

Statement for the examination of the Cranbrook DPD

Response to the Inspectors Matters Issues and
Questions

Matter 14: Infrastructure Delivery

Date – 8 January 2020

Contact details

Planning Department – Cranbrook Team
East Devon District Council
Blackdown House, Border Road, Heathpark Industrial Estate,
Honiton, EX14 1EJ
DX 48808 Honiton

Phone: 01395 516551
Email: planningcranbrook@eastdevon.gov.uk

eastdevon.gov.uk
[@eastdevon](https://www.instagram.com/eastdevon)

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Issue 20: | 4 |
| Are the Infrastructure delivery provisions justified and effective in the light of previous delivery? | 4 |
| Q163 – Certainty of delivery | 4 |
| Q164 – Overall home cost & delivery | 6 |
| Q165 – Integrated community aspirations | 12 |
| AQ20 – Main modification | 13 |

Issue 20:

Are the Infrastructure delivery provisions justified and effective in the light of previous delivery?

| Response | Inspectors Question(s) |
|--|--|
| <p>1.1 Delivery of facilities to date have been slower than anticipated – what certainty is there around the delivery of further infrastructure and how will this influence future phasing? How realistic is it that all infrastructure would be delivered via contributions from new housing?</p> <p>1.2 The Council do not consider that that the assertion that facilities have to date been slower than anticipated is fair. The new town has only now reached 2000 dwellings but has a track record which demonstrates an infrastructure based approach that has already delivered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 form entry Primary school • An all through school including nursery and 2 form entry Primary School • Railway station • Neighbourhood centre including Multipurpose community building • Multiple play parks, areas of open space and allotments <p>1.3 Most significantly the schools, station and community building which are large and expensive have been delivered ahead of their identified</p> | <p>Q163 – Certainty of delivery</p> |

trigger within the Section 106 agreement and represent significant delivery milestones for a relatively small town which is private sector led.

- 1.4 It is acknowledged that public perception paints a different picture and has not been helped by recent delays to the first shops in the Town Centre and in respect of delivery of the skate park but these should not be used to tarnish what has to date been a very successful delivery mechanism, within the town. Such success is referenced in a paper “Local growth for local people” that is available on the Local Government Association website¹ and provides a useful overview concerning Cranbrook’s growth and importantly its success at delivering infrastructure.
- 1.5 Looking to the future infrastructure delivery that needs to accompany the expansion areas it is considered that the DPD and accompanying IDP represents a robust and viable plan that will allow delivery of all items of infrastructure as set out (up to the proposed contribution levels where items are not being fully funded). That is not to say the Council will not continue to try to secure external funding where it can. The Council recognise that there remains aspects of the IDP which are not fully funded and as well as avoiding any risk in costs rising ahead of any indexation, it is prudent to try to further improve the viability of the development package that is being set out.
- 1.6 Overall it is considered that the package of obligations and associated infrastructure requirements that are set out are achievable. In this regard and noting both the need to deliver a new school by the 30th

¹ <https://www.local.gov.uk/local-growth-local-people>

dwelling, and tranches of SANGS ahead of respective occupations there are no other overriding influences to delivery other than cash flow – something that the Council remain committed to working with the developers to suitably address.

1.7 **What is the overall per home cost given the headline figures set out below? How would these costs affect the deliverability of any or all of the expansion areas? What proportion of these individual costs are reliant on sources other than residential developments and how will they be secured to ensure timely delivery?**

Q164 – Overall home cost & delivery

1.8 The list of projects identified within Q164 are set out below recognising updates that have occurred as a result of the pre-submission consultation and further clarity on the extent to which they would be fully funded by development at Cranbrook. This information corresponds with the Cranbrook IDP version 2 (January 2020) and is appended to this statement.

• Primary school 420 place – £7.2m

1.9 Total costs increased to £8.15m to recognise up to date Department of Education scorecards weighted with a 0.99 weighting for location. This would be fully funded by development in Cranbrook

• Primary school 630 place - £10.8m

1.10 Total costs increased to £12.2m to recognise up to date Department of Education scorecards weighted with a 0.99 weighting for location. This would be fully funded by development in Cranbrook

• Senior School expansion - £4.3m

1.11 The secondary school contribution sought by the Local Education Authority has been reviewed following their response to the Pre-submission consultation. It is now agreed with the Authority that based on the delivery of 4170 houses across the 4 expansion areas, a total contribution of £2,598,992 should be sought. This recognises the previously identified requirement of £1.53m (which was deemed sufficient for pupil places up to 7500 dwellings - index linked) together with a top up of £21,921 (index linked) per additional place required. This component has now been updated within the Cranbrook IDP – with a caveat that if dwellings numbers are affected, the total sought will be affected based on the resultant difference between 7500 and the final numbers

• SEN school - £1m contribution from Devon CC

1.12 The Cranbrook expansion developments have a responsibility to secure necessary land and a developer contribution totalling £1.03m towards this facility. The total cost for the full facility is in the region of £5.5m (plus land) but this is a cost that cannot be justified by the level of development that is proposed within the expansion areas. As such Devon County would need to secure third party funding to meet the residual gap and to deliver the facility.

• OH wires undergrounding - £3m to 5m

1.13 The costs identified within the IDP are those calculated by a study that the Council commissioned to understand the feasibility of undergrounding the OHL. They reflect the best estimate of the total costs of the work and would in its entirety need to be met by the

development in Cobdens and Grange. To help ensure that the costs are met equally they have been proportioned on a per linear metre basis across the two development areas.

• Highway Infrastructure – costs are unclear – please clarify?

1.14 The costs identified within the IDP generally have sought to identify those costs that are not typical to simply building housing, estate roads and the specific infrastructure necessary to service individual households. It does not recognise surface water management costs or those associated with site abnormalities but does attribute a value to the strategic requirements as well as the specific components necessary to meet the policy requirements of the Plan. In this regard there are a number of transport related costs identified – comprising those related to sustainable transport (including cycle networks and shared cars/bikes) and those related to the works on the London Road to improve connectivity between developments either side of the London Road. It is debateable whether new junctions would need to have been included within the IDP and the costs used for equalisation purposes but recognising the importance of connection across the road for pedestrians cyclists and vehicles they have to date been retained within the IDP. All transport costs within the Cranbrook IDP are expected to be met in full – either by a respective developer where these directly relate to a specific expansion (category 2) or shared across the expansion areas where these are off-site infrastructure (category 3).

• HRA mitigation – 78 acres SANG – how is this to be funded?

1.15 The 78ha SANG is funding is broken down into the three components

- land acquisition

- site establishment costs
- in perpetuity maintenance costs

1.16 Land acquisition is not recorded within the IDP cost equalisation approach within the IDP as it has already been accounted for on a plan-wide basis within the viability testing. Paragraph 4.2.9 of Cran063² sets out that testing has been on the basis of £25,000 per hectare which when taken with residential benchmark land value of £300,000 per gross hectare results in a total gross benchmark land for the whole expansion (including SANGS) of £205,414

1.17 Beyond the initial land acquisition, SANGS set-up costs are then identified within the IDP (schedule ref 58) with an allowance of £4.13m and for on-going maintenance (schedule ref 59) with an allowance of £2.5m.

1.18 Off site habitat mitigation (effectively forming on site measures for the protected environments are also identified within the costs schedule (ref 60) with £2.05m allocated.

• Clyst Valley Regional Park – funding gap stated as £6.5 m

1.19 It is not proposed that the Clyst Valley Regional Park is funded by the Cranbrook Development, falling primarily outside of the Cranbrook Plan area. While park may benefit from enhanced cycle provision to it from the Cranbrook development, the delivery of the park does not feature within the Cranbrook IDP.

² <https://eastdevon.gov.uk/media/2760827/east-devon-cil-review-and-cranbrook-viability-report.pdf>

• Flooding – no infrastructure in contained in the schedule – how will this be funded and by what method will it be secured?

1.20 It is considered that surface water management and flood mitigation requirements fall within the normal range of development costs already recognised within the viability testing. These will be on site works that physically relate to the delivery of housing and associated infrastructure. As such it is not considered that they need to be independently identified within the IDP. They nevertheless represent a cost to development that would be funded by and secured in most instances by condition.

• Heath Medical Practice – proportionate costs of the £16.3 million

1.21 The Health and well-being hub (identified within the IDP under reference 28) has an allowance of £8.77m to be derived from the development at Cranbrook. With an updated total cost estimate of £16.3m it is therefore expected that the development at Cranbrook makes provision for slightly over 50% of the total costs. This is considered a reasonable split noting the ultimately size of the expansion areas compared with the wider town (Cranbrook Phase 1) and the surrounding hinterland that the facility would serve. The identified shortfall would need to be met in a capital funding to bid to the NHS. Initial discussions and models where such developments have already been funded, have already been explored.

• Extra Care housing 55 flats £10.3 million – how are these costs attributed.

1.22 Extra care facilities have a significantly higher capital development costs than general needs housing and therefore needs to pool funding

from various streams. It is considered that the Cranbrook expansion should be liable for £3.5m of the total recognising that external funding and third party investment for such facilities can be obtained. To fund a higher proportion than is set would not represent a fair and reasonable approach recognising the scale of the development, the additional funding that should be obtainable and the viability constraints affecting the IDP which are already noted.

• Blue Light emergency services facility – funded from developer contributions – to what extent?

1.23 The blue light services facility already has land secured through Cranbrook Phase 1 and the item identified within the costs schedule under reference 30 makes provision for the full funding of the facility from Cranbrook expansion development. The Council have explored whether such a level of funding is appropriate and Devon Fire and Rescue Service who are the service leading the request have evidenced their response times and the benefits of having a service directly located in the town. While it remains the case that some benefits would accrue to immediately adjacent villages (such as Whimple/Rockbeare) these benefits are modest and do not necessitate a reduction in the proportion of the development that would be funded

• LEAPS/NEAPs – how will these facilities be funded?

1.24 LEAPs and NEAPs would be funded directly by developer contributions resulting from the Cranbrook expansion. A costs line for these facilities has been included within the IDP under Category 1 – reference 41 “formal play”.

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>• Bus service £1.7 million cost – £780,000 gap how will these be funded.</p> <p>1.25 The bus service total of £1.7m is derived from three sources: £660,000 from the Skypark development £260,000 from the Science park development £780,000 from the Cranbrook expansion</p> <p>1.26 However within the Cranbrook IDP, costs schedule and equalisation, the residential bus contribution of £780,000 has been index linked (increasing it by £283,140) and wrapped up in the single public transport entry (ref 18) and funded in full to a total of £9,253,140.</p> <p>• Traffic impact on M5 capacity – what costs are envisaged?</p> <p>1.27 Highways England have accepted that the existing junctions onto the M5 and A30 are able to cope with the likely increases in traffic associated with the Cranbrook expansion without further improvement works being required. Such a response however underpins the need to ensure that public transport improvements – particularly those associated with the bus network are delivered.</p> | |
| <p>1.28 How does the strategy for expansion address the “integrated community” aspirations of the plan given an apparent imbalance of the provision of facilities in the first phases of Cranbrook?</p> <p>1.29 The strategy recognises the need to deliver a community which addresses the health and well-being of all residents, ensuring walkable neighbourhoods and a range of services and facilities are delivered that help to maximise the sustainability and self-sufficiency of the expansion areas. The apparent imbalance that is alluded to is not as</p> | <p>Q165 – Integrated community aspirations</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>stark as suggested although the public concerns for this are recognised. The Council contend that Cranbrook Phase 1 as a whole will be well served by infrastructure and to this end, significant infrastructure has already been delivered given the scale of residential delivery to date. The infrastructure that is set to come forward within the expansion areas may be a slightly different nature but will ultimately build on the good work that has already been, and continues to be achieved.</p> | |
| <p>1.30 Additional Question:</p> <p>1.31 AQ20. Are any Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 20?</p> <p>1.32 No Main Modifications are proposed in relation to Issue 20.</p> | <p>AQ20 – Main modification</p> |