

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	22 nd October 2015
Time	11am
Location	Room 3c, Grafton House
Attendees	James Brierley (Gerald Eve) (JB) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Siôn Davies (Gerald Eve) (SD) Duncan Innes (Crest Nicholson) (DI) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Steve Miller (IBC Town Planning) (SM) Hollie Stacey (Crest Nicholson) (HS) Nick Walford (Mott MacDonald) (NW) Lloyd Worsley (Mott MacDonald) (LW) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Felicia Blake (IBC Town Planning) (FB)
Apologies	Martin Blake; James Cutting; Martyn Fulcher; Claire Hupton.
Distribution	Invitees only

Items:

			Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting		
1.1	DI requested amendment to point 3.2 to remove brackets so clear that 15% externals and 3% design are separate items – Agreed		
1.2	SC requested wording of 3.8 is clarified and action added at 3.18 that he is to circulate a note on land value for consideration.		
1.3	Actions from last meeting were discussed and it was agreed that many would be discussed as part of the agenda for this meeting.		
1.4	The following action points were discussed as outstanding:		

1.5	Action 3.5 – RC to pursue query on Bader Close build costs.	RC	
1.6	Action 3.18 - SC to finalise note on Land Value and circulate.	SC	
1.7	Action 3.23 – RC has raised query on Affordable Housing Rental Income with Housing and is waiting for feedback. JB agreed to send a draft question to RC which can be passed to Housing so that there is clarity on the information required.	RC/JB	
1.8	Action 3.32 – Totals of table have been sent need to be circulated as part of revised draft.	RC	
1.9	RC provided a quick update on the rail issues which were raised at last meeting. Information relating to compensation payments for line closures has been received. A meeting on ransom payments is to be arranged with Network Rail. A note on rail issues has been sent to DCLG.		
1.10	DI suggested that colleague Sharon Flood may be able to assist. Everyone agreed this would be beneficial.		
1.21	Action: Compensation information received to be sent to NW for Stage 1 report.	RC	
1.22	Action: DW to be kept updated.	RC	
1.23	Group agreed remainder of minutes to be accurate.		
2.0	Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Stage 1		
2.1	RC outlined the main feedback to the stage 1 report and how this compared to the four main outputs identified in the original brief for the work. A more detailed breakdown of the costs and details behind the assumptions was needed, along with some corrections to factual information. The way in which the information was presented in the report could be looked at again to ensure all expected outputs were achieved and enable all parties to have a better understanding of the assumptions being used and therefore be in better position to agree the inputs for stage 2 work.		
2.2	NW advised that feedback had been taken on board and would be happy to address comments through a revised Stage 1 report. Will be looking to strip out a lot of information relating to later stages which is unnecessary. Aspects of infrastructure phasing and cashflow which were identified in the original brief as stage 1 work, is considered to be part of stage 2 work.		

2.3	Further clarity was sought on where the costings were coming from for the secondary school (a pro-rata sum was needed).		
2.4	Action – NM said he could provide data analysis from Bury School as a good example of a new school build.	NM	
2.5	NW working on presentation of costs which provide a tool going forward for updating costs and adjusting for phasing and programming.		
2.6	The group had a lengthy discussion on delivery and implications of using SPD for trigger assumptions. SC cautioned the need for flexibility to allow for changes in delivery timetables and assumptions used to date. JB noted that incorporating such safeguards was the role of the stage 3 work.		
2.7	DI stated that development should not be expected to pay for anything before development has started. PW queried distribution of costs and gave electricity contribution as an example.		
2.8	RC reiterated that presentation of the information was important in order to show at what points funding needed, and from which developments funding would be captured from. JB advised this would be shown through Gantt chart type presentation. SC added there should be 3 Gantt charts (3 neighbourhoods) with the 4 th Gantt chart (to encompass all).		
2.9	SM informed the group that this viability work will be used as a guidance tool to aid the IDP work whereby more detailed viability assessments would be undertaken for each planning application.		
2.10	DI queried whether developers should be providing comment on cost inputs at stage 1 or 2. RC advised that stage 1 was the point at which costs should be agreed and developer input needed.		
2.11	FL asked whether queries on costs have been specific. DI and SC advised that they have sent through own cost information to Motts.		
2.12	RC suggested that until a more detailed breakdown of cost assumptions has been received it is difficult for all parties to comment.		
2.13	Discussions around way in which information could be presented followed, RC has sent NW table of information needed which followed same lines as that suggested by JB. Also agreed that costs need to re-catergorised from those used in PBA work.		

2.14	Action – NW advised that revised stage 1 assumptions would be circulated in two weeks.	NW	
2.15	Action - Feedback on stage 1 information to be provided within two weeks of receipt in order for it to be used in Stage 2 report which is to be amended for the next Steering Group meeting.	All	
3.0	IDP – Stage 2		
	<u>Build Costs</u>		
3.1	LW advised that BCIS figure for Colchester was incorrect. There was some discussion on mean / median figures being relied on from BCIS. LW explained why median figure used.		
3.2	JB went through build cost methodology sent through from DI and explained some aspects had been covered already through inputs used in the viability. Some other aspects were queried such as design and enhancements. There was discussion on what acceptance of this methodology might mean for current sales value assumptions.		
3.3	Action – JB to look into DI build cost methodology and implications for sales values.	JB	
3.4	Action – SC offered to provide an example of a proven scheme and DI offered to arrange an excursion for the group to *nearby towns* to illustrate ‘best practice’.	SC/DI	
	<u>Unit Size / Mix</u>		
3.5	RC circulated a note which brought together CBRE and Crest information on unit size and mix assumptions for their sites in IGS, and how this compared to National Standard unit sizes and SPD mix.		
3.6	It was explained that the mix identified in the SPD had been split between affordable housing and private to reflect advice from Housing dept. This was reflective of the general proportion of housing IBC were striving for. A suggested mix and units sizes based on max national standards was suggested by RC.		
3.7	DI and SC questioned the unit sizes as they over-estimated the sizes they were assuming for the 1 beds and underestimated the sizes of the larger 4/5 bed units.		
3.8	There was discussion on whether an average could be derived from unit sizes SC and DI had submitted based on mix provided by RC. JB suggested this would be around 1100 sq.ft.		

3.9	Action – JB to produce average values table based on figures fed in from Crest and Mersea Homes.	JB	
3.10	<u>Net Developable Areas</u> RC circulated a hand-out on Net Developable Areas which shows potential shortfall of residential areas (97 ha rather than 102 ha).		
3.11	Action – RC said she would do further work on the land measurements and provide a revised breakdown of all areas.	RC	
3.12	Action - JB said he would be able to resolve the density issue and add to modelling table as long as the figures had been agreed.	JB	
3.13	FL added it was the Council's main objection to achieve a high quality garden suburb.		
3.14	<u>Land Value</u> As previously noted SC to circulate note on land value.		
3.15	Action - JB will undertake necessary re-calculations.	JB	
3.16	<u>S106 / Infra Costs</u> Discussed as part of item 2 of agenda.		
4.0	IDP – Stage 3		
4.1	RC outlined need for clarity on what expectations were of stage 3 and suggested that work started on this as soon as possible. Main output of Stage 3 is the draft IDP and delivery options.		
4.2	RC and NW to work on note which provides more detail on stage 3 work and expected outputs.		
4.3	DI queried the timescales for agreeing the agreed delivery date for completion of this.		
4.4	Action – A note setting out stage 3 work is to be drafted and circulated when completed.	RC/NW	
5.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
5.1	None noted.		
6.0	Any Other Business		
6.1	None noted.		
7.0	Date of Next Meeting		
7.1	In 5 weeks time.		

The full minutes of this meeting are assumed to be accessible to the public and to staff, unless the chair claims an exemption under the **Freedom of Information Act 2000**. For detailed guidance about applying the exemptions visit <http://www.ico.gov.uk/>

Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.

Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.

Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.



These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
1. That is personal data	
2. Provided in confidence	
3. Intended for future publication	x
4. Related to criminal proceedings	
5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
6. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	
7. That could prejudice the conduct of public affairs	
8. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety	
9. That is subject to legal privilege	
10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests	
11. That may not be disclosed by law	
12. Other Please describe	