



IPSWICH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	26 th March 2014
Time	11:30
Location	Grafton House
Invited	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Strategic Projects) (NP) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Simon Hall (Mersea Homes) (SH) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RCL) Sarah Conlan (Crest Strategic Projects – Planning Director) (SCN) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD) Robert Hobbs (IBC Town Planning Policy) (RH) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH)
Distribution	Attendees only
Apologies	Phil Sweet (IBC); Arwel Owen (DLA); Dave Watson (SCC); Eddie Peters (IBC)
Minutes Agreed	15 May 2014

Items			Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting (29.01.2014).		
1.1	Point raised by AO of DLA regarding minute 4.9 – agreed and changed; 5.4 - agreed but minute stands; and 6.2 -agreed but minute stands.	FB	Minutes of 29.01.14 attached
1.2	No other points raised.		


2.0	Update on SPD consultation, responses received and significant issues arising	FB	Summary document attached
2.0.1	A document summarising the consultation responses to the draft SPD was handed out. RCL went through the document identifying the number and types of responses that had been received, and the significant issues that had arisen. RCL advised that not all responses had been summarised as yet but the summary note highlighted the significant issues which were arising from the responses considered so far.		
2.0.2	RCL detailed that the next stage was to complete the response analysis with a view of reporting to the Executive Committee on 15 th July '14.		
2.1	Update of the Core Strategy consultation responses		
2.1.1	RH explained the core strategy responses were being considered. RH noted the responses made by Mersea and Crest, in particular from Mersea regarding affordable housing and environmental standards, and that the aim was to align the affordable housing strategy/housing standards with whole plan viability in the Core Strategy Review.		
2.1.2	SC queried whether this would result in a % change to the affordable housing requirements. SM thought that it might, however ML stated that affordable housing was a key priority for Members.		
2.1.3	RH identified that employment was another topic of the responses to the consultation, but that IBC was allocating a number of employment sites within the Borough, as well as there being a regional strategy for employment in the form of the New Anglian LEP.		
2.1.4	With regards to comments on traffic and a potential Northern bypass, ML stated that the Strategic Economic Partnership had not flagged this up as an issue.		
2.1.5	The Jan – Mch consultation represented a Reg.18 draft plan consultation, with the Reg.19 submission stage being in approximately 6 months. RH anticipated that the report to Executive Committee will be in September '14 along with Whole Plan Viability.		

2.1.6	SC and SCN were both supportive of the CS review and were keen for it to be adopted, however SC raised concerns regarding how IBC arrived at it's objectively assessed housing need figure. He felt that the ONS population figure should have been a starting point to arriving at a local number (as other LPAs have done), and that the IBC assessed need figure may be challenged by an Inspector.		
2.1.7	SC also raised concerns that the CSR had more than minor changes to a lot of the policies and that an Inspector may consider it as a new plan rather than as a focused review.		
2.1.8	RH/SM noted the concern but it was considered to be a focused review while updating the whole plan through minor amendments following adoption of the NPPF.		
3.0	Update on Mersea Homes proposals		
3.1	SC updated the group on the Mersea/CBRE first phase planning application. Initial plans have started to be discussed with planning and design officers at the Council and that the aim was to submit a planning application at the end of May / early June. A public consultation event by Mersea is planned for the end of April at Henley Road Sports Club.		
3.2	Mersea/CBRE are working on evidence gathering with regards to Infrastructure delivery, and had agreed on a transport model, but that it hadn't been run yet.		
3.3	PW had concerns regarding the impact on Ipswich School land by development of other parcels of land.		
4.0	Update on IGS wide infrastructure delivery plan		
4.1	NP queried whether SC was speaking to utilities companies with reference to just the first phase application. SC confirmed the discussions were being had based on a global figure (3,500), but with specific regard to the first phase application.		
4.2	SC confirmed that there were no landowner agreements in place, and that discussions had not taken place regarding infrastructure delivery. RCL		

	thought that a focussed discussion with all of the land owners regarding infrastructure delivery was necessary, and that this should happen either through the DSG or outside as separate meetings.		
4.3	KD would seek to have meetings outside of the DSG with Mersea/CBRE/Ipswich School. But generally it was considered a good idea that discussion should be had.		
4.4	Action: Organise meeting with land owners and FL of Atlas to discuss delivery of infrastructure in the next couple of weeks.	RCL	
5.0	Implications for SPD		
5.1	RCL outlined that there would need to be discussions regarding the infrastructure trigger points in the final SPD.		
5.2	SCN could not understand where the evidence base for the triggers had come from. NP also agreed that the triggers resulted in too much infrastructure being required up front in the development, and thought a flexible approach to what triggers when.		
5.3	SM thought that it was an ongoing debate but that IBC reserved judgment on an SPD revision if necessary. It was highlighted that the draft SPD has a viability caveat on viability.		
5.4	FL thought it an appropriate time to take stock and possibly review some of the infrastructure delivery issues, but that it was important that the community was confident that infrastructure would be comprehensively delivered.		
5.5	ML/SM made it clear that the IBC Members were aware of viability considerations as part of planning applications, and that specifics such as E.C. Harris work would only be presented at an application stage.		
6.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
6.1	Confirmation that all minutes would be made public as normal. ML		
7.0	Any Other Business		

7.1	SM stated that the IBC Chief Executive requested that the draft SPD be subject to an independent Design Review, and that officers were currently in discussions with Shape East about this.		
7.2	Action: Arrange Design Review and discuss developers' contribution where necessary.	RCL	
7.3	Action: Invitee list to be reviewed.	FB	
8.0	Date of Next Meeting		
8.1	16 th April 2014 – time and room TBA		
8.2	4 Weekly meeting dates to be arranged for next 6 months.	FB	

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/>

 <p>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</p> <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>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	
	3. Intended for future publication	x
	4. Related to criminal proceedings	
	5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	
	7. That could prejudice the conduct of public affairs	
	8. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety	
	9. That is subject to legal privilege	
	10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests	
	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
	12. Other Please describe	

