

Emily Porter

Subject: FW: Lotmead

From: Emma Geater <Emma.Geater@cpplc.com>
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2022 2:06 PM
To: Kimberly Corps <KCorps@swindon.gov.uk>
Cc: Darren Dancey <Darren.Dancey@cpplc.com>
Subject: Lotmead

Hi Kimberley

Thanks again for the meeting on Tuesday, it was so nice to meet everyone and finally make some progress. Face to face meetings are definitely more productive and we would like to try and keep this going, is Peter Eggleton able to join us in person as it would also be good to meet with him and build a rapport ?

I know Janet has raised the PPA with my colleague and I am more than happy to relook at the structure of the meetings in order to ensure we make the best use of everyones time, I will pick that up with Janet. Also I just want to let you know that we are going to stand Turleys down as planning agent and my colleague Emma will be managing the project from now on with me. We will have Turleys in the background providing planning advice but all communication with officers will be via Emma Gillespie with a view to helping your officers and streamlining discussions. I can also discuss that with Janet.

One key point we have been checking is the abnormal costs within the outline viability. Janet advised us all in the meeting that the viability includes all the costs for the LLFA preferred drainage strategy and we want to make sure we are comparing apples and apples. We have reviewed and we do not believe that this statement is correct. A summary of why is outlined below.

The viability appraisal prepared by RLB on behalf of Ainscough included the following costs, which did allow for seven large ponds on site, which also isn't reflective of what Richard is now expecting:

3.05	Surface Water			
	Drainage			
	a Cut off drains for flooding	500 m	100.00	50,000
	b Dredge existing water / ditch courses	1 item	50,000.00	50,000
	SUDS			
	a Ponds			
	Phase 1	16,796 m3	15.00	251,940
	Phase 2	0 m3	15.00	0
	Phase 3	20,426 m3	15.00	306,390
	Phase 4	13,658 m3	15.00	204,870
	Phase 5	0 m3	15.00	0
	Phase 6	24,238 m3	15.00	363,570
	Phase 7	0 m3	15.00	0

	b Swales			
	Phase 1	760 m	67.50	51,300
	Phase 2	0 m	67.50	0
	Phase 3	3,921 m	67.50	264,668
	Phase 4	624 m	67.50	42,120
	Phase 5	2,199 m	67.50	148,433
	Phase 6	348 m	67.50	23,490
	Phase 7	515 m	67.50	34,763
	k Headwalls to Ponds (infall/outfall)	16 Nr	12,000.00	192,000
	l Headwalls to Swales (cascading)	55 Nr	6,000.00	330,000
	m Conveyance (pipel) (SAY)	400 m	200.00	80,000
	Storm water Total			2,393,543
3.06	Foul Water			
	Drainage			
	a Provisional allowance for sewers in landscaped areas	500 m	250	125,000
	b Manholes	17 Nr	2,500	42,500
	c Pumping Stations	4 Nr	120,000	480,000
	d Off site works (EXCLUDED)			EXCL
	Foul Water Total			647,500
3.07	Drainage diversions			
	Provisional allowances			
	a Foul	1 item	50,000	50,000
	b Surface Water	1 item	50,000	50,000
	Drainage diversions Total			100,000
	Earthworks			
	a To alleviate local flooding issues; excavate to Plots 3 and 4	150,555 m3	10.00	1,505,550
	b To create cut off ditches	11,000 m3	10.00	110,000
	c Top soil and subsoil handling strategy / levels issues	6 Ph	75,000.00	450,000
	Enabling Works Total			2,140,550
1	Dwellings (Abnormals)			
1.01	Houses			
	a Abnormal foundations; piling or similar to address alluvium clay	430 Units	3,900.00	1,677,000
	Total			1,677,000

We noticed that levels were specifically excluded from the costs (please see extract below from cost report)

3.6 Exclusions

3.6.1 Generic Exclusions

- Local taxes (eg. VAT)
- Land acquisition cost / Land compensation costs
- Land rental for temporary accommodation
- Restrictive Land Covenants / Ransoms / Rights of Light / Land compensation / Oversailing
- Finance
- Legal Fees
- Agency Fees
- Statutory Approval Fees (Permits etc)
- Inflation / Increase costs
- Flood defence works
- Acoustic Fences
- Archaeological watching briefs
- Marketing signage
- Off site water reinforcement
- CIL
- Poor ground conditions and / or contamination
- Raising levels for the flood plain
- On Plot works (dwellings, roads, sewers)

However we note that an additional £300k was added to the road infrastructure to deal with levels, see below:

A further contingency of £300,000 has been added to cover any level issues once engineering design and site conditions are known. It is reasonable to assume that extra costs for potential site related conditions beyond the typical constructions will be incurred. However without detailed level analysis any allowance must be considered subjective and could be deemed covered by the contingency provision.

RLB state that the contingency is intended to cover unknown scope, design development and construction risk, not known work content. RLB's allowance to remain.

In the absence of detailed level information any allowance for raising levels is purely subjective. Unknown works are normally covered by the percentage contingency therefore this allowance should be deducted.

On the basis of all of the above we do not believe the site level increases (even the reduced ones) required by the LLFA strategy have been accounted for in the viability. We have made provision in our viability of the monies above but we have not made allowances for the LLFA strategies we are now discussing with you. Just so you have a feel for it the figures for land raising are likely to be the following:

- 3 metres plus (worse case which we have all agreed is unlikely) – £31.2 million (includes piling, land moving, soil import etc)
- 2-3 metres - £15 million (includes piling, land moving, soil import etc)
- 1-2 metres - £ 5 million (potentially able to use standard foundations but extra deep with land moving and soil import)

This doesn't change our commitment to trying to work with you and the LLFA to get to a solution, we just want to be transparent that we aren't trying to achieve any betterment or mislead you , we are in fact going to be at a loss due to the LLFA requirements.

We were really pleased at the progress we made on Tuesday and remain hopeful that we can get to a solution soon that suits everyone and can get us on site.

One other thing I wanted to raise is that due to the delay in agreeing on the drainage strategy we are now behind programme, so in order to give us more time on Phase 1 RM we thought it might be worth submitting an infrastructure application for phase 1 in tandem to the RM. The plans will be identical it just might allow you the ability to approve just the road quicker and allow the RM more time to focus on design matters? I think Emma raised this with Janet and the answer was no but I am just trying to find ways to get the SCR etc moving once we have agreed the make up of it.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks
Emma