



Minutes

IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	14 May 2014
Time	10:00
Location	Grafton House – Room 3B
Invited	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD) Chris Fish (SCC Highways) (CF) John Pitchford (SCC) (JP) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Eddie Peters (IBC Parks and Open Spaces) (EP) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning (RCI) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH)
Distribution	Attendees only
Apologies	Martin Blake (Mersea Homes)(MH), Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas)(FL)
Minutes Agreed	23 rd July 2014

Items:

			Attachments
1.0	Minutes from Last Meeting (26 March 2014)	FB	Minutes of 26.03.14 attached
1.1	Ref minute 2.0.2. SC asked whether the analysis of consultation responses to the SPD would be discussed as an agenda item before they are presented to the Executive Committee. SM confirmed		

	they could be on the agenda for 11.06.14		
1.2	Ref 2.1.2 SC asked for progress on affordable housing (AH) policy position. SM said that IBC was some way off making any decisions, but that some thought was required as to how to join up AH in the SPD and the Core Strategy review.		
1.3	PW felt that there should be discussions between parties on access to the Ipswich School land, owing to impacts on viability. SM considered that this should be part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).		
1.4	Some debate was had regarding the issues of viability and ransom strips, but SM concluded that these should be discussed between the principal land owners as part of the IDP.		
1.5	KD stated that Crest had decided to prepare Heads of Terms for discussions with other land owners, which could be discussed at the next meeting.		
1.6	Action: Put SPD changes on agenda for next DSG meeting.	RCI	
1.7	Action: Change to minute 5.2: - <u>SCN</u> could <u>not</u> understand where the evidence base for the triggers had come from. Change initial reference for Sarah Conlan to SCN in the invitee list.	CH	
2.0	Infrastructure Delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes from Infrastructure Delivery Meeting • Update from Landowners on Infrastructure delivery discussions • Current IBC view on delivery/ viability • Agree next step / meeting date to progress discussions and ensure approach agreed in time for CBRE / Mersea Homes planning submission 		
2.1	ML asked whether the circulated IDP-note had been as a result of a meeting between the land owners. KD confirmed that it had, and that Crest had instructed solicitors to draft Heads of Terms for a collaborative agreement.		
2.2	SCs view was that the process of agreeing a Collaboration Agreement with all landowners could take at least 12 months and that it would not be		

	possible to do even if it were required, and unlikely to be quick enough to be ready for their planning application submission.		
2.3	It was agreed that there would be a meeting arranged before the next DSG to discuss Infrastructure delivery and the Crest - Heads of Terms.		
2.4	RCI outlined the contents of the IDP-note which should be used to inform discussions on Infrastructure delivery between landowners / developers.		
2.5	KD explained that a Collaboration Agreement would run in tandem with the IDP.		
2.6	SC agreed that the IDP would be a public document which demonstrates the SPD infrastructure requirements, whereas a Collaboration Agreement would be a separate commercial document.		
2.7	RCL/SM asked SC about whether the IDP would cover the entire SPD site, and accompany the first phase application. SC said that it would but the detail would be on the beginning of the 'time-line' of the whole SPD development.		
2.8	RCI reiterated that a site-wide IDP should be submitted with any planning application which is drawn up in agreement with other landowners / developers in IGS. Expressed concern that SC's suggestion did not comply with this.		
2.9	SM asked SC whether the IDP would be agreed across all parties, and whether there would be engagement with the other land owners. SC – yes there would be engagement but the Council will need to judge whether it is agreeable when deciding on the planning application. SC stated draft of IDP should be available in next two weeks.		
2.10	JP raised school delivery as part of the uncertainty surrounding the IDP, and felt that it should be part of the agreement particularly with the need for early delivery of a primary school. SM said that this would come out in the IDP.		
2.11	SC asked what the Council thought about the issue of affordable housing (AH). SM explained that it was necessary to have a discussion on AH with the		

	<p>elected Portfolio Holder. A roof-tax proposition on some elements could be a way to secure infrastructure. SC agreed that a roof-tax could be a way of securing the wider strategic infrastructure.</p>		
2.12	Action: Crest draft Heads of Terms legal document to be circulated.	KD	
2.13	Action: Meeting to be arranged to discuss Infrastructure delivery and the Crest - Heads of Terms before the next DSG.	KD / SC / PW	
2.14	Action: IDP to be agenda item at next meeting.	RCI	
2.15	Action: SC to send draft IDP to Council before end May.	SC	
3.0	<p>CBRE / Mersea Home application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on planning application progress, including Highways and timescales for submission, include feedback from public exhibition event • IBC perspective on discussions / progress 		
3.1	<p>SC detailed the progress on the CBRE/Mersea application. Highways scoping response had been received which identified outstanding issues to agreed. Mersea are continuing on transport modelling, which will then deal with the outstanding issues as part of the TA to be submitted with the application. KD requested whether the scoping response would be shared, and whether the sensitivity testing was for the entire site. SC agreed to send the scoping response to KD, and confirmed that the testing was for the entire site.</p>		
3.2	<p>RCI requested that the transport details be seen and further discussed with IBC & SCC pre-submission, given this was one of principal issues associated with the proposals. SC would discuss this with the consultants but confirmed the TA would be robust.</p>		
3.3	<p>SC summarised the main points raised at the public consultation event undertaken. Highways and Drainage being main issues. Most queries were regarding the detail of the proposals rather than the principle itself. ML asked about drainage. SC said a FRA which answers all the drainage questions will be submitted with the application.</p>		

3.4	<p>With regards to the IBC perspective RCI felt that the project teams were not progressing at a pace that was in line with an application which Mersea Homes were targeting for a mid-end of June submission. Critical issues related to transport and drainage, which are required to underpin the design and layout work were still unresolved. In particular there are significant drainage concerns to which details are still awaited and concern that there has been no further engagement following SCC's response to TA scope/modelling response. It was also noted that whilst some positive engagement had been undertaken on design of phase 1, the remainder of the outline site was still to be discussed. Given current state of other matters relating to community development, viability etc. still to be discussed. RCI concluded that given the outstanding matters to be resolved there were serious reservations whether acceptable proposals would be ready for targeted submission date. SC responded by confirming that further information and engagement would still happen but the planning team wanted to ensure IBC see the application as a whole rather than individual strands.</p>		
3.5	<p>DC stated that the surface water drainage was not resolved and that the ongoing design was not following key IBC or National standards or the draft SUDS Strategy and did not include sufficient space integrated in residential streets. DC's comments made 2 months ago are being ignored. No design or modelling had been received 2 months on from the core project meeting. DC stated development phases after October 2014 would require SAB approval and would have to comply with National Standards, regardless of whether planning permission was granted. It was vital phase 1, the outline application and the SPD included cross sections through residential streets that reflected the garden suburb character and included sufficient space for SuDS compliant with standards. SC disagreed with this as the application would be submitted to national standards.</p>		
3.6	<p>DC noted that many of his comments were also aimed at reducing development costs. SC disagreed with this as DC was not taking into account all aspects of the application and was looking at SuDS in isolation.</p>		

3.7	Discussion was had about how the SUDs strategy and swale widths would influence highway design, urban design, and open space provision. (DC/EP/MT/SC)		
3.8	RCI asked whether the drainage design was to be shared with IBC before the application. SC said that it would.		
3.9	RCI said there had been some positive engagement regarding design however there had been no response to the IBC feedback on the draft Design and Access Statement. SC said he would pass on the comments.		
3.10	MK explained for the benefit of the group that he and CF had met with Network Rail regarding the potential for car parking at Westerfield Railway Station. SC queried the need for this additional car parking which he felt would encourage car use. SM explained the sustainable benefits of the parking at the station that was outlined in the SPD.		
3.11	SC let the group know that an unknown third party was seeking to cancel the Fonnereau Way at public inquiry.		
3.12	CF explained that SCC had looked into the feasibility of closing the level crossing but that this was unlikely, and that full barriers across the road and cameras were the most likely solution.		
3.13	DC stated for the record that he had been trying to work with the Mersea consultants on drainage, and that they had consistently presented non-compliant designs, which had not taken any notice of any IBC comments. MT also said that the liaison meetings were not all they could have been, with very little feedback from the Mersea Consultants.		
3.14	ML thought that these issues needed resolving and asked that SC take this back to his consultants. SC agreed.		
3.15	Action: SC to provide Crest with highways scoping response.	SC	
3.16	Action: SC to forward drainage information & design to IBC by end of May	SC	

4.0	DCLG Large Sites Infrastructure programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine which elements of the programme will be bid for and who responsible • IBC view 		Attachment
4.1	RCI outlined the benefits of the DCLG Large Sites Infrastructure Programme. FL of Atlas had advised IBC that the Council had the right criteria to apply for Infrastructure and Capacity funding which would need to be done by the end of May.		
4.2	Both SC and KD confirmed that currently the scheme is not eligible owing to a requirement for a minimum of 1,500 dwellings to be allocated which is not the case here until a review and adoption of the Local Plan. However Mersea and Crest were bidding for other schemes they were involved in, and as funding was being put forward by the DCLG every year until 2020 they may be in a position to put in bids in the future.		
4.3	Action: IBC to put in application for capacity funding via the Large Sites Infrastructure Programme.	RCI	
5.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
5.1	Confirmation that all minutes would be made public as normal. ML		
6.0	Any Other Business		
6.1	SM outlined the process of the design review undertaken as an independent assessment by Design South Easton the SPD, to establish whether it was sound. No fundamental changes to the document were proposed.		
6.2	Action: Response of Design South East panel to be circulated to members of DSG for comments by end of May.	RCI	
7.0	Date of Next Meeting		
	11 th June 2014 – 10:00 – 12:00, Room 4B		

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/>



Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.

Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.

Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.

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