



TEAM 12

QUARTET

LAND  
DEVELOPMENT

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1) Report Highlights
- 2) Guiding Principles
- 3) Alternative 1 - Status Quo
- 4) Alternative 2 - Market Expansion
- 5) Alternative 3 - Calgary Expansion
- 6) Capital Structure
- 7) Recommendation
- 8) Implementation

# REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- **Recommendation:**
  - Continue land development business in Calgary
  - Partner with non local developer to raise equity funding
- Market expansion is too risky given management preferences and unfamiliarity with the market

# GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Market Fundamentals
- Risk Appetite of Management
- Management Expertise
- Strategic Direction



# ALTERNATIVE 1 - STATUS QUO

- What? Sit on the sidelines
- Pros:
  - Aligns with shareholders low appetite for risk and future objectives
  - Allows Quartet to focus on core competency as a home builder
- Cons:
  - Current business model is not sustainable
  - Significant economic volatility in Calgary could cause land prices to spike when oil prices recover
  - Quartet's existing land supply to be completely used in the next four years



# ALTERNATIVE 2 - MARKET EXPANSION

- What? Expansion to Edmonton
- Results: Unlevered IRR: 12.1% Levered IRR 27.2%
- Pros:
  - Market fundamentals (i.e. employment and population growth) support demand for housing
  - Less competition
- Cons:
  - Lack of expertise in the local market
  - Lack of relationships with local regulatory bodies
  - Extra time commitment from management
  - Limited relationships with local trades

# ALTERNATIVE 3 - CALGARY EXPANSION

- What? Land acquisition in Calgary
- Results: Unlevered IRR: 10.8% Levered IRR 26.4%
- Pros:
  - Long term demand for single family housing is strong
  - Tight land supply will continue to drive up prices
  - Local developers are seen more favourably by planning bodies and regulatory agencies
  - Can leverage local expertise and reputation
- Cons:
  - Market fundamentals may weaken in the near term due to economic uncertainty
  - Highly cyclical economic drivers (ie. commodities) increases volatility in the housing market
  - Proposed capital structure at 80% leverage may not be optimal given current debt ratio

# FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

		Construction Phase								
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Land	\$70,000,000	\$70,000,000								
General Servicing	\$44,000,000		\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	\$7,333,333	
Project Management	\$144,000,000		\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	
Marketing	\$16,000,000		\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	\$2,666,667	
	\$3,000,000		\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000		
<b>DEVELOPMENT COST</b>	<b>\$277,000,000</b>	<b>\$70,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$35,500,000</b>	<b>\$35,500,000</b>	<b>\$-</b>
Sales Proceeds										
<b>PROJECT CASH FLOW</b>		<b>\$(70,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(34,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(34,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(34,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(34,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(34,000,000)</b>	<b>\$(35,500,000)</b>	<b>\$(35,500,000)</b>	<b>\$444,000,000</b>
Project IRR (unlevered)	10.8%									
Financing (Interest)	\$8,000,000		\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	\$1,333,333	
Equity	\$45,000,000	\$(45,000,000)								\$212,000,000
<b>PROJECT CASH FLOW</b>		<b>\$(45,000,000)</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$1,333,333</b>	<b>\$212,000,000</b>
Levered IRR	26.4%									

Sensitivity	LOW: Number of Units	MID: Number of Units	HIGH: Number of Units
Single	1,320	600	600
Small	-	1,100	825
Stacked	600	1,000	1,500
Project IRR	<b>3.8%</b>	<b>10.8%</b>	<b>13.2%</b>
Levered IRR	<b>13.4%</b>	<b>26.4%</b>	<b>30.0%</b>



# CAPITAL STRUCTURE

- Pros
  - Magnified IRR with increased leverage
  - Flexibility to diversify equity in other investments
  - Equity partners builds relationships and distributes risk
- Cons
  - Increased volatility with more leverage
  - Increased overall risk to the business

# RECOMMENDATION

## Land Acquisition in Calgary

- Partner with non local Developer to raise equity funding (Ie. McKee, Carlisle Group, ReidBuilt Homes)
- Remaining capital sourced from institutional investor
- Continue land development as an integrated firm is best in current market
- Market fundamentals anticipated to be strong
- Agreement with management objectives

# IMPLEMENTATION

- Immediately
  - Due Diligence on Calgary acquisition
  - Source equity partner and institutional investor
- Year 1-5
  - Service land and prepare for lot sales to integrated builder
- Year 5+
  - Reassess Calgary market and available supply and demand, while considering changing management preferences