

The Cranbrook Plan: Examination

Matter 13 Infrastructure Phasing

Statement on Behalf of East Devon New Community
partners

Matter 13 – Infrastructure Phasing

Issue 19: Are the Infrastructure Phasing Proposals through Policy CB7 positively prepared, justified and effective?

Q152. How robust is the phasing of key infrastructure in conjunction with the housing expansion areas? How have the issues relating to infrastructure delivery in Cranbrook Phase 1 influenced the development of the phasing policy?

1. EDNCp has addressed infrastructure phasing in statements on Matters 8 9 and 15 which should be read in conjunction with the discussion under this overlapping Matter.
2. To be clear while the IDP provides guidance in respect of infrastructure delivery, the precise phasing will be set out in detailed consents rather than in policy form. The IDP needs to be recognised as background information rather than a policy requirement.

Q153. How does the approach to infrastructure funding influence the phasing of the four expansion areas?

3. It does not as each of the expansion areas are planned to come forward in overlapping rather than sequential manner and will be delivered with specific individual phasing arrangements set out in legal agreements accompanying each consent.

Q154. How does Policy CB7 align to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan?

4. To be clear while the IDP provides guidance in respect of infrastructure delivery, the precise phasing will be set out in detailed consents rather than in policy form. The IDP needs to be recognised as background information rather than a policy requirement.

Q155. Is the phasing strategy justified where the majority of land in three of the four expansion areas appears to be largely controlled by a single developer?

5. No – please see response to Matter 8 and representations at reg 19 stage

Q156. There is a time critical relationship referred to between school provision and funding via housing; how realistic is the delivery of the school?

6. Triggers are set out in the policy regarding the timing of provision of primary schools. It is not a matter of dispute that when approved planning permissions will need to include section 106 obligations regarding the timing or delivery of education infrastructure or payments. The details of those legal agreements will need to be determined at that point in the light of the best information then available. They will also need to be determined having regard to the whole infrastructure package and the triggers relating to other cost elements.
7. In this light it is inappropriate to set out specific triggers for education provision in the plan. While it is appropriate to refer to the need to deliver education facilities having regard to completions on the site - the precise provisions should remain to be finalised.

8. Provision of the first primary school by 30 occupations represents a very challenging target appears not to be evidenced that such a prescriptive approach is justified or reasonable or proportionate.

Q157. Phasing of the school by the 30th Dwelling inextricably links the four expansion areas; what is the rationale behind this approach?

9. See Question 156.

Q158. Should the primary school be completed prior to the first occupation of any new dwellings in these four expansion areas?

10. No – see above.

Q159. What is the mechanism for funding an additional station to serve the development? How robust is the Cobden's allocation without any certainty on the timing or provision of the station?

11. The IDP has not clarified funding mechanisms for the proposed additional station at Cranbrook. The cost for provision of a second station is estimated at £9m (as identified at paragraph 2.18 of the CIDP). However, neither this figure or measure has been included in the Equalisation Assessment for Required Infrastructure (Appendix 1) or the Infrastructure Schedule (Appendix 2) of the CIDP.
12. The provision of a second Cranbrook station also seems unrealistic and unviable given that the over-riding need is for more frequent trains. It is understood that more frequent trains can only be accommodated if the passing loop is delivered. The passing loop is estimated to cost £50m and again, no mechanism for funding has been set out within the CIDP to deliver this.
13. It is also noted that there is an absence of need for a second station until after the construction of approximately 6,000 - 6,500 units on the Cranbrook site. The current development total 3,487 homes which would increase to 4,527 (following construction of a total 1,040 homes as part of the Bluehayes expansion) and an increase to 5,442 homes (following construction of a total 915 homes as part of the Treasbeare expansion).
14. Policy CB10 'Safeguarding of Land for a Second Station' at paragraph 3.62 of the Cranbrook Plan DPD suggests that the provision of a second station is primarily proposed to ensure that all phases to the east of the Town Centre and from the Cobdens and Grange expansion areas are within "the 1km recommended suitable walking distance to a station". The source of the 1km distance is not cited in the policy, but it is assumed that this has been taken from the document Providing for Journeys on Foot as published by the IHT. This document identifies a desirable, acceptable and preferred maximum distances for walking to facilities and amenities. For a rail station they are 500m, 1,000m and 2,000m respectively. It is therefore considered that at least some of the Cobdens Expansion Area could come forward for development (within the 2,000m threshold), regardless of timing / provision of any second rail station.
15. Provision of a second station is also not the only option available in terms of encouraging sustainable commuter trips. Paragraph 4.3.2 of the Transport and Movement Addendum (2019) states that due to the ongoing uncertainty over the deliverability of the station, alternative means of bringing people to existing rail services should be explored. These could include

coordination of timetables with bus services bringing people from the more distant parts of Cranbrook or providing more attractive, secure cycle storage for end-to-end sustainable journeys.

16. A direct road link from the proposed station to Cranbrook town centre is not possible as it would need to cross an area of floodplain. Therefore, a second station would only provide limited opportunity for multi-modal trips by bus, car and train (as set out as paragraph 2.2.4 of the Cranbrook Transport and Movement Addendum 2019). The existing Cranbrook station however, does have the potential to serve as a multi-modal transport interchange with existing facilities available for a bus to turnaround, cycle parking spaces and car parking spaces.
17. Therefore, it is considered that there is an opportunity to provide alternative means of public transport for future residents accessing rail services, which have been prioritised higher in the CIDP and allocated specific funding streams. It is felt that this would provide a more cost-effective option that also encourages trips by sustainable methods.

Q160. Is it certain that power, water and sewage capacity can be fulfilled for all the additional development expected within the expansion areas?

18. Yes – Cranbrook has consistently delivered all necessary capacity and for more than 10 years has been planned with the expansion of the town in mind.

Q161. If power lines cannot be placed underground, how might this affect the delivery of the Cobden's allocation?

19. No comments.

Q162. How far will the requirement for a train loop to enable stopping services to be more frequent reduce road traffic into Exeter. What is the delivery mechanism and how realistic is it?

20. The Evidence Base provided in support of the Cranbrook Plan DPD suggests that provision of a second station would have the least impact on providing relief on the local highway network in terms of removal of peak hour trips. The Evidence Base (in DCC's Cranbrook s.106 Transport Request June 2018) suggests that the option to provide a second station at Cranbrook would be approximately 65% less effective in removing peak hour car trips compared to undertaking rail enhancements elsewhere on the network (e.g. at Axminster). See also Rail Update report appended to EDNCp's Matter 9 Statement

AQ19. Are any Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 19?