

The Cranbrook Plan: Examination

Matter 14 Infrastructure Delivery

Statement on Behalf of East Devon New Community
partners

Matter 14 – Infrastructure Delivery

Issue 20: Are the Infrastructure delivery provisions justified and effective in the light of previous delivery?

Q163. 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?

1. It is not fair to conclude that delivery of infrastructure has been slower than anticipated.
2. Prior to the occupation of any dwellings, the offsite Clyst Honiton bypass had been completed and was funded by EDNCp.
3. Prior to the occupation of 50 dwellings the St Martins primary school was opened. The railway station – notoriously difficult to deliver was open ahead of programme as was the secondary school.
4. Prior to any occupations the Younghayes community building had been constructed meaning that there were a range of community facilities viable to the earliest residents. Cranbrook has been highly successful in delivering affordable infrastructure. It has been positively and efficiently managed by EDNCp and has recognised as such at national level.
5. It is the commercial facilities that have required a demand profile and houses on the ground or committed in expansion areas that have been slower to be provided. The full reasons for this are set out in the comprehensive statement on Matter 18. Rather than repeat that analysis, the EDNCp Matter 18 statement should be read in conjunction with this question.
6. It is therefore entirely probable that affordable infrastructure provision will be funded and delivered on time through the same model. The issue with the Cranbrook Plan is that the infrastructure and section 106 requirement is so far awry of what can be afforded that it is not realistic that all of the infrastructure in the IDP will be delivered by the allocations for housing. The remedy is set out in the EDNCp Matter 9 and Matter 15 Statements – the Inspector should require EDDC to work collaboratively with EDNCp and other stakeholders to agree a deliverable package of infrastructure that reflects the key priorities associated with development. Not everything being sought can be required as a priority.

Q164. 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?

Primary school 420 place – £7.2m

Primary school 630 place - £10.8m

Senor School expansion 4.3m

SEN school - £1m contribution from Devon CC

OH wires undergrounding - £3m to 5m

Highway Infrastructure – costs are unclear – please clarify?

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

Clyst Valle Regional Park – funding gap stated as £6.5 m
 Flooding – no infrastructure in contained in the schedule – how will this be funded and by what method will it be secured?
 Heath Medical Practice – proportionate costs of the £16.3 million
 Extra Care housing 55 flats £10.3 million – how are these costs attributed.
 Blue Light emergency services facility – funded from developer contributions– to what extent?
 LEAPS/NEAPs – how will these facilities be funded?
 Bus service £1.7 million cost – £780,000 gap how will these be funded.
 Traffic impact on M5 capacity – what costs are envisaged?

7. The question appears to be direct to EDDC but appears to mirror many of the issues raised by EDNCp. EDNCp have set out their concerns about individual elements of the IDP and their cumulative impact in detailed representations at Reg 19 stage and in EDNCp Statements on Matters 9 and 15. The EDNCp statements on Matters 9 and 15 should be read in conjunction with this question and considered at the same time in the examination.

Q165. 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?

8. Please refer to response to Question 163. There has been no imbalance in the delivery of infrastructure required by Cranbrook to date.
9. EDNCp Statement in respect of Matter 18 sets out the further progress being made to deliver community facilities and commercial facilities.
10. EDNCp have worked hard to deliver elements of the town centre – putting in the High Street infrastructure and making available serviced parcels of land. A public house has been secured. The public service agencies have been working up proposals for the community elements which has been given new impetus in particular by the decision of the County Council in November 2019 to press ahead with a multipurpose public sector community building in the town centre.
11. EDNCP have worked with variety of potential partners and occupiers to deliver the commercial elements of the town centre. In particular EDNCp have and are presently working with Henry Davidson Developments (HDD) which are a retail lead mixed use development specialist, established in 1992 with commercial aspects expected to be delivered by 2021.
12. The Town Council and District Council are working on proposals to deliver the Town Council offices and related facilities – potentially with EZ support.
13. Moreover the aspirations for an integrated community as is described in Q165 have to be set in the context of the planned strategy for Cranbrook. Again this is set out in full in Statement Matter 18, and not repeated here in detail.
14. In summary, Cranbrook was never conceived as a self-contained town. Cranbrook is located very close to Exeter, which provides a broad range of high order services and employment including health and leisure. It was planned such that it must have a railway station with ready access to such facilities. That station has been provided. Moreover the rapid growth of employment on the east side of Exeter including the Met Office, the Airport and the planned developments at Skypark

(40 hectares), Science Park (25 plus hectares) was the catalyst for Cranbrook's location – providing housing in a sustainable manner in a growth point experiencing and planning a rapid expansion of jobs. The employment provision has since this time been bolstered by the provision of the Regional Distribution Centre and further planned employment on the old rail freight site, opposite Skypark, and less than 1km from Bluehayes.

15. The following references from the Councils Economic Development Strategy for Cranbrook – part of the Cranbrook DPD evidence base - capture the point:

- *“Much of its [Cranbrook’s] working population will find employment elsewhere in the Growth Point, or in Exeter” (page 5)*
- *“Unlike many new towns, Cranbrook sits next to some major employment sites where there are extensive employment opportunities for people across the Growth Point and beyond. Two sites are under construction just outside the boundaries of the town:

 - *Skypark is a new commercial and industrial centre intended to be a locally and regionally significant employment location which could provide up to 6,500 jobs when completed. So far, it has provided bespoke premises, the Ambulance Special Operations Centre building and E.On Energy Centre (the hub for the district heating network into Cranbrook and Skypark) are open, and the new depot building express delivery service DPD Logistics is under construction.*
 - *Exeter Science Park is a major new development for innovation and technology businesses, with the Met Office (which is soon to gain a new supercomputer) and the University of Exeter among the partners behind its development. The Science Park Centre, a managed workspace, is under construction, and Eagle House (the first building on the park) is fully occupied by Blur Group, a global technology company” (page 6)**
- *“The new town at Cranbrook is a core component of the Exeter and East Devon Growth Point. The Growth Point also includes strategic urban extensions for Exeter, strategic employment sites, city centre regeneration, and other new housing sites, along with higher and further education investment. These developments have been supported by large-scale infrastructure projects including energy, transport, education and community facilities. The projects making up the Growth Point include developments in East Devon, Exeter and Teignbridge. (Further details are given in Annex 1.) The Growth Point programme is expected to deliver around 20,000 new homes and over 25,000 jobs in the period up to 2026”.*

16. Cranbrook was not, is not, and was never intended to be a self-contained or self-sustainable town. Its inherent sustainability comes from its relationship with the growth point not its internal dynamic.

AQ20. Are any Main Modifications proposed in relation to Issue 20?

17. EDNCp have set out in detail in Statements 9 and 15 the need for substantial modifications to the DPD.

18. For the DPD to be viable it continues to be necessary to:

- reduce the expectations placed on the development in respect of affordable housing and other costs; and/or
- reduce the expectations placed on the development in terms of infrastructure delivery and section 106 obligations.

-
19. To assist the Inspector the work completed by Whiteleaf and Partners suggests that on the basis of their evidenced assumptions in Appendix E then to ensure a viable development then the affordable housing contribution would need to be reduced to 10% AND a substantial proportion of the development costs/section 106 expectations would be unaffordable (potentially some £60m of the £113m spelt out in the Cranbrook IDP). This would need to be coupled with other more realistic assumptions relating to other inputs into the development model.
 20. As set out above after your careful consideration of the evidence in relation to viability, we would urge you to require EDDC to constructive negotiate with EDNCp and other objectors (as appropriate), to achieve a cost saving of some £60m from the proposed infrastructure/section 106 costs and to amend the Plan/IDP accordingly – rather than rush to the unhelpful adoption of the DPD. If, upon consideration, you consider that the savings required are a different figure – then please set out your expectations of necessary cost savings. This is critical if delivery of Cranbrook and housing in East Devon is not to be undermined.
 21. Ideally this should have been a matter for members of the Council rather than the Inspector but the plan has been submitted in its current form and needs to be considered by the Inspector.
 22. As indicated in the PPG a balance needs to be struck. The DPD seeks to achieve all possible outcomes in terms of Healthy new towns, Zero carbon, GI, custom built housing; Design Codes; digital connectivity; new railway infrastructure; ultra low emission charging and so on and so on. The anticipated extremely large section 106 contributions and the 15% affordable housing policy expectation are therefore unaffordable.
 23. EDNCp have hitherto suggested scenarios to close the gap between the demonstrable residual values and the benchmark values. Consideration needs to be given to:
 - a. A reduction in the affordable housing expectation to 5% or 10%;
 - b. An amendment in the affordable housing tenure mix;
 - c. A reduction in the proportion of an infrastructure cost that is anticipated to be attributable to Cranbrook expansion
 - d. The removal, or postponement until funding is secured from third parties, of a number of infrastructure savings.
 24. It is likely that more than one of the above options will be necessary.