default data is now based on projects that are up to 15 years old except where this would result in the sample size being less than four projects, when a longer period will be used. I generally consider both default and maximum 5 year average prices; the latter are more likely to reflect current regulations, specification, technology and market requirements. For this project I have only considered default data because of the very limited availability of 5 year data. The starting point for my benchmarking is the £/m² study (see Appendix C). I determine the adjustments to the basic BCIS cost for abnormal costs or enhanced specifications in the application scheme by considering on an element or group element basis the Applicant's cost compared to the BCIS elemental cost. Any adjustments I consider appropriate are then added to the £/m² study cost. This process is assisted by the level of detail in the Applicant's cost estimate if a detailed estimate is available. BCIS also provide a location factor compared to a UK mean of 100 (Appendix A); at the date of this exercise 17th March 2020 the Location Factor for Camden was 134.

2.4 BCIS costs are available on a quarterly basis – the most recent quarters use forecast figures, the older quarters are no longer annotated as forecast when the sample size reaches 20. If any estimates require adjustment on a time basis I use the BCIS all-in Tender Price Index (TPI) (Appendix B).

2.5 BCIS average costs are available for different categories of buildings. My benchmarking for this review has utilised data for 524. New Build Theatres. The new build theatre average build cost default figure adjusted to a Camden location (Location Factor 134) is £4,078/m² based on a sample size of 6. The sample size for the same Theatre category 5 year value is only 1 so I have used the default rate.

2.6 The BCIS average £/m² study includes overheads and profit (OHP) and preliminaries costs. The inclusion of preliminaries is explicit; refer to the top of Appendix C. The inclusion of overheads and profit is not explicit. BCIS Group Element costs also include preliminaries. Average prices per sqm do not include for external services and external works costs. Demolitions and site preparation are also excluded from all BCIS costs.

2.7 I consider the Applicants feasibility report or cost plan to determine if any abnormal costs such as demolitions, external services and external works should be added to the BCIS data to determine a reasonable cost. I also consider if there are any other additional costs arising from an increased level of specification that might also reasonably be added to the BCIS data. These additions will result in an adjusted benchmark cost that I consider reasonable.

2.8 The BCIS elemental rates are inclusive of OHP but exclude preliminaries. The Applicant's elemental costs exclude preliminaries and OHP which are added separately at the end of the estimate. I therefore add preliminaries and OHP to the benchmarking adjustments, but not to the £/m² study figure which already includes both preliminaries and OHP.

2.9 The BCIS data downloaded on 17th March 2020 is included as Appendices A to E. I considered updating this dataset but following the passage of time since this hearing was

adjourned and because of Covid. I have not done so as I consider the March 2020 data is reliable for the purposes of appraising costs prepared before that date in all the circumstances. Changes that I am aware of include that TPI was 335 and it has fallen on several dates since and is now 327 (as at 29th October 2020), and that the Camden location was 134 and is now 130, but overall these are not likely to significantly change the conclusions, and given that as Mr Jones records at 1.13 as to the latest RICS position and the degree of uncertainty because of Covid, and at 1.15 as to proceeding on the basis of a return to normality, in my view using data as of March 2020 is sufficient for this analysis

3 Consideration of the Feasibility Conversion to a 1000 Theatre (Version 1) issued by Gardiner & Theobald

3.1 The Feasibility Conversion to a 1000 Theatre (Version 1) for Capital Start Ltd issued by Gardiner & Theobald dated 09 September 2019 henceforth referred to as the G&T feasibility is in the total sum of £41,974,000 (£8,587/m²). The base date is 3Q2019 the increase in TPI from 3Q2019 (333) to a current 1Q2020 (335) is 0.6%. This G&T feasibility provides a Schedule of Design information on P.10. Under the headings of Architectural, Structural and MEP Services are annotated "No design". Theatre Consultant is annotated "Charcoal Blue report dated September 2019". Quantity Surveyor is annotated "G&T Cost Report Stage 2 Rev G – Odeon Shaftsbury Av. This Cost Plan has been used as a reference document in order to provide a degree of consistency between the theatre cost plan and the previously prepared information".

3.2 I have a copy of the G&T Cost Plan Stage 2 Rev F – Odeon Shaftsbury Av dated 21 December 2017 – I have not seen rev G although as far as I can tell the cost figures are the same. This cost plan is for the refurbishment of the existing building, the provision of a two storey roof extension and new basement level providing a four screen cinema, a restaurant/bar and 94 bed hotel. Although the footprint of the building is the same for both the 2017 cost plan and the current Feasibility and the external facade is retained; clearly the internal structures and indeed the GIAs of the two schemes are very different. In my view considerable caution should be exercised in referencing the 2017 cost plan to calculate costs for the current Feasibility because of the functional differences in the two schemes and the different GIAs. The current scheme is for a 1000 seat theatre GIA 4,888m² the 2017 scheme Rev F is for a 94 bed hotel, 4 screen cinema, restaurant/bar, spa and roof terrace GIA 7,749m²

3.3 This lack of design information has apparently resulted in a very limited and abbreviated Feasibility cost. A credible proposal would require properly developed design details based on properly conducted investigations that could be utilised in the production of an appropriately detailed and quantified elemental cost plan incorporating a level of specification detail.

3.4 There appear to be three sections of the 2017 cost plan that the current G&T Feasibility has referenced:-

- The section P.11 under the heading Demolition/strip out total £4,499,040
- The item on P.4 Prov Sum for Infrastructure Upgrades £3,00,000
- The item 1.01 on P.12 Works to basement/dewatering/piling £5,100,000

3.5 Taking each of these in turn: the build-up of the demolition and strip out figure on P.11 items 1.00 to 1.11 is exactly as the 2017 cost plan (subtotal £4,326,000 not shown by G&T) with an adjustment for inflation to Sept 21019 of 4% £173,040. The current BCIS all-in TPI

for 4Q2017 is 327, for 3Q2019 333 and the current 1Q2020 335. The actual increase to 3Q2019 is therefore 1.83% and to a current 1Q2020 2.45%. In my view this cost should be calculated as a bespoke cost for the Theatre scheme and not lifted unamended from the 2017 scheme.

3.6 The Prov Sum for Infrastructure Upgrades £300,000 appears in both the 2017 cost plan and the current feasibility in the same amount. The infrastructure for each of the schemes should be considered to suit the requirements of the scheme. The same figure has been adopted without any apparent consideration. There is no adjustment for inflation.

3.7 The works to basement/dewatering/piling £5,100,000 appear to be referenced by a section of the 2017 cost plan under the heading of Substructure with sub headings of Basement excavation, piling foundations, secant piling, basement construction, waterproofing, columns & beams and internal walls comprising items 2.00 to 2.36 totalling £5,034,000. In my view this cost should be calculated as a bespoke cost for the Theatre; the closeness of the two figures suggests to me that the figure has been rounded up for inclusion in the feasibility without any more detailed consideration. I am also instructed that investigations have been requested of what structural fabric remains and that these are not concluded. I discuss this further below.

3.8 The item on P.12 under the heading of 2.00 construction of new theatre follows with the item 2.01 Allow benchmark rate 4,888m² @ £3,750/m² = Total £18,330,000. There is no further information on the origin of this rate nor on what is included. This sum is part of the item 2. On P.5 Construction and fit out £26,105,000 to which is added preliminaries 16.5%, OHP 6%, Design & Development contingency 5% and construction contingency 5%. The rate of £3,750/m² with preliminaries and OHP added is therefore **£4,630/m².** This would be directly comparable to the current BCIS default mean rate adjusted for a Camden location of **£4,078**. If the G&T benchmark rate is adjusted for the two additions for contingency the G&T benchmark rate is **£5,105/m².**

3.9 Although there is no information on the G&T benchmark rate it is under the heading of new theatre. As the existing facades are retained and the costs of retention are shown elsewhere in the G&T feasibility the costs of external wall should be deducted from the benchmark rate for new construction. My analysis of costs (see para 5.6 and Appendix F) leads me to believe that no omission has been made of the external walls from the new benchmark rate.

3.10 I am instructed that there is uncertainty as to whether structural fabric remains. I am not able to comment on this uncertainty. However if structural fabric remains this is likely to impact the costs of the substructure. Such costs need to be taken into account on a bespoke basis, as above.

3.11 If structural fabric remains, and if it is in a condition and location which enables its re-use at proportionate cost, this is likely to lower the costs for some of these items. It could lower the costs of some items potentially very significantly. If structural fabric remains and would require to be removed, this may add some cost. It may not require to be removed. However, costs of removal, should it be required, for example because of the condition, are not as likely to be significant. Other than these general comments, I have not taken these elements further into account.

4 The Gross Internal Area (GIA) of the new theatre, the GIA of the existing building

4.1 The G&T feasibility includes at P.9 a schedule of areas resulting in a total GIA of 4,888m². This is taken from Appendix 2 of the Charcoal Blue report with a correction made to the Dressing rooms area. I have adopted the same GIA of 4,888m² in my own assessment.

4.2 This Theatre scheme assumes construction within the existing retained façade on the same footprint as the existing building. The GIA of the existing building was given as 3,265m² in the application for four screen cinema and hotel scheme. This theatre scheme therefore has a 50% increase in the GIA notwithstanding it is on the same footprint.

5 Group Elemental analysis of G&T feasibility and comparison to BCIS benchmark

5.1 I have extracted d the G&T feasibility costs into a BCIS Group Element format to facilitate comparison to BCIS average build costs. This analysis is included at Appendix F.

5.2 Strip out, demolitions, façade retention, asbestos removal and vibration monitoring are abnormal costs that would not be included in BCIS average build costs. I have therefore accounted for these separately in my benchmarking. Similarly any external works and infrastructure costs are abnormal and accounted for separately.

5.3 Preliminaries have been included in the G&T feasibility at 16.34% and Overheads & Profit (OHP) at 5.95%. The rates are based on a normal BCIS organisation of costs and therefore the %ages slightly different to the G&T figures. I consider both of these % additions reasonable and have used the same %ages to adjust my benchmarking.

5.4 The substructure sect ion of £5,100,000 (£1,043/m²) compares to a BCIS mean cost adjusted to a Camden location of £303/m². I have adopted the G&T figures for the purposes of this exercise but note my concerns at 3.7 that this cost should be properly calculated based on bespoke design details for this project.

5.5 G&T have included costs for seating/ stage Eng/ Stage lighting / Audio Visual (AV) provided by Charcoal Blue in their report of £2,675,000 (£547/m²). The BCIS elemental cost of fittings is £283/m². For the purposes of this exercise I have assumed that the typical general fittings for a theatre project that comprise the BCIS rate would be in addition to the specialist fittings and equipment costed by Charcoal Blue. I have therefore treated the whole of the charcoal Blue equipment costs as abnormal. However in practice I would anticipate overlap. I have inadequate information to enable me to quantify that overlap and therefore have made no adjustment for this.

5.6 The results of my benchmarking show an adjusted benchmark cost of £36,889,637 (£7,547/m²) that compares to the G&T cost of £41,974,000 (£8,547/m²) a difference of £5,084,363 (£1,040/m²). For the reasons above I consider it likely my adjusted benchmark cost is likely to be an overprovision but I cannot quantify by how much. With the limited information available I am unable to determine the source of this difference; however a possible source of difference might include a duplicated provision of the external walls in both the benchmark rate and the retained façade. The final page of the G&T Feasibility Conversion to a 1000 seat theatre includes under the heading at 2.00 “Construction of new theatre” the item 2.01 “Allow benchmark rate 4,888m² @ £3,750/m² Total £18,330,000”. If this new construction benchmark rate includes for external walls, as seems probable to me, and makes no allowance for retaining the existing facade in lieu of the external walls, then this will lead to a duplicated provision. Because of the almost complete absence of design

information I am unable to give a better opinion of the construction cost but the G&T rate of £8,547/m² seems to me to be extraordinarily high. This cost is 111% higher than the BCIS mean rate of £4,078/m² – it is 81% higher than the upper quartile rate of £4,741/m².

6 An alternate cost for restoring the original theatre

6.1 There is no study or design information available to enable an estimate to be prepared for the cost of removing structures added to the building as part of previous conversions for non-theatre usage. Nor is there any design information on what may be required to put back necessary structures to restore the original theatre use. However the question posed here is why build a new theatre if there is already an existing one?

6.2 However the existing GIA of 3,265m² is known. A build cost using BCIS average build cost for rehabilitation/ conversion of theatres at a default mean rate adjusted to a Camden location with a 10% addition for contingency yields a construction cost (excluding fees and VAT) of £11.5M. This cost may well change if better and scheme specific information is produced but it does give some perspective to the Appellants cost for a new theatre of £41,974,000.

6.3 I have used average build costs. I consider this is prudent for the basis of a review of a feasibility report. However average figures do not necessarily adequately reflect the range of choices operators may make taking into account a particular site and its potentials. The lack of information based on properly conducted investigations in this case also reduces confidence. Choices are made within budgets. Where there is a pre-existing theatre structure and one which was purpose-built, there is a reasonable likelihood of reusable aspects facilitating choices, which may enable cost reductions and/or may enable business operating choices in different areas of the GIA to be made by a particular operator (e.g. the quality of the fit-out) within budgets. A BCIS average build cost does not necessarily properly reflect those choices on a particular site. For such reasons it is prudent to also consider that the costs indicated by BCIS (adjusted to a Camden location 134) ranges from lowest £2,111/m² to highest £6,053/m². Given the size of this range, it is also realistic to consider alternative costs for restoring the original theatre could be lower than this average

7 Conclusion

7.1 For these reasons, on the information provided, I therefore do not consider the Applicant's feasibility report or cost plan when benchmarked can properly be considered as reasonable.

Appendix A – Location 17Mar20

BCIS®

RICS

Tender price studies

Location (using 2000 boundaries data)

Base: UK mean = 100

Effective date: Latest

Updated: 14-Mar-2020

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
North East	91	90 - 92	11	68 - 165	476
Durham County	90	88 - 91	10	69 - 122	108
Chester-le-Street	88	85 - 91	8	76 - 102	16
Derwentside	92	84 - 101	15	78 - 122	9
Durham	92	89 - 95	10	73 - 112	28
Easington	89	85 - 93	9	73 - 109	16
Sedgefield	90	86 - 94	11	69 - 111	23
Teesdale	89	81 - 97	10	74 - 103	6
Wear Valley	88	85 - 92	6	80 - 97	10
Northumberland	94	91 - 96	15	73 - 165	56
Berwick-upon-Tweed	106	84 - 133	32	89 - 165	5
Blyth Valley	89	85 - 93	8	73 - 101	14
Castle Morpeth	94	87 - 102	15	78 - 124	11
Tynedale	94	89 - 100	13	78 - 124	15
Wansbeck	91	87 - 95	6	85 - 104	8
Tees Valley	93	91 - 95	12	68 - 135	100
Darlington	97	94 - 101	10	77 - 126	27
Hartlepool	89	83 - 95	16	68 - 135	15
Middlesbrough	94	90 - 98	12	78 - 117	21
Redcar and Cleveland	89	86 - 92	6	79 - 99	12
Stockton-on-Tees	92	88 - 95	11	69 - 116	25
Tyne and Wear	90	89 - 91	11	68 - 129	212
Gateshead	93	90 - 96	14	74 - 129	46
Newcastle Upon Tyne	91	88 - 93	11	71 - 126	60
North Tyneside	91	87 - 94	12	75 - 123	36
South Tyneside	89	86 - 91	8	68 - 108	30
Sunderland	86	84 - 89	8	71 - 111	40
North West	98	98 - 99	11	66 - 162	1024
Cheshire	98	97 - 100	10	75 - 127	203
Chester	99	97 - 102	9	85 - 115	30
Congleton	97	90 - 103	14	80 - 127	14
Crewe and Nantwich	98	95 - 102	10	84 - 117	20
Ellesmere Port and Neston	98	95 - 102	8	87 - 118	17
Halton	97	93 - 101	10	76 - 111	18
Macclesfield	104	101 - 107	10	89 - 126	32

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Vale Royal	97	94 - 100	11	77 - 123	32
Warrington	96	93 - 98	9	76 - 122	39
Cumbria	99	97 - 101	12	66 - 144	88
Allerdale	106	97 - 115	17	87 - 144	11
Barrow-in-Furness	102	95 - 109	9	93 - 113	6
Carlisle	97	93 - 102	11	78 - 130	17
Copeland	100	96 - 103	8	87 - 114	13
Eden	100	94 - 107	13	74 - 123	14
South Lakeland	97	93 - 101	12	66 - 115	26
Greater Manchester	98	97 - 99	12	67 - 157	334
Bolton	97	95 - 100	10	81 - 116	36
Bury	97	93 - 102	10	79 - 115	16
Manchester	101	98 - 103	12	78 - 133	67
Oldham	96	93 - 100	11	73 - 116	30
Rochdale	98	95 - 101	10	79 - 117	34
Salford	99	95 - 103	13	67 - 129	35
Stockport	97	93 - 102	15	74 - 126	31
Tameside	98	91 - 104	17	85 - 157	15
Trafford	98	96 - 101	11	82 - 125	44
Wigan	94	91 - 98	11	75 - 115	26
Lancashire	98	96 - 99	11	74 - 142	194
Blackburn With Darwen	101	97 - 104	11	80 - 122	30
Blackpool	100	95 - 104	14	76 - 142	25
Burnley	102	96 - 109	12	82 - 120	11
Chorley	96	91 - 102	10	83 - 115	10
Fylde	90	81 - 100	9	80 - 102	4
Hyndburn	90	80 - 100	11	74 - 103	5
Lancaster	92	89 - 94	8	77 - 109	24
Pendle	101	91 - 112	14	85 - 123	6
Preston	97	94 - 100	9	80 - 117	27
Ribble Valley	102	99 - 106	8	93 - 117	14
Rossendale	95	85 - 106	10	85 - 109	4
South Ribble	97	93 - 101	9	86 - 114	13
West Lancashire	99	92 - 107	14	81 - 135	11
Wyre	100	94 - 105	10	89 - 115	10
Merseyside	98	97 - 99	12	72 - 162	205
Knowsley	96	91 - 101	11	85 - 126	13
Liverpool	96	94 - 98	11	72 - 138	90
Sefton	102	98 - 107	15	85 - 162	30
St Helens	99	96 - 103	10	78 - 121	32
Wirral	99	96 - 102	11	79 - 129	40
Yorkshire and the Humber	91	91 - 92	11	69 - 172	642

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
East Riding and North Lincolnshire	90	89 - 92	10	70 - 123	143
East Riding of Yorkshire	92	90 - 95	10	75 - 114	46
Kingston Upon Hull	91	88 - 94	10	73 - 113	41
North East Lincolnshire	87	84 - 91	11	70 - 123	29
North Lincolnshire	90	87 - 92	8	75 - 108	27
North Yorkshire	96	94 - 98	12	70 - 148	102
Craven	98	91 - 106	10	93 - 120	6
Hambleton	97	93 - 102	10	85 - 116	14
Harrogate	96	92 - 100	10	80 - 116	21
Richmondshire	94	85 - 104	9	82 - 104	4
Ryedale	92	89 - 96	7	81 - 106	13
Scarborough	100	95 - 105	10	86 - 124	11
Selby	94	89 - 98	9	75 - 107	13
York	97	91 - 104	18	70 - 148	20
South Yorkshire	92	90 - 93	13	69 - 172	154
Barnsley	88	85 - 90	8	76 - 109	34
Doncaster	98	94 - 104	12	79 - 120	19
Rotherham	88	86 - 91	9	69 - 102	41
Sheffield	95	92 - 98	15	75 - 172	60
West Yorkshire	90	89 - 91	10	69 - 139	243
Bradford	88	86 - 89	9	70 - 119	75
Calderdale	87	84 - 90	7	70 - 95	21
Kirklees	93	89 - 96	13	75 - 131	36
Leeds	91	89 - 93	12	72 - 139	76
Wakefield	89	87 - 92	8	69 - 107	35
East Midlands	105	105 - 106	12	69 - 151	658
Derbyshire	106	104 - 107	13	69 - 151	157
Amber Valley	105	101 - 110	14	84 - 139	28
Bolsover	106	98 - 116	11	92 - 121	6
Chesterfield	110	106 - 114	10	93 - 126	19
Derby	100	97 - 103	11	69 - 125	38
Derbyshire Dales	106	99 - 113	13	85 - 129	11
Erewash	103	97 - 109	14	86 - 140	15
High Peak	114	108 - 120	13	87 - 137	15
North East Derbyshire	113	103 - 124	19	84 - 151	10
South Derbyshire	108	103 - 113	11	90 - 133	15
Leicestershire and Rutland	104	102 - 106	12	80 - 144	108
Charnwood	103	96 - 109	12	80 - 120	12
Harborough	109	97 - 122	12	96 - 125	4
Hinckley and Bosworth	101	95 - 108	9	87 - 110	7
Leicester	104	101 - 107	12	85 - 144	42
Melton	108	102 - 115	8	100 - 121	5

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
North West Leicestershire	104	98 - 110	17	82 - 141	21
Oadby and Wigston	103	95 - 112	13	80 - 122	8
Rutland	108	100 - 117	10	94 - 119	6
Lincolnshire	104	102 - 106	11	83 - 143	90
Boston	105	99 - 112	14	90 - 143	12
East Lindsey	105	100 - 109	10	86 - 121	14
Lincoln	100	97 - 104	9	88 - 124	17
North Kesteven	110	104 - 116	9	97 - 124	8
South Holland	102	96 - 109	9	95 - 113	6
South Kesteven	102	99 - 106	11	83 - 130	21
West Lindsey	105	100 - 111	10	91 - 127	12
Northamptonshire	110	108 - 111	11	82 - 138	151
Corby	104	98 - 110	13	82 - 127	14
Daventry	109	106 - 112	8	97 - 127	21
East Northamptonshire	114	110 - 119	9	102 - 129	14
Kettering	110	106 - 114	11	92 - 132	24
Northampton	109	106 - 112	13	82 - 138	53
South Northamptonshire	112	106 - 118	12	101 - 136	12
Wellingborough	110	105 - 116	11	87 - 132	13
Nottinghamshire	103	102 - 105	11	80 - 149	152
Ashfield	99	93 - 105	11	80 - 119	11
Bassetlaw	104	94 - 114	14	85 - 121	7
Broxtowe	105	101 - 108	9	91 - 121	17
Gedling	101	96 - 105	9	87 - 117	13
Mansfield	99	96 - 102	6	88 - 110	14
Newark and Sherwood	104	98 - 111	12	85 - 124	11
Nottingham	105	102 - 107	13	81 - 149	64
Rushcliffe	105	101 - 110	9	94 - 132	15
West Midlands	93	93 - 94	10	64 - 160	946
Herefordshire	90	88 - 93	10	73 - 126	47
Shropshire	93	91 - 94	10	74 - 118	98
Bridgnorth	92	89 - 95	4	86 - 99	7
North Shropshire	93	89 - 98	8	74 - 106	13
Oswestry	97	91 - 105	12	78 - 118	9
Shrewsbury and Atcham	96	92 - 100	11	76 - 118	20
South Shropshire	98	92 - 105	11	79 - 115	10
Telford and Wrekin	89	87 - 91	9	74 - 110	38
Staffordshire	91	90 - 93	10	66 - 126	150
Cannock Chase	94	88 - 102	11	79 - 113	8
East Staffordshire	87	84 - 90	8	66 - 104	23
Lichfield	96	92 - 102	11	86 - 123	14
Newcastle-under-Lyme	92	89 - 95	10	75 - 113	27

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
South Staffordshire	93	86 - 102	9	84 - 108	5
Stafford	95	90 - 99	11	75 - 116	21
Staffordshire Moorlands	89	84 - 94	9	74 - 105	11
Stoke-on-Trent	91	89 - 94	10	69 - 126	35
Tamworth	86	80 - 92	7	75 - 94	6
Warwickshire	95	94 - 97	10	69 - 148	119
North Warwickshire	94	90 - 98	8	85 - 110	11
Nuneaton and Bedworth	92	89 - 96	10	69 - 115	24
Rugby	96	92 - 100	10	80 - 120	19
Stratford-on-Avon	96	94 - 99	8	84 - 119	26
Warwick	97	94 - 100	13	76 - 148	39
West Midlands	93	92 - 94	10	64 - 132	428
Birmingham	94	92 - 95	10	64 - 132	139
Coventry	93	92 - 95	10	70 - 127	70
Dudley	91	89 - 93	10	75 - 130	56
Sandwell	93	91 - 95	10	77 - 119	57
Solihull	92	90 - 95	10	77 - 121	43
Walsall	89	85 - 94	11	71 - 108	19
Wolverhampton	93	90 - 95	10	74 - 116	44
Worcestershire	96	94 - 98	12	73 - 160	104
Bromsgrove	94	91 - 97	8	77 - 112	25
Malvern Hills	101	92 - 112	21	83 - 160	11
Redditch	90	86 - 94	9	74 - 113	17
Worcester	94	88 - 101	14	73 - 125	16
Wychavon	100	97 - 103	7	87 - 121	16
Wyre Forest	98	94 - 102	10	85 - 119	19
East of England	101	101 - 102	12	67 - 159	1021
Bedfordshire	104	102 - 106	11	74 - 140	84
Bedford	101	97 - 104	11	74 - 125	29
Luton	106	103 - 109	11	88 - 140	28
Mid Bedfordshire	105	101 - 109	10	90 - 124	17
South Bedfordshire	107	100 - 115	13	84 - 124	10
Cambridgeshire	100	99 - 101	11	67 - 145	203
Cambridge	103	101 - 105	11	84 - 131	70
East Cambridgeshire	100	93 - 108	15	86 - 135	12
Fenland	102	98 - 107	11	87 - 124	16
Huntingdonshire	96	94 - 99	8	83 - 120	32
Peterborough	97	95 - 100	13	67 - 145	53
South Cambridgeshire	101	97 - 106	12	84 - 129	20
Essex	104	103 - 105	11	77 - 152	269
Basildon	107	104 - 110	10	83 - 134	31
Braintree	105	102 - 108	9	88 - 129	32

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Brentwood	100	94 - 105	9	90 - 115	8
Castle Point	112	105 - 119	9	102 - 128	6
Chelmsford	101	98 - 104	11	82 - 121	33
Colchester	99	95 - 103	12	82 - 124	24
Epping Forest	105	101 - 109	12	81 - 138	27
Harlow	106	101 - 111	12	88 - 135	15
Maldon	109	101 - 118	17	94 - 152	12
Rochford	118	111 - 126	11	103 - 138	8
Southend-on-Sea	102	98 - 105	10	86 - 119	21
Tendring	103	99 - 108	10	91 - 125	14
Thurrock	101	96 - 106	10	77 - 114	13
Uttlesford	103	100 - 107	10	82 - 118	25
Hertfordshire	107	105 - 109	13	85 - 159	148
Broxbourne	114	106 - 123	12	93 - 130	8
Dacorum	111	105 - 117	14	85 - 143	17
East Hertfordshire	106	102 - 110	9	93 - 135	18
Hertsmere	105	102 - 108	9	85 - 120	22
North Hertfordshire	110	102 - 118	19	88 - 159	14
St Albans	103	99 - 106	10	87 - 127	23
Stevenage	102	96 - 109	9	87 - 117	8
Three Rivers	108	102 - 113	9	95 - 119	8
Watford	108	101 - 115	17	89 - 149	16
Welwyn Hatfield	108	102 - 115	13	93 - 141	13
Norfolk	96	95 - 98	11	70 - 122	121
Breckland	95	92 - 99	9	82 - 117	22
Broadland	99	93 - 106	10	83 - 118	8
Great Yarmouth	97	92 - 102	11	83 - 115	15
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	99	92 - 108	15	78 - 122	11
North Norfolk	99	95 - 103	9	84 - 120	15
Norwich	94	91 - 97	12	70 - 122	39
South Norfolk	95	90 - 100	9	81 - 117	11
Suffolk	98	97 - 99	9	75 - 126	196
Babergh	98	94 - 101	7	85 - 108	15
Forest Heath	99	95 - 102	10	79 - 117	20
Ipswich	97	94 - 99	9	76 - 117	37
Mid Suffolk	100	97 - 102	9	87 - 126	27
St Edmundsbury	97	95 - 99	8	78 - 117	49
Suffolk Coastal	99	95 - 103	13	75 - 125	29
Waveney	96	93 - 100	9	78 - 118	19
London	127	126 - 128	18	82 - 208	1031
Inner London Boroughs	131	130 - 132	19	94 - 208	496
Camden	134	129 - 140	22	98 - 183	52

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
City of London	125	121 - 130	17	95 - 164	36
Hackney	129	124 - 135	21	106 - 194	34
Hammersmith and Fulham	134	129 - 139	18	107 - 185	33
Haringey	133	125 - 140	19	106 - 187	18
Islington	132	127 - 136	15	110 - 167	31
Kensington and Chelsea	138	130 - 146	27	94 - 208	31
Lambeth	131	127 - 135	15	112 - 186	33
Lewisham	123	118 - 129	15	98 - 154	19
Newham	121	114 - 127	19	94 - 174	24
Southwark	132	128 - 136	17	109 - 178	44
Tower Hamlets	129	122 - 135	24	96 - 201	33
Wandsworth	133	129 - 138	17	102 - 169	39
Westminster	134	130 - 138	19	105 - 196	69
Outer London Boroughs	123	122 - 124	15	82 - 184	535
Barking and Dagenham	120	114 - 126	11	100 - 139	10
Barnet	124	121 - 127	10	108 - 147	30
Bexley	126	118 - 135	20	99 - 176	17
Brent	124	120 - 129	14	96 - 155	27
Bromley	123	119 - 127	15	90 - 169	37
Croydon	126	122 - 130	16	98 - 168	38
Ealing	130	124 - 136	21	98 - 184	29
Enfield	121	118 - 124	11	103 - 146	35
Greenwich	127	122 - 132	16	101 - 166	28
Harrow	120	116 - 124	11	98 - 136	27
Havering	110	104 - 118	15	82 - 146	14
Hillingdon	119	116 - 122	13	95 - 155	54
Hounslow	118	114 - 122	14	86 - 155	35
Kingston Upon Thames	128	123 - 133	17	101 - 178	31
Merton	127	122 - 133	14	90 - 158	21
Redbridge	118	113 - 122	14	97 - 154	25
Richmond Upon Thames	125	121 - 129	12	110 - 148	30
Sutton	122	118 - 126	11	103 - 142	26
Waltham Forest	120	114 - 127	19	92 - 171	21
South East	106	105 - 106	12	74 - 160	1515
Berkshire	106	104 - 107	11	82 - 141	149
Bracknell Forest	107	102 - 112	13	85 - 133	21
Reading	105	102 - 108	11	90 - 141	33
Slough	105	99 - 110	13	82 - 126	17
West Berkshire	105	102 - 107	10	87 - 137	39
Windsor and Maidenhead	109	105 - 113	13	88 - 134	25
Wokingham	106	101 - 111	11	90 - 120	14
Buckinghamshire	104	103 - 106	12	80 - 144	197

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Aylesbury Vale	107	104 - 110	11	86 - 129	40
Chiltern	110	106 - 115	11	90 - 127	18
Milton Keynes	99	97 - 101	9	81 - 140	88
South Bucks	112	106 - 118	14	80 - 144	20
Wycombe	110	106 - 114	13	83 - 136	31
East Sussex	107	106 - 109	12	80 - 159	130
Brighton and Hove	107	103 - 111	15	80 - 159	34
Eastbourne	106	103 - 109	9	91 - 126	25
Hastings	114	110 - 118	11	97 - 143	21
Lewes	104	101 - 107	9	92 - 126	20
Rother	106	102 - 110	7	95 - 117	10
Wealden	107	101 - 112	16	91 - 152	20
Hampshire	103	102 - 104	12	74 - 160	333
Basingstoke and Deane	103	100 - 107	9	84 - 118	24
East Hampshire	109	104 - 115	14	83 - 140	18
Eastleigh	100	96 - 104	13	74 - 125	31
Fareham	101	98 - 104	7	88 - 113	18
Gosport	105	101 - 110	9	85 - 117	14
Hart	109	106 - 112	6	96 - 121	16
Havant	105	100 - 111	16	85 - 153	22
New Forest	100	97 - 103	10	86 - 124	28
Portsmouth	100	98 - 102	9	82 - 118	41
Rushmoor	108	102 - 113	11	80 - 122	14
Southampton	103	100 - 106	13	81 - 151	51
Test Valley	101	98 - 104	9	88 - 119	26
Winchester	106	102 - 111	15	87 - 160	30
Isle of Wight	102	98 - 107	11	82 - 123	18
Kent	107	106 - 108	12	78 - 159	256
Ashford	111	106 - 116	15	83 - 159	27
Canterbury	107	102 - 113	15	78 - 136	24
Dartford	111	103 - 119	14	94 - 138	9
Dover	108	103 - 113	13	92 - 134	20
Gravesham	101	93 - 110	8	90 - 108	4
Maidstone	105	101 - 109	12	88 - 135	28
Medway	107	103 - 112	13	84 - 141	23
Sevenoaks	114	110 - 120	12	91 - 140	19
Shepway	101	97 - 105	10	88 - 127	18
Swale	101	98 - 105	7	88 - 113	14
Thanet	105	101 - 109	8	90 - 116	15
Tonbridge and Malling	108	103 - 112	12	90 - 140	22
Tunbridge Wells	107	104 - 110	9	90 - 123	33
Oxfordshire	102	100 - 104	13	80 - 159	121

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Cherwell	99	95 - 102	9	82 - 112	22
Oxford	106	102 - 109	16	80 - 159	49
South Oxfordshire	101	98 - 104	10	88 - 136	24
Vale of White Horse	99	95 - 103	10	85 - 117	17
West Oxfordshire	100	93 - 107	12	80 - 118	9
Surrey	111	110 - 113	12	81 - 157	181
Elmbridge	115	111 - 119	9	97 - 126	15
Epsom and Ewell	109	105 - 113	7	96 - 118	11
Guildford	110	107 - 113	11	93 - 157	31
Mole Valley	114	109 - 119	12	89 - 145	21
Reigate and Banstead	112	105 - 120	16	89 - 146	12
Runnymede	106	100 - 112	13	82 - 132	16
Spelthorne	107	102 - 113	11	92 - 124	14
Surrey Heath	113	106 - 121	15	86 - 137	14
Tandridge	105	88 - 125	20	81 - 123	5
Waverley	112	108 - 115	9	99 - 132	23
Woking	116	111 - 122	15	100 - 155	19
West Sussex	106	104 - 107	11	83 - 142	130
Adur	111	106 - 116	4	105 - 116	4
Arun	105	100 - 110	11	90 - 130	13
Chichester	101	99 - 103	7	87 - 115	30
Crawley	105	101 - 109	11	86 - 121	27
Horsham	109	105 - 113	12	86 - 142	24
Mid Sussex	106	99 - 113	16	83 - 142	15
Worthing	109	105 - 113	10	91 - 129	17
South West	102	102 - 103	12	71 - 224	877
Cornwall	104	102 - 106	16	79 - 224	133
Caradon	108	102 - 113	17	86 - 163	23
Carrick	105	101 - 110	14	86 - 146	23
Kerrier	99	94 - 103	11	84 - 134	18
North Cornwall	104	101 - 107	7	95 - 123	23
Penwith	106	101 - 111	10	86 - 118	12
Restormel	102	99 - 106	13	79 - 139	32
Devon	101	100 - 103	11	76 - 138	211
East Devon	102	96 - 108	15	85 - 137	15
Exeter	99	97 - 102	10	84 - 131	39
Mid Devon	100	93 - 106	12	86 - 120	11
North Devon	101	97 - 106	12	77 - 120	20
Plymouth	101	98 - 103	10	80 - 123	35
South Hams	104	98 - 109	12	76 - 129	16
Teignbridge	104	101 - 106	7	89 - 115	22
Torbay	104	100 - 108	13	82 - 138	35

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Torridge	100	96 - 105	9	84 - 114	12
West Devon	97	92 - 103	7	88 - 106	6
Dorset	104	102 - 106	13	84 - 155	121
Bournemouth	107	103 - 112	14	89 - 155	23
Christchurch	103	95 - 112	10	88 - 113	5
East Dorset	101	96 - 106	10	86 - 116	14
North Dorset	104	99 - 109	11	92 - 128	12
Poole	103	99 - 106	10	88 - 120	25
Purbeck	105	101 - 110	7	98 - 115	7
West Dorset	107	101 - 113	18	86 - 154	23
Weymouth and Portland	99	95 - 103	7	84 - 110	12
Gloucestershire	103	101 - 105	13	71 - 147	92
Cheltenham	104	100 - 108	15	85 - 147	32
Cotswold	107	102 - 111	12	89 - 129	18
Forest of Dean	98	93 - 104	7	91 - 108	6
Gloucester	98	93 - 104	13	71 - 128	17
Stroud	106	102 - 111	10	91 - 127	14
Tewkesbury	97	90 - 106	9	85 - 110	5
North Somerset	102	101 - 104	11	75 - 128	124
Bath and North East Somerset	105	102 - 109	9	88 - 120	22
Bristol	105	102 - 107	11	83 - 128	57
North Somerset	101	97 - 105	9	88 - 120	20
South Gloucestershire	95	92 - 99	11	75 - 117	25
Somerset	100	98 - 102	9	73 - 127	84
Mendip	101	96 - 107	12	86 - 123	15
Sedgemoor	98	96 - 101	8	87 - 119	25
South Somerset	100	96 - 104	9	73 - 114	19
Taunton Deane	101	98 - 103	7	89 - 120	22
Wiltshire	102	101 - 104	11	81 - 143	112
Kennet	111	105 - 118	9	99 - 126	8
North Wiltshire	104	101 - 107	10	93 - 129	24
Salisbury	103	99 - 107	12	86 - 143	22
Swindon	100	98 - 103	10	81 - 122	44
West Wiltshire	99	95 - 104	10	82 - 116	14
Wales	99	98 - 100	12	75 - 157	410
North Wales	97	95 - 99	12	75 - 146	102
Flintshire	94	90 - 99	11	75 - 115	17
Conwy	98	89 - 108	19	76 - 142	11
Denbighshire	94	91 - 98	7	80 - 107	14
Gwynedd	102	97 - 106	11	87 - 125	18
Isle of Anglesey	100	92 - 109	12	87 - 126	7
Wrexham	97	94 - 100	11	83 - 146	35

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Mid Wales	103	101 - 105	10	77 - 128	70
Carmarthenshire	103	99 - 107	10	77 - 125	20
Ceredigion	105	101 - 109	11	92 - 128	19
Powys	103	99 - 106	9	83 - 119	22
Pembrokeshire	97	92 - 103	10	89 - 121	9
South Wales	99	98 - 100	12	77 - 157	238
Blaenau Gwent	101	97 - 105	6	93 - 111	8
Bridgend	98	93 - 103	17	77 - 148	26
Caerphilly	99	95 - 103	10	85 - 125	20
Cardiff	100	97 - 102	10	80 - 126	41
Monmouthshire	106	92 - 122	23	86 - 157	7
Neath Port Talbot	93	91 - 96	8	81 - 112	21
Newport	101	98 - 104	10	81 - 122	34
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff	98	95 - 101	11	83 - 132	33
Swansea	98	93 - 104	14	79 - 132	20
Torfaen	96	89 - 104	11	79 - 111	8
Vale of Glamorgan	102	97 - 107	12	84 - 138	17
Scotland	92	92 - 93	13	62 - 187	1301
East Central Scotland	93	92 - 95	11	73 - 137	209
East Lothian	94	91 - 96	8	77 - 108	36
City of Edinburgh	96	94 - 98	11	77 - 137	87
Falkirk	87	84 - 90	10	73 - 109	29
Midlothian	95	90 - 101	14	79 - 129	16
West Lothian	92	89 - 95	11	76 - 128	41
Eastern Scotland	91	90 - 92	10	71 - 125	221
Angus	89	86 - 92	8	71 - 100	19
Clackmannanshire	92	87 - 97	7	82 - 103	9
Dundee City	92	90 - 95	11	71 - 124	63
Fife	91	89 - 92	10	71 - 115	73
Perth and Kinross	92	89 - 95	11	72 - 125	36
Stirling	88	85 - 90	7	73 - 102	21
Highlands, Argyll and Bute	96	93 - 99	18	68 - 187	99
Argyll and Bute	106	101 - 111	20	79 - 187	34
Highland	91	88 - 94	16	68 - 168	65
North Eastern Scotland	86	84 - 87	11	63 - 147	179
Aberdeen City	86	84 - 87	11	65 - 147	114
Aberdeenshire	86	84 - 88	9	71 - 107	40
Moray	85	81 - 90	14	63 - 122	25
Southern Scotland	93	92 - 95	12	62 - 138	218
Dumfries and Galloway	91	89 - 94	10	73 - 115	41
East Ayrshire	93	90 - 96	9	74 - 111	30
North Ayrshire	94	90 - 98	15	73 - 138	44

Location	Index	90% confidence interval	Standard deviation	Range	Sample
Scottish Borders	94	90 - 97	11	76 - 115	27
South Ayrshire	97	93 - 103	15	73 - 131	24
South Lanarkshire	93	90 - 95	12	62 - 135	52
West Central Scotland	93	92 - 94	10	69 - 133	336
East Dunbartonshire	90	86 - 93	9	72 - 107	21
East Renfrewshire	99	94 - 105	12	75 - 126	15
Glasgow City	94	93 - 95	9	75 - 133	169
Inverclyde	92	89 - 95	9	78 - 108	22
North Lanarkshire	93	90 - 96	12	69 - 125	47
Renfrewshire	92	90 - 95	10	70 - 130	44
West Dunbartonshire	88	86 - 91	7	75 - 102	18
Western and Northern Islands	109	104 - 114	19	73 - 161	39
Eilean Siar (Western Isles)	113	98 - 130	14	94 - 126	4
Orkney Islands	102	97 - 108	15	78 - 145	21
Shetland Islands	118	108 - 130	22	73 - 161	14
Northern Ireland	55	54 - 55	6	42 - 73	202
Eastern	56	55 - 57	7	42 - 73	99
Ards	52	48 - 55	5	45 - 59	7
Belfast	58	57 - 59	7	48 - 73	65
Down	51	47 - 56	7	46 - 66	7
Lisburn	55	51 - 59	7	48 - 68	8
North Down	56	53 - 59	5	49 - 63	9
Northern	54	53 - 56	5	43 - 69	42
Antrim	55	52 - 58	5	47 - 60	8
Ballymena	51	50 - 52	2	47 - 54	10
Carrickfergus	51	45 - 58	6	43 - 57	4
Coleraine	54	50 - 59	6	49 - 67	7
Newtownabbey	59	56 - 62	4	55 - 64	5
Southern	52	50 - 54	6	43 - 64	27
Derry	54	50 - 58	7	43 - 62	9
Fermanagh	52	44 - 60	8	45 - 61	4
Omagh	50	46 - 53	4	44 - 54	5
Strabane	51	47 - 56	6	43 - 64	7
Western	54	52 - 55	5	44 - 67	32
Banbridge	52	49 - 55	4	44 - 58	8
Craigavon	55	52 - 58	5	44 - 64	10
Dungannon	53	50 - 56	5	45 - 60	9
Islands	114	112 - 116	14	86 - 162	148
Isle of Man	110	107 - 112	11	86 - 137	69
Channel Islands	118	115 - 120	14	90 - 162	79
Guernsey	128	124 - 133	14	109 - 162	29
Jersey	112	109 - 115	11	90 - 136	50

Appendix B – TPI from 1.1.16 18Mar20

BCIS All-in TPI #101

Base date: 1985 mean = 100 | **Updated:** 14-Mar-2020 | #101

			Percentage change		
Date	**Index**	**Sample**	**On year**	**On quarter**	**On month**
1Q 2016	275	24	1.9%	1.5%	
2Q 2016	282	25	-0.4%	2.5%	
3Q 2016	273	27	1.5%	-3.2%	
4Q 2016	283	25	4.4%	3.7%	
1Q 2017	298	28	8.4%	5.3%	
2Q 2017	324	23	14.9%	8.7%	
3Q 2017	306	23	12.1%	-5.6%	
4Q 2017	327	20	15.5%	6.9%	
1Q 2018	328	Forecast 13	10.1%	0.3%	
2Q 2018	332	Forecast 18	2.5%	1.2%	
3Q 2018	320	Forecast 15	4.6%	-3.6%	
4Q 2018	333	Provisional 18	1.8%	4.1%	
1Q 2019	328	Provisional 11	0.0%	-1.5%	
2Q 2019	332	Provisional 8	0.0%	1.2%	
3Q 2019	333	Provisional 8	4.1%	0.3%	
4Q 2019	334	Provisional	0.3%	0.3%	
1Q 2020	335	Forecast	2.1%	0.3%	
2Q 2020	339	Forecast	2.1%	1.2%	
3Q 2020	341	Forecast	2.4%	0.6%	
4Q 2020	343	Forecast	2.7%	0.6%	
1Q 2021	353	Forecast	5.4%	2.9%	
2Q 2021	358	Forecast	5.6%	1.4%	
3Q 2021	360	Forecast	5.6%	0.6%	
4Q 2021	364	Forecast	6.1%	1.1%	
1Q 2022	373	Forecast	5.7%	2.5%	
2Q 2022	378	Forecast	5.6%	1.3%	
3Q 2022	380	Forecast	5.6%	0.5%	
4Q 2022	384	Forecast	5.5%	1.1%	
1Q 2023	394	Forecast	5.6%	2.6%	
2Q 2023	399	Forecast	5.6%	1.3%	
3Q 2023	401	Forecast	5.5%	0.5%	
4Q 2023	404	Forecast	5.2%	0.7%	
1Q 2024	414	Forecast	5.1%	2.5%	
2Q 2024	417	Forecast	4.5%	0.7%	
3Q 2024	419	Forecast	4.5%	0.5%	

BCIS All-in TPI #101

Base date: 1985 mean = 100 | **Updated:** 14-Mar-2020 | #101

			Percentage change		
Date	**Index**	**Sample**	**On year**	**On quarter**	**On month**
1Q 2017	298	28	8.4%	5.3%	
2Q 2017	324	23	14.9%	8.7%	
3Q 2017	306	23	12.1%	-5.6%	
4Q 2017	327	20	15.5%	6.9%	
1Q 2018	328	Forecast 13	10.1%	0.3%	
2Q 2018	332	Forecast 18	2.5%	1.2%	
3Q 2018	320	Forecast 15	4.6%	-3.6%	
4Q 2018	333	Provisional 18	1.8%	4.1%	
1Q 2019	328	Provisional 11	0.0%	-1.5%	
2Q 2019	332	Provisional 8	0.0%	1.2%	
3Q 2019	333	Provisional 8	4.1%	0.3%	
4Q 2019	334	Provisional	0.3%	0.3%	
1Q 2020	335	Forecast	2.1%	0.3%	
2Q 2020	339	Forecast	2.1%	1.2%	
3Q 2020	341	Forecast	2.4%	0.6%	
4Q 2020	343	Forecast	2.7%	0.6%	
1Q 2021	353	Forecast	5.4%	2.9%	
2Q 2021	358	Forecast	5.6%	1.4%	
3Q 2021	360	Forecast	5.6%	0.6%	
4Q 2021	364	Forecast	6.1%	1.1%	
1Q 2022	373	Forecast	5.7%	2.5%	
2Q 2022	378	Forecast	5.6%	1.3%	
3Q 2022	380	Forecast	5.6%	0.5%	
4Q 2022	384	Forecast	5.5%	1.1%	
1Q 2023	394	Forecast	5.6%	2.6%	
2Q 2023	399	Forecast	5.6%	1.3%	
3Q 2023	401	Forecast	5.5%	0.5%	
4Q 2023	404	Forecast	5.2%	0.7%	
1Q 2024	414	Forecast	5.1%	2.5%	
2Q 2024	417	Forecast	4.5%	0.7%	
3Q 2024	419	Forecast	4.5%	0.5%	

Appendix C – Avg prices def £persqm 17Mar20

£/m2 study

Description: Rate per m2 gross internal floor area for the building Cost including prelims.

Last updated: 14-Mar-2020 00:49

At 1Q2020 prices (based on a Tender Price Index of 335) and UK mean location (Location index 100).

Maximum age of results: Default period

Building function (Maximum age of projects)	£/m² gross internal floor area						Sample
	Mean	Lowest	Lower quartiles	Median	Upper quartiles	Highest	
New build							
524. Theatres (15)	3,043	1,575	2,498	3,091	3,538	4,517	6
525. Cinemas (30)	1,679	-	-	-	-	-	1
Rehabilitation/Conversion							
524. Theatres (15)	2,024	1,452	1,464	1,731	2,364	3,110	5
525. Cinemas (25)	2,371	864	-	2,507	-	3,741	3

Appendix D – Avg prices 5yrs £persqm 17Mar20

£/m2 study

Description: Rate per m2 gross internal floor area for the building Cost including prelims.

Last updated: 14-Mar-2020 00:49

At 1Q2020 prices (based on a Tender Price Index of 335) and UK mean location (Location index 100).

Maximum age of results: 5 years

Building function (Maximum age of projects)	£/m² gross internal floor area						Sample
	Mean	Lowest	Lower quartiles	Median	Upper quartiles	Highest	
New build							
524. Theatres (5)	1,575	-	-	-	-	-	1

Appendix E – Avg prices def new build & refurb group elements 17Mar20

BCIS®

RICS

group element prices

Description: Rate per m2 gross internal floor area for the group element Cost including prelims.

Last updated: 14-Mar-2020 02:25

At 1Q2020 prices (based on a Tender Price Index of 335) and UK mean location (Location index 100).

Maximum age of results: Default period

Building function (Maximum age of projects)	£/m² gross internal floor area						Sample	Unpriced excl
	Mean	Lowest	Lower quartiles	Median	Upper quartiles	Highest		
New build								
524. Theatres								
01 Substructure (15)	226	121	154	194	302	372	6	0
02 Superstructure (15)	1,314	819	1,011	1,140	1,518	2,175	6	0
03 Finishes (15)	177	90	130	185	211	268	6	0
04 Fittings, Furnishings and Equipment (15)	211	5	73	197	263	517	5	0
05 Services (15)	1,024	484	761	994	1,250	1,652	6	0
525. Cinemas								
01 Substructure (30)	425	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
02 Superstructure (30)	998	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
03 Finishes (30)	69	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
04 Fittings, Furnishings and Equipment (30)	54	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
05 Services (30)	133	-	-	-	-	-	1	0
Rehabilitation/Conversion								
524. Theatres								
01 Substructure (20)	190	116	-	-	-	265	2	1
02 Superstructure (20)	782	562	-	665	-	1,119	3	0
03 Finishes (20)	236	141	-	265	-	302	3	0
04 Fittings, Furnishings and Equipment (20)	116	55	-	75	-	217	3	0
05 Services (20)	1,048	694	-	789	-	1,660	3	0
525. Cinemas								
01 Substructure (25)	165	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
02 Superstructure (25)	445	208	-	-	-	682	2	0
03 Finishes (25)	312	214	-	-	-	409	2	0
04 Fittings, Furnishings and Equipment (25)	81	2	-	-	-	159	2	0
05 Services (25)	765	439	-	-	-	1,091	2	0

Appendix F Analysis of 1000 seat theatre behind retained façade & BCIS benchmarking

Odeon 135-149 Shaftsbury Ave

Elemental analysis new build behind retained façade & BCIS benchmarking

				Theatres - Def	
				New bld	Rehab
		GIA m²	4,888	LF134	LF134
		£	£/m²	£/m²	£/m²
	Strip out, demolition, façade retention, asbestos, vibration monitoring	**4,499,040**	**920**		
1	**Substructure - works to basement/ dewatering/ piling**	**5,100,000**	**1,043**	**303**	**255**
2	**Superstructure**	**18,330,000**	**3,750**	**1,761**	**1,048**
3	**Internal Finishes**			**237**	**316**
4	**Fittings - seating/stage Eng/ stage lighting/ Av**	**2,675,000**	**547**	**283**	**155**
5	**Services**			**1,372**	**1,404**
6A	Site Works				
6B	Drainage				
6C	External Services - infrastructure upgrades	300,000	**61**		
6D	Minor Building Works				
6	**External Works**	**300,000**	**61**		
	SUB TOTAL	**30,904,040**	**6,322**	**3,956**	**3,178**
7	**Preliminaries 16.34%**	**5,050,000**	**1,033**		
	Overheads & Profit 5.95%	**2,140,000**	**438**		
	SUB TOTAL	**38,094,040**	**7,793**		
	Design Development risks 4.96%	1,890,000	**387**		
	Construction risks 5.22%	1,990,000	**407**		
	Employer change risks				
	Employer other risks - rounding	-40	**0**		
	TOTAL	**41,974,000**	**8,587**		

Benchmarking - new build scheme behind retained facade		4,078
Add demolitions etc	920	
Add infrastructure upgrades	61	
Add additional cost of substructure etc - provisional	741	
Add seating/ stage eng/ stage lighting/ AV	547	
	2,270	
Add prelims (not added to infrastructure) 16.34%	361	
Add OHP (not added to infrastructure) 5.95%	153	2,783
		6,861
Add contingency 10%		686
Adjusted benchmark	36,889,637	7,547