



Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	12 th February 2015
Time	12:30
Location	Grafton House
Invited	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) James Cutting (SCC) (JC) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) 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) John Terry (Crest Strategic Projects) (JT) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO)
Distribution	Attendees only

Items:

			Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting		Attached
1.2	Action - Additional school information to be circulated	JC	
1.3	SC clarified his position on pt 4.3 in that the approach of apportionment was fair in principle but needed further work. Agreed that pt 4.3 of minutes is changed to that effect.		
2.0	IGS Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBRE / Mersea planning application. • DCLG funding awarded to IGS project. 	RC	

<p>2.1</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>2.3</p> <p>2.4</p> <p>2.5</p>	<p>RC updated the group on the Mersea application. An extension of time has been agreed until September, with the detailed element having been removed. The application is now in Outline only. Present timetable provides for proposals to be presented to the July P&D Committee.</p> <p>AO confirmed that the detail needed for the Outline was being worked on to fit in with these time frames but that infrastructure and viability could set these back.</p> <p>SC confirmed that they were on track to get technical elements of the application ready for submission by the end of April including viability.</p> <p>KD advised that he was looking to get internal authorisation from Crest to submit an Outline planning application in the summer for the entire Crest site. JT advised that this would be dependent on the viability work currently being undertaken.</p> <p>The DCLG funding awarded to IGS project was raised and would be discussed in more detail as part of next item.</p>		
<p>3.0</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p>	<p>Delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on IDP approach set out in the IDP Note circulated at last meeting 09/12/14 (attached). • Agreement between parties on the proposed IDP approach or any other alternative proposal put forward. • Agree next steps to progress approach including options for consultancy input. <p>SC said that he had received an email from Crest regarding IDP. SC's biggest concern with IDP approach was viability due to costs associated with infrastructure required in SPD. SC considered that a radical approach may be needed to the infrastructure delivery as over time number of houses assumed for the site was reducing as more land was needed for provision of infrastructure items. Perhaps relocation of an item like school or country park to outside IGS was needed to ensure sufficient land for housing could be delivered. SC felt that without the three big issues (secondary school, country park, and rail bridge) the IDP would be much simpler, as a site specific document. ML confirmed that the SPD is the document IBC will be using to direct infrastructure delivery. SM advised that the infrastructure requirements would be tested as part of public examination of the Core Strategy Review.</p> <p>General discussion on need to update viability for IGS. JT suggested that an agreed IDP needed to look again at what were essential and less essential items of</p>		<p>Attached</p>

	<p>infrastructure. FL agreed with AO and JT that it was timely to go back and look again and refine the costs of infrastructure.</p>		
3.3	<p>SC made the point that the IGS infrastructure (strategic and local) is significantly above the CIL levels that he was aware of.</p>		
3.4	<p>RC introduced the Scope of Works document that had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was advised that the document was intended to inform the potential for using capacity funding for external advice for delivering the infrastructure. The scoping document identified two main issues / blockages to delivery. 1 - Overall IGS viability questions, and 2 – The absence of an agreed mechanism to deliver the strategic infrastructure. It was concluded that a collaborative approach to this work was considered the preferential method for getting best outcomes.</p>		Attached
3.5	<p>It was agreed by the group that a collaborative approach to the work could be taken. There was agreement from Crest and Mersea that the outcomes of the work and consultant conclusions would be used in IGS planning applications.</p>		
3.6	<p>RC commented that the specifics of the collaboration will need to be set out in terms of who will be involved and what is expected.</p>		
3.7	<p>In terms of the specifics of the scoping JT felt that new independent consultants should be found to do the work. It was agreed generally that a range of consultants would be considered for the work and it was requested that suggestions could be put forward. FL advised of the HCA's consultation panel.</p>		
3.8	<p>SC and JT felt that as part of costing work, build costs should also be looked at again.</p>		
3.9	<p>JC thought that as part of the scoping different financing options could be explored for infrastructure delivery, including the LEP.</p>		
3.10	<p>AO suggested that delivery options which reflected geography or phasing were also considered.</p>		
3.11	<p>JT thought that the pooling of contributions could work if it was equal on the strategic items. SC felt that this was ok in principle but problems arise when developers work at different speeds. MK advised that caution will be needed when deciding on approach to funding. After April 2015 S.106 agreements will need to be specific about the funding of particular projects.</p>		

3.12	RC asked how this work would fit within the timetable for the CBRE application, given that an IDP would need feedback, for example from SCC on secondary school matters. It was agreed by SC that this work could run alongside the Mersea application with the July committee date in mind.		
3.13	With regards to the list of Outcomes and Outputs SC raised the query that there should be a break after the 'review of draft reports' to enable a cost plan/viability check and discussion on options, prior to the jointly agreed IDP being written.		
3.14	RC stated that next step would be to draft up the brief for circulation.		
3.15	Action: IBC to write and circulate brief for use of the Capacity Funding.	RC	
3.16	Action: Developers to provide feedback on brief and to forward a list of possible companies who might undertake the viability work.	SC/PW/ KD/JT	
3.17	Action: IBC to set out the terms of collaborating on brief and circulate for comment and agreement.	RC	
4.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
4.1	No issues raised.		
5.0	Any Other Business		
5.1	None		