

# Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	18 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
<b>Time</b>	10am
<b>Location</b>	Room 4c, Grafton House
<b>Attendees</b>	James Brierley (Gerald Eve) (JB) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Christopher Fish (SCC) (CF) Carlos Hone (IBC Planning) (CHo) James Farrar (Atlas) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Hollie Stacey (Crest Nicholson) (HS) Nick Walford (Mott MacDonald) (NW) Lloyd Worsley (Mott MacDonalds) (LW) Robert Hobbs (IBC Planning Policy Team Leader) (RH)
<b>Apologies</b>	Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) James Cutting (SCC) Claire Hupton (HCA) Duncan Innes (Crest Nicholson) Dave Watson (SCC) Russell Williams (IBC Chief Executive) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School)
<b>Distribution</b>	Invitees only

## Items:


			<b>Attachments</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b>		
1.1	SC requested a change to wording at 3.2 in the draft minutes, which was accepted.		
1.2	With regards to action 2.3 RC advised that Suffolk Coastal have agreed deed of variation to Felixstowe port s.106 which includes removal of improvements to level crossing east of Ipswich. However level crossing improvements are still included in the revised s.106 as		

	part of the potential capacity improvements to be undertaken by the port. The revision results in the necessary works being less specific and certain but discussions with the relevant officer at Suffolk Coastal suggests that focus is still on Westerfield level crossing as part of the improvements.		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>IDP Commission – Stage 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Update on progress</b></li> </ul>		
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Action - Mott MacDonald Stage 1 report to be circulated along with Stage 2 report.</b>	<b>RC</b>	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>IDP Commission – Stage 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Update on progress and presentation of findings to date</b></li> </ul>		
3.1	JB went through in detail the Stage 2 modelling work that had been undertaken to date. This included a detailed look at the previous Peter Brett assumptions.		
3.2	Meetings had been undertaken between JB and each of the various landowners /developers, to understand their particular circumstances and development aims. The outcomes of the meetings were used to inform the modelling work.		
3.3	The model is based on following unit numbers:- CBRE 793; Mersea Homes 1215; Crest Nicholson 941; Ipswich School 390; Other 35, which totalled 3374 dwellings. Which is below the 3,500 total identified in the SPD.		
3.4	In terms of affordable housing the output at this stage suggests a level of around 11%. Although due to the size of the development and length of time it would take to complete, sensitivity analysis based on future values could achieve higher levels. Furthermore an IRR (Internal Rate of Return) target as opposed to traditional GDV (Gross Development Value) could improve things further and allow for risk in earlier phases of the development to be factored in.		
3.5	JB continued to describe that the model of the development, which had been structured across each of the development phases where data had been provided, and that each ownership had been broken into individual phases. JB described that it was important that each of these phases were viable in their own right. The Peter Brett model took a more general / high level approach across the entire development.		
3.6	Consequently with 3,335 dwellings the density achieved would be 32.9 dph. The SPD allows for up to 3,500 dwellings which equates to a density of 34dph,		

	<p>which indicates that a slight improvement could be made on viability if greater number of dwelling realised.</p>		
3.7	<p>The model assumed a delivery rate of 200 units per annum, aggregated across the whole development, with all the CBRE/Mersea/Crest being on site in 2022 – assuming different start dates. Ipswich School land that is reliant on CBRE delivery, is expected to come at the end of the development.</p>		
3.8	<p>JB looked at the strategic infrastructure costs in the model some of which were mentioned, e.g. £6.7M for the road/rail crossing.</p>		
3.9	<p>The land value assumed was split between developable and non-developable land. Which resulted in a blended rate of around £110,000 per acre. Total land value was therefore assumed to be £52.8M which included the Country Park.</p>		
3.10	<p>Construction costs were assumed to be £85 p/sq/ft. Whilst the build cost was queried by SC/HS, JB explained that on top of this a contingency % and piled foundations across 50% of the site had been added which increased this to around £95 p/sq/ft. JB advised that other construction cost evidence could be considered if parties felt the assumptions being used were unrealistic.</p>		
3.11	<p>JB described the model is merely a simulation rather than fact, and that it should be reflected in the wording of the s.106. The s.106 should include the review of future phases which might include a surplus in the latter stages for infrastructure or affordable housing. Although JB felt that 35% was an appropriate cap for affordable housing and would prevent significant pockets of affordable housing from occurring in the later phases of the development, which would occur in the Peter Brett model.</p>		
3.12	<p>JB thought that an overarching agreement would be required for the ring-fenced elements, with individual s.106 agreements for each of the land owners. The overarching agreement would need to be signed by all parties.</p>		
3.13	<p>JB said the sales values were as per the Stage 1 report £224 p/sq/ft, and was dependent on dwelling mix, number of houses, and sizes etc.</p>		
3.14	<p>JB concluded by saying that the model was set up in order to deliver the requirements of the SPD.</p>		
3.15	<p>SM stated that everyone need to consider the data that JB had gone through in detail prior to stage 3 work</p>		

	being undertaken.		
3.16	It was agreed that SC/HS/Ipswich School will all have an opportunity to comment on the report prior to completion, and prior to the next meeting of the DSG meeting being held.		
3.17	<b>Action – Bill of Quantities / construction cost evidence to be supplied to JB to assess build costs.</b>	<b>SC / HS</b>	
3.18	<b>Action – Geological survey of the entire site giving ground types to be provided to JB.</b>	<b>RC</b>	
3.19	<b>Action – Tables of figures and draft Stage 2 report, including s.106 principles, to be circulated to interested parties.</b>	<b>JB</b>	
3.20	<b>Action – Comments to be made in writing about the stage 2 report by landowners to JB by w/c 14.09.15.</b>	<b>SC/HS/PW</b>	
4.0	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b>		
4.1	None		
5.0	<b>Any Other Business</b>		
5.1	FL stated that the DCLG / Treasury Department are becoming more involved in garden suburbs, in terms of their delivery, and offering more help. Having already provided capacity funding they would like to meet with the LPA at the end of August or early September to see how the project was moving forward.		
5.2	The interested parties agreed to be available for such a meeting.		
5.3	<b>Action – Meeting to be organised between DCLG/Treasury and IBC/ landowners to discuss the project. Ipswich School to be included.</b>	<b>FL/RC</b>	
5.4	<b>Next meeting TBA for w/c 21<sup>st</sup> September 2015.</b>	<b>RC</b>	

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/>

<b>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</b>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
<p>Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.</p> <p>Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.</p> 	1. That is <b>personal data</b>	
	2. Provided in <b>confidence</b>	
	3. Intended for <b>future publication</b>	x
	4. Related to <b>criminal proceedings</b>	
	5. That might prejudice <b>law enforcement</b>	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing <b>external audit</b> investigations	
	7. That could prejudice the <b>conduct of public affairs</b>	
	8. Information that could endanger an individual's <b>health &amp; safety</b>	
	9. That is subject to <b>legal privilege</b>	
	10. That is prejudicial to <b>commercial interests</b>	
	11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>	
	12. <b>Other</b> Please describe	