



# IPSWICH

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	29 January 2014
<b>Time</b>	10:00
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House – 4C
<b>Present</b>	Matthew Ling – (IBC Chair) (ML) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Eddie Peters (IBC Operations Manager Parks and Open Spaces) (EP) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) Fionnuala Lennon (ATLAS) (FL) Geoff Gardner (ATLAS) (GG) Chris Fish (SCC Highways) (CF) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC)
<b>Apologies</b>	Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Robert Hobbs (IBC Planning Policy ) (RH) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	26.03.14


	Items	Action	Attachments
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Apologies</b>		
1.1	Apologies that had been received were noted.		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Update on draft SPD &amp; timescales for consultation.</b>		
2.1	SM / PS updated the group about the ongoing 8 week consultation for the draft Ipswich Garden Suburb SPD (13 <sup>th</sup> January – 10 <sup>th</sup> March) and associated exhibitions.		
2.2	Following the conclusion of the consultation period IBC will give consideration to the responses, making alterations to the SPD that might be necessary. A report on the adoption of the SPD, its status prior to adoption and continuing governance of it will then be made to the Executive Committee.		
2.3	AO enquired as to whether there would be any inspection of the comments by members of the public prior to the Executive report being drafted.		
2.4	ML stated that IBC would not make comment until the report in 2.2 is completed but the comments would be available to view.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Update on IBC staff resources for INF garden Suburb.</b>		
3.1	SM announced that PS would be leaving on 28 <sup>th</sup> March and that IBC had employed a dedicated Senior Planning Officer, Rosalynn Claxton (RC), as his replacement who will start on 17.02.14 allowing for a handover from PS.		
3.2	The Development Steering Group (DSG) were pleased that IBC had employed a dedicated officer.		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>On-going role of the INF Steering Group &amp; frequency of meetings.</b>		<b>A project management diagram was circulated with the Agenda</b>
4.1	SM felt that the DSG would continue to have an important role with overseeing the entire Ipswich Northern Fringe (INF) project, and should meet on a regular basis.		
4.2	It was agreed by the group to continue to have an overview of the INF project as set out in the Agenda, and that there should continue to be regular meetings.		
4.3	The overall project management of the INF was proposed to include a Core Project Team to manage the planning applications, with a Design & Masterplan Working Group, Access & Transport Working Group, and Viability & S.106 Working Group feeding into the		

	process.		
4.4	AO thought that it would be necessary to have a Core Project Group for each application but a single Community Steering Panel (CSP) would still look at the overall impacts of the INF and feed directly into DSG.		
4.5	The amended structure was agreed.		
4.6	<b>Action: Change location of CSP on the management diagram so that it feeds into the DSG.</b>	<b>PS</b>	<b>See attached diagram</b>
4.7	Core Project Team should meet as necessary to ensure involvement in the evolution of any application. SC agreed that it would be a sensible way forward.		
4.8	AO asked whether the DSG be responsible for producing the transport assessments and infrastructure delivery plans of each planning application as implied in the DSH terms of reference.		
4.9	SM confirmed that the DSG would oversee the transport and infrastructure issues to ensure that they respond to the SPD across the entire site but ultimately it would be the planning application process that would be the final decision maker.		
5.0	<b>Preparation for setting up Delivery Board.</b>		
5.1	Discussion was had about how/when a Delivery Board would be set up and its role. It will effectively supersede the Development Steering Group in due course.		
5.2	FL stated that this is likely to be a natural process that will happen with time, and gave Fareham as an example of a successful delivery board, however thought that discussions about what the objectives/terms of reference of the group are will be necessary at a later date.		
5.3	SC asked what powers the Delivery Board would have.		
5.4	SM said that the views of the Delivery Board would be a material planning consideration on future planning applications.		
6.0	<b>Preparation for first planning application by Mersea Homes/CBRE GI.</b>		
6.1	A general round table discussion was had about a first phase application by Mersea Homes/CBRE GI, which included considering the weight that could be attributed to the SPD in its draft format prior to its adoption in Spring 2015, when a Design Code would be expected, and Infrastructure trigger points.		

6.2	AO commented that the SPD was a clear statement of the Borough Council's expectations and had been prepared with the landowners' involvement.		
6.3	SM felt that a collaborative approach on a future planning application would be the best approach. A project planning meeting of ½ day session to decide on a project plan, and what the expectations for the content of a planning application might be was agreed upon. The involvement of relevant parties from IBC, Mersea Homes/CBRE GI, Suffolk County Council, and to include RC, and ATLAS (FL/GG).		
6.4	<b>Action: ½ day session to be arranged.</b>	<b>PS</b>	
7.0	<b>Managing on-going stakeholder involvement and community relations.</b>		
7.1	The role of the CSP was discussed and where it would fit into the INF project structure in the future. (see Pt 4.4)		
7.2	ML stated that a further CSP meeting should be arranged to provide an update.		
7.3	SC agreed that Mersea Homes would be very happy to attend the meeting so that CSP has direct contact with the developer.		
7.4	<b>Action: Arrange meeting of the Community Steering Panel.</b>	<b>FB</b>	
7.5	SC stated that Simon Hoare (SH) of Community Connections had been employed to engage with the residents on behalf of Mersea Homes/CBRE GI.		
7.6	It was agreed that SCC and other agencies should continue to be involved in the process of bringing forward the INF project. Who should be involved will be discussed at the project planning meeting to be arranged. (see Pt 6.4)		
7.7	NM asked whether there would be County Councillor or MP interaction with the process.		
7.8	Involvement of Elected Members will continue through Portfolio Holder meetings, and through their involvement in the CSP, but bearing in mind the timing of local elections and Purdah (from 9 <sup>th</sup> April). ML stated he would advise the Executive Committee through Early Warning Group.		
7.9	<b>Action: Report on progress of INF to Early Warning Group.</b>	<b>ML</b>	

<b>8.0</b>	<b>Arrangements for Design Review / Presentations.</b>		
8.1	SC confirmed that it would be his intention for Mersea Homes/CBRE GI to make a presentation of any proposed scheme to both the Planning & Development Committee and the Design & Conservation Panel in due course. The Design & Conservation Panel would serve a design review function for the Borough.		
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Action: Forward dates of Design &amp; Conservation and Planning &amp; Development meetings to Mersea Homes/CBRE GI.</b>	<b>CH</b>	
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Action: SC to liaise with MT to confirm date for a design review session with the DCP.</b>	<b>SC/MT</b>	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI).</b>		
9.1	ML confirmed that the minutes of the meeting would be made public as normal.		
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business.</b>		
10.1	MK stated that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) consultation had received 5 responses. This was noted by the DSG.		
10.2	EP queried the process of community development and management of assets such as public open space.		
10.3	FL said that there are examples of different levels of adoption which would need to be explored as part of the process.		
10.4	SM said that this would be part of the role of the Delivery Board as and when it starts to have a functioning role.		
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Date of Next Meetings</b>		
11.1	11.30am Wednesday 26 <sup>th</sup> March 2014 at Grafton House. Room 1C. <b>*Please note the later start due to room availability.</b>	<b>FB</b>	

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