



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	2 nd July 2015
Time	1pm
Location	Room 3B, Grafton House
Attendees	Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) James Cutting (SCC) (JC) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Nick Walford (Mott MacDonald) (NW) James Brierley (Gerald Eve) (JB) Duncan Innes (Crest Nicholson) (DI) Hollie Stacey (Crest Nicholson) (HS) Lloyd Worsley (Mott MacDonald) (LW)
Distribution	Attendees only

Items			Attachments
1.0	Introductions		
1.1	Duncan Innes introduced Hollie Stacey who is Planning Manager with Crest Nicholson and shall be taking over from Kenny Duncan.		
1.2	Nick Walford introduced Lloyd Worsley who is Quantity Surveyor with Mott MacDonald and has been working on the Stage 1 work of the IDP commission.		
2.0	Minutes of Last Meeting		
2.1	Some information related to action 3.10 has been retrieved but further clarification on current situation still required. All other actions completed.		
2.2	Minutes agreed.		

2.3	Action: Clarify revisions to Felixstowe Port S106 with regards to Westerfield Level Crossing.	RC	
3.0	<p>IDP Commission – Stage 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on progress • Gaps in information • Conclusions <p>3.1 Update on Stage 1 findings presented by NW, JB and LW. Which included a recap on the project brief, approach & work undertaken, findings, recommendations and project timescales.</p> <p>3.2 The findings of the Stage 1 work so far were discussed. Although there were some changes to some of the PBA assumptions reviewed, initial findings confirmed that PBA's viability conclusions were still achievable</p> <p>3.3 SC commented that Savills for the CBRE/Mersea scheme have used a land sale value for the District Centre rather than yield and queried therefore whether Stage 2 work could address this. SC also queried the 12% assumption for external works as being too low for the Garden Suburb standards proposed.</p> <p>3.4 It was noted that some costs still require further consideration in particular foul water drainage and schools. JC advised that further advice on schools could be provided.</p> <p>3.5 The breakdown of some of the costs used and what they actually cover was not clear and greater clarity needed. For instance there was some discussion as to what Ecology costs covered, whether the figure was high enough or whether there was some overlap with some of the professional fee assumptions. NW and JB advised that as part of next stage of work the categorisation of the costs could be revised to address concerns regarding duplication and omission of costs.</p> <p>3.6 It was agreed that comments on stage 1 findings to date should be gathered and used to inform an interim stage 1 report. It was understood that further refinement of the costs were needed in order to complete stage 1 and the further information required would be set out in the interim report.</p>	All	
4.0	<p>IDP Commission – Stage 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion on whether Stage 2 work required on basis of Stage 1 conclusions. 		
3.7	Action: Feedback on Stage 1 findings.		

4.1	Work on stage 1 has revealed a potential increase in infrastructure costs of 11% as well as some changes to unit numbers and distribution. It is recommended that Stage 2 work is undertaken in order to provide a finer grain analysis of the development and consider the viability of individual phases in order to improve the overall viability of the scheme.		
4.2	SC and DI raised concerns that some costs seemed light and how realistic the viability of the IGS development would be in light of costs being assumed. Concern that no advancement being made in resolving issues.		
4.3	General consensus that Stage 2 work should be undertaken.		
4.4	On that basis it was advised that one to one meetings with developers to understand their particular sites and approach was needed and bespoke inputs could be included within viability model. One to one meetings would be held during July between developers/landowners and JB.		
4.5	Action: Consultants to arrange one to one meetings with developers.	NW / JB	
5.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
6.0	Any Other Business		
6.1	SC advised that revised material for CBRE/Mersea Homes planning application was expected to be submitted in August.		
6.2	Next Steering Group meeting to be arranged mid-August to coincide with next stage of IDP work		
6.3	Action: August Steering Group to be arranged.	RC	

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.	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
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.



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	