

## Northern Fringe – Consultation responses

### **Consultation**

The consultation period for the Northern Fringe Issues and Options Report ran from Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> January to Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> February.

A total of 3689 letters and emails advising of the exhibition locations, Area Committees and Public Meeting were sent out to residents adjacent to the site including Westerfield Village and those fronting Valley, Henley and Tuddenham Roads in addition notification of the exhibitions were sent to representees on the Core Strategy mailing list and all respondees to the “call for ideas” on the SPD. A Public Notice was placed in EADT and Evening Star. A feature was included in the Angle. The EADT, Ipswich Star and BBC Suffolk covered also the exhibition.

In addition a preview meeting was held on 11<sup>th</sup> January for workshop attendees this was attend by twenty eight people. Presentations were made to North West and North East Committees and a public meeting attended by approximately two hundred people took place on 29<sup>th</sup> January at Northgate Arts Centre.

### **Feedback from Exhibition**

The manned Exhibition covered four locations; Henley Road Sports Club, Westerfield Church, Town Hall and Colchester Road Baptist Church a total of 676 people attended over sixteen days.

<b>Table 1 Exhibition Attendance</b>		
<b>Location</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Number of attendees (signed in)</b>
Henley Road Sport Centre	12 <sup>th</sup> to 15 <sup>th</sup> January	249
Westerfield Church	23 <sup>rd</sup> to 27 <sup>th</sup> January	238
Town Hall	2 <sup>nd</sup> , 5 <sup>th</sup> to 8 <sup>th</sup> February	129
Colchester Road Baptist Church	14 <sup>th</sup> and 15 <sup>th</sup> February	60
<b>Total</b>		<b>676</b>

- Generally we talked at lot about traffic, transport, rat runs and existing deficits in the public transport system. There is a feeling in the community that we do not really have a clear understanding of likely traffic impact or enough certainty as to how impacts will be mitigated.
- Sheer scale of the development (3500 homes in one location) was a concern to many.
- The Northern By-pass was high on some peoples agenda
- There was a lot of concern and apprehension about the development which residents wanted to see cater for families and Ipswich people
- Inevitably there was concern about what is going to be built at 'the bottom of my garden'
- Drainage was also big issue and flooding of Lower Road, Westerfield
- The idea of three neighbourhoods with facilities was welcomed.
- Lack of understanding of densities and what 35 dwellings / ha would look like and uncertainty whether a genuine Garden City character would be delivered over this density.
- Most people didn't want to see 3 storey houses
- Need for bungalows
- There was a significant request for land to be set-aside for a multi faith centre separate from the community facilities.
- Additional retail facilities, health facilities and community facilities in the area were welcomed
- As the community will have gas/ broad band can this be extended to Westerfield?
- Many people accepted that the NF development will probably go ahead but emphasised that the promised garden suburb vision, new community facilities, and excellent design quality must be delivered.
- How the site fronts to Henley Road and Westerfield Road are handled was a key concern.
- The interface between existing and new community was considered important especially the need to provide a green buffer to the rear of existing properties.

## Written Responses.

Responses were received in the form of individual letters, questionnaires and an On Line Survey. The number of responses is shown in table 2

<b>Table 2 responses received up to and including Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> February *</b>	
<b>Response type</b>	<b>Number</b>
Individual letters*	73
Returned Questionnaires*	88
Online Survey*	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>220</b>
* Available to view as hard copies from Ipswich Borough Council	

Paper copies of representees responses are available to view by appointment please contact;

Felicia Blake

Business Support Officer (Northern Fringe Project)  
Ipswich Borough Council  
Grafton House  
15-17 Russell Road  
Ipswich  
IP1 2DE at Ipswich Borough Council

## **Questionnaire feedback** (Copy of Questionnaire provided appendixA)

The questionnaire sought views about the fixed and variable components to ascertain respondent's views on the emerging framework plan. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the options being displayed and indicate a preferred option or alternative option. Finally they were asked to identify what elements of the development were most important to them for example family housing, Country Park, health facilities. The following tables show the results to the questions asked (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).

## Fixed components

<b>Table 3 Fixed Components</b> (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).		
Component	Agree	Disagree
<p><b>Results for fixed components as a combined question (question was not separated out on the online questionnaire)</b></p> <p>(Results for fixed components broken down for questionnaires returned to IBC only)</p> <p>The strategic landscape framework shows a high level of connectivity throughout the site. It incorporates the existing trees and hedgerows and the current Fonnereau Way.</p> <p>Each neighbourhood has a park or playing fields, and a children's play area.</p> <p>Green corridors will create distance between the railway and the development to reduce noise and visual impact.</p>	<p><b>70%</b></p> <p><b>(58%)</b></p> <p><b>(48%)</b></p> <p><b>(41%)</b></p>	<p><b>16%</b></p> <p><b>(19%)</b></p> <p><b>(10%)</b></p> <p><b>(16%)</b></p>
<p>The proposed country park is located in the northern most part of the site where it can create a transition between town and country, with rural space on its northern edge.</p>	<p><b>48%</b></p>	<p><b>33%</b></p>
<p>A railway bridge is proposed to allow access between different parts of the Northern Fringe.</p> <p>The railway crossing is determined by the technical requirements of the bridge and the railway track.</p>	<p><b>50%</b></p>	<p><b>12%</b></p>
<p>The site lends itself well to three neighbourhood units. Each neighbourhood would have a primary school, a district or local centre, and an open space as a</p>	<p><b>42%</b></p>	<p><b>30%</b></p>

<p>focus for community life. Depending on the final location of strategic land uses, neighbourhoods will have between approximately 1,000 and 1,300 dwellings.</p>		
<p>The exact location of the site accesses is to be determined as the master plan evolves. The intention is to ensure a good level of connectivity between the existing and new development so that over time the Northern Fringe is seamlessly integrated into the existing fabric of the town, as well as providing routes and other facilities that will support public transport, walking and cycling.</p>	<p><b>31%</b></p>	<p><b>48%</b></p>

- The majority of respondents regarded the retention of existing hedgerows, and trees within a strategic landscape framework as important. Although a minority would prefer to see the area retained in agricultural use. A significant number of respondents requested a green corridor to be located to the rear of existing properties which backed onto the site and along Henley Road. Concern was also raised regarding the former Red House parkland and the significant number of ancient trees.
- Concerns were raised regarding the effectiveness of a green corridor along the railway line to effectively reduce noise especially at night. And the change in nature of Fonnereau Way from a rural to urban footpath with potential for antisocial behaviour to be attracted to the rear of existing properties.
- The Country Park whilst welcomed was seen as a benefit for new residents and existing residents of Westerfield only. A significant minority would prefer to see the country park located to the south as a buffer between urban Ipswich and the northern fringe development.
- The railway crossing was seen as an essential piece of infrastructure which should be designed to provide adequately for cyclists, pedestrians cars and buses.
- A development of three neighbourhoods with their own local facilities was generally welcomed especially the potential for residents to walk

and cycle to local shops, schools and health facilities. However, the need to provide facilities in tandem with dwellings was highlighted, concern was expressed that houses would be built without the facilities and that existing facilities would not be able to cope with increased demand. Concerns were voiced regarding the density of dwellings and that by making the neighbourhoods self contained there would be little or no integration with existing residents.

- The issue of access and impact of the proposed development on the existing transport infrastructure was a major concern. The management of traffic was of critical importance to the majority of respondents as was the location and type of access points from the Northern Fringe. A significant number stated a need for a Northern Bypass and major highways works to be undertaken before any development on the northern fringe. Within the development it was felt that connectivity was essential and there should be no barriers on any modes of transport. Whilst encouraging residents to use buses, cycle and walk was accepted this was not seen as a viable transport solution and that car usage would be the dominant mode of transport.

### Option 1

<b>Table 4 Option 1</b> (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).		
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
The northern neighbourhood would become the focus for most of the commercial and community activity, with a food store, local shops, health centre and community facility located here, along with a primary school.	31%	48%
The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road would be the location for the secondary school. The secondary school is shown on the Ipswich School Playing fields, which would allow much of this part of the site to maintain its current use.  A primary school would be located adjacent to the secondary school to create a larger school campus.	29%	45%
The neighbourhood to the east of	41%	30%

Westerfield Road would have a primary school and potentially a small local centre or community facility, but would not have any substantial educational or commercial uses.		
---	--	--

- The location of a district centre on Henley Road was seen to disadvantage the majority of residents in the development a more central location would be beneficial. Concern was raised regarding the potential impact on existing retail provision. Locating the retail element towards Westerfield/ Valley Road was seen as providing facilities needed by existing residents; early provision of these facilities would help to establish shopping habits. .
- Whilst the use of Ipswich School Playing fields for the secondary school was seen to be beneficial maintaining an existing use and being central to the development concern was expressed about deliverability.
- Providing local facilities on the eastern neighbourhood would be beneficial to existing residents.

## Option 2

<b>Table 5 Option 2</b> (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).		
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
The northern neighbourhood would accommodate a primary school and potentially a small local centre, and would be largely residential.	49%	17%
The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road would be the focus for retail and community activity, with the proposed district centre (including a food store, health centre and other commercial and community uses) fronting Westerfield Road.	50%	20%
The neighbourhood to the east of Westerfield Road would accommodate a primary school and the secondary school – by locating the school here, the	45%	27%

playing fields would help to form an area of separation between the existing village and the development.		
---	--	--

- The majority of respondents preferred a mainly residential area to the north of the railway line, close to the proposed country park and the retail element would not be in competition with Fircroft shops
- The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road was agreed by most respondents to be the preferred location for retail and community uses. Respondents felt that this would place facilities central to the new community whilst providing existing residents especially Westerfield with much needed facilities. Concern was expressed about the loss of the rural nature of Westerfield Road unless the district centre was carefully designed.
- Location of the secondary school on the eastern neighbourhood was generally accepted and welcomed as a way of separating Westerfield Village from the development. However, concerns were raised regarding deliverability and where children would be schooled until available. Potentially for school traffic causing additional congestion of Westerfield Road at peak times was a concern.

### Option 3

<b>Table 6 Option 3</b> (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).		
	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>
The northern neighbourhood would accommodate the secondary school and a primary school. The secondary school would front Henley Road and would be accessible to the new residents as well as being close to the existing community.	27%	49%
The district centre, including the food store, health centre and other commercial and community uses would be located in the neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road. It would be close to existing residents to the south of the site. The neighbourhood would also have a primary school.	46%	21%



The eastern neighbourhood would include a primary school and small local or community centre.	48%	17%

- The northern neighbourhood was not regarded as an appropriate location for a secondary school due to its close proximity to Ormiston Endeavour Academy and potential for school traffic adding to congestion at peak times. The school site was regarded too distant from the remaining development.
- The comments received were broadly similar to option 2. The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road was agreed by most respondents to be the preferred location for retail and community uses. Respondents felt that this would place facilities central to the new community whilst providing existing residents especially Westerfield with much needed facilities. Concern was expressed about the loss of the rural nature of Westerfield Road unless the district centre was carefully designed.
- The eastern neighbourhood was considered ideal for residential use and to have least effect in traffic terms on Westerfield Road.

### Preferred Option

<b>Table 7 Preferred Option</b> (percentages do not equate to 100% as not all respondents answered all questions).		
<b>Option 1</b>	<b>Option 2</b>	<b>Option 3</b>
17%	35%	14%

- Whilst the majority of respondents who answered this question preferred option 2 it was noticeable that the choice of option was influenced by the respondent's residence and perceived impact on local roads, current facilities and views.

The main reasons for choosing option 2 included;

- Commercial centre being located centrally
- The secondary school would provide an alternative to Northgate for residents north of Ipswich
- Supermarket would serve existing and new residents

Disadvantages of option 2 included

- Increase traffic on Westerfield Road leading to congestion
- Loss of rural character of Westerfield Road.

### Type of development and community facilities

<b>Table 8 Elements to be provided by the development Ranked by order of importance given by responders to questionnaire</b>	
<b>Rank (1= most important 10= least important)</b>	<b>Elements</b>
1	New roads and improvements to existing roads
2	Health care facilities
3	Funding of works outside the Northern Fringe (e.g. junction improvements on the existing network)
4	Parks and village greens
5	A Country park
6	New bus services
7	Serviced Retirement Homes
8	New footpaths cycle ways, and bridleways and improvements to existing
9	More family homes
10	Small independent shops
11	Speed reduction measures
12	Primary and secondary schools
13	Homes for first Time buyers
14	Play facilities for children and teenagers
15	Community halls and meeting places
16	Sport Facilities
17	Nurseries
18	Accommodation for local businesses

19	Supermarket
20	Affordable homes (e.g. shared ownership, social rented housing)
21	Facilities for visually or physically impaired
22	Funding towards community projects
23	New Apartments

- The majority of respondents identified the need for new roads and improvements to existing roads and funding for works to the highway network outside the northern fringe as the most important requirements. They identified peak time congestion on Tuddenham / Westerfield / Henley and Valley Roads as a current concern with drivers taking unsuitable alternative routes to avoid the congestion including Defoe / Lower / Church Road Westerfield via Great Bealings.
- A significant number of people identified the need for a northern bypass to provide direct links to the A12/A14 for existing and future residents to access employment opportunities.
- Respondents are keen to see parks and village greens in the development plus a country park. However, a significant number disagreed on the Country Park being located to the north of the development. and the overall distribution of open spaces. In particular respondents wished to see more open space in the south of the development and establishment of Red House Farm as public open space.
- Walking and cycling opportunities to Westerfield Railway Station were identified as important as was an enhanced rail service. Improvements to the rights of way network with better connections to town centre and employment areas together with new bus services were identified as important.
- The need for family housing was identified. There was also a high demand for serviced retirement accommodation some respondents asked for bungalows to be included in the housing mix.

## Individual letters

73 individual letters were received, the points raised are summarised in table 9 together with the number of respondents who identified the point.

<b>Table 9 Summary of Issues raised by individuals</b>		
<b>Issue</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Number identifying issue</b>
Transport	Development should not proceed without Northern Bypass	8
	Will increase traffic on existing rat runs and create more rat runs	14
	Will increase congestion already experienced on Tuddenham / Westerfield/ Valley and Henley Roads	31
	Bus Priority will not work	1
	Rail services need to improved from Westerfield Station	1
	Up to date traffic survey required	2
	Residents of development will not cycle / walk	6
	Unacceptable to build without adequate traffic /road infrastructure	2
Access	Bus services need to run from day one	1
	Well designed cycle and pedestrian routes are important	2
Air Quality	Increased congestion will impact negatively on Air Quality already an issue on St Margaret's Plain	14

Infrastructure	Infrastructure needs to developed at same time as dwellings and high quality	5
	Concern that infrastructure will be inadequate / not be provided	4
	Existing services such as Ipswich Hospital will not be able to cope	9
Housing	Brownfield sites need to be developed before greenfield	16
	Houses should be built where jobs are	6
	No justification for more dwellings	6
	Too many dwellings are proposed	2
Density	35 dwellings /ha is too dense for 'garden suburb'	3
Agricultural land	Should not be developing on agricultural land	18
Open space	County Park should be located towards the south	7
	Green buffer should be provided between existing residents and development	10
	Large areas of public / open space should be spread throughout development	3
Trees	Support retention of veteran trees and hedgerows	2
Wildlife	Development would have an adverse impact on biodiversity	1
Surface Water	Concern development would increase flooding	13

Sewage	Object to use of Tuddenham Sewage works	2
	Sewage system cannot cope with increased demand	4

### Statutory Consultee Responses

Statutory consultees and stakeholders were contacted by letter their responses are set out in tables 10 and 11

<b>Table 10 Summary of Statutory Consultee responses</b>	
<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
Highways Agency	No objection
Suffolk County Council	<p>The County Council believes that the Borough Council must make the maximum possible use of brown field sites when it considers how it will proceed with its proposals for the Northern Fringe</p> <p>The proposed development could only work in transport terms if robust measures are taken to minimise traffic flows from the site and to encourage sustainable means of travel. It does not consider that the measures, as set out in the Issues and Options Report, represent an adequate response to address concerns. The County council is yet to be convinced that the traffic impacts can be mitigated and therefore it falls to the Borough Council and developers to demonstrate, to the highway Authorities satisfaction, that the development can proceed without unacceptable impacts on the highway</p> <p>The SPD should plan for the provision of three new primary schools and a new secondary school within the development</p> <p>Members expressed a desire to work in a collaborative manner in forming the SDP.</p> <p><b><u>Detailed Response:-</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Vision:-</u></b> Firmer commitments required on sustainability,</p>

	<p>sustainable transport, and lifetime homes.</p> <p><u>Land Use:-</u> Promotion of homeworking to be prioritised.</p> <p><u>Access and movement:-</u></p> <p>SCC Local Transport Plan (2011) Principles need to be followed.</p> <p>Lack of clear design philosophy that focuses on sustainable travel.</p> <p>SPD needs to set out greater penetration of site by sustainable means, especially walking and cycling to key destination such as town centre and Westerfield Station.</p> <p>Fast, frequent public transport needed from commencement of development (including cross-town routes)</p> <p>Proposed new rail bridge should have limited use at peak times.</p> <p>Traffic signals required at all site accesses with bus priority – SPD does not currently reflect this approach.</p>
	<p>Crossing improvements to Westerfield level crossing – possible need for new road bridge.</p> <p>30 mph speed limit likely to be required on Westerfield Road.</p> <p>Traffic calming may also be required on other roads surrounding the site.</p> <p>Design standards should be DMRB and Manual for Streets.</p> <p>Phasing and delivery mechanisms for transport infrastructure must be clearly set out in SPD.</p> <p>Retention and enhancement of Fonnereau Way welcomed – more detailed work on rights of way generally required.</p>

	<p><u>Infrastructure</u></p> <p>Requirement for provision of land for primary and secondary schools reiterated.</p> <p>Central location adjacent district centre preferred.</p> <p>New secondary school required by 2020. First primary school required by 2018.</p> <p>Need for pre-school places identified.</p> <p><u>Waste</u></p> <p>Reference at para. 4.117 welcomed.</p> <p><u>Other community facilities</u></p> <p>See SCC Section 106 Developers Guide.</p> <p><u>Viability</u></p> <p>I&amp;O Report takes too narrow a view of viability.</p> <p><u>Community</u></p> <p>Need to give more consideration to assumptions about average occupancy. 2.35 is too low.</p> <p><u>Community development</u></p> <p>Support for community development measures.</p> <p><u>Older People</u></p> <p>Lifetime Homes Standard should be required.</p>
	<p>Design features within the development should reflect the needs of an aging population.</p> <p><u>Environment</u></p> <p>Air Quality:- measures linked to air quality must be fully explored and incorporated in the overall mitigation. Reinforces SCC concern to manage traffic flow from site.</p> <p>Surface Water Drainage:- Supports concept of SUDS</p>



	<p>masterplan.</p> <p>Historic Environment: - need to take full account of archaeology.</p> <p>Landscape and Green Infrastructure: - concept of landscape transition zone supported.</p>
<p>Forest Heath / St Edmundsbury Borough Council</p>	<p>No points of concern to raise</p>
<p>Suffolk Coastal DC</p>	<p>Generally supportive of the proposals to meet housing need and economic growth across Ipswich policy Area</p> <p>Coalescence of Westerfield – The proposed green/open space and commitment to appropriate landscaping is welcomed as a buffer to safeguard the identity of Westerfield Village</p> <p>Country Park / Green Infrastructure – entirely supportive of substantial green infrastructure provision within the proposals, specifically the Country Park. The strategy should be looking to prioritise the timely delivery of strategic green infrastructure at least to match the phasing of development and not towards the end of the process. Arrangements for future management and funding could usefully be clarified.</p> <p>Infrastructure-It is important that infrastructure is provided in a timely manner throughout the delivery of the development and consequences across neighbouring authorities</p> <p>Regarding transport infrastructure it is noted the draft status of the Transport Strategy for the Northern Fringe and is supportive of the objectives. The strategy will need to address transport implications across the IPA area...</p> <p>Heritage – a number of heritage assets border the IBC Northern Fringe boundary which need to be considered to avoid potential adverse impacts</p> <p>Joint Working – The Council looks forward to close joint working in the future</p>

Mid Suffolk DC	None received
Westerfield Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council views are totally influenced by the concern over traffic conditions in the village, especially Lower Road and Church Lane. Conditions on these roads are influenced by the ability to use Valley Road for east/west travel and therefore the suitability of Westerfield Road as an access to the development has had a major effect on the comments above and the location of key elements.</p> <p>The perceived traffic effects of the location of the secondary school and the District Centre were discussed at length by Parish Council members. Although appreciating there were other issues affecting the location of these facilities the need to minimise the risk of extra traffic was the deciding factor in expressing the view that the District Centre should be in the Northern Sector with access to Henley Road and the Secondary school in the South western sector.</p> <p>The Parish Council also supported the Country Park as in all three options as it gave the opportunity for both existing residents and new development residents to enjoy access to the countryside in an area of pleasant landscape</p> <p>Still concerned that this green field site should not be developed until all other area within the borough have been used for development. This plan however needs to safeguard the future both for the new residents but also for the existing neighbouring communities.</p> <p>There is greater risk of flooding in Lower Road as suitable drainage systems must accommodate greater rate of run-off as well as coping with increased storm effects arising from climate change.</p> <p>There need to be footpath links to the adjacent countryside from all of the development – not just Fonnereau way.</p>
Swilland & Witesham Parish	The site boundary is distant from the parish; therefore the impacts of the development are likely to be indirect

<p>Council</p>	<p>principally related to traffic.</p> <p>Traffic Assessments must consider the impacts of the development on the wider rural network and sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Concerned that no provisions are set out either for monitoring on-going performance against target to maintain congestion at 2011 levels, nor for addressing any shortcomings in the transport strategy in delivering the target.</p> <p>Supportive of sustainable transport-led strategy which must be realistic about what can be achieved. There must be a town-wide improvements so that the network is complete e.g. comprehensive network of bus prioritisation</p> <p>Every effort should be taken to retain the distinction between town and country e.g. Westerfield Road</p> <p>Consideration of re-routing the B1077 and moving the train station should be considered. Safety of all road users important.</p> <p>The Country Park should not be come a significant destination in its own right to avoid generating unique trips</p> <p>Construction traffic should be managed</p> <p>Consideration should be given to increasing the amount of employment land</p> <p>Phasing of schools is important</p> <p>Viability is not so important to justify unsustainable development</p>
<p>Tuddenham St Martin Parish Council</p>	<p>Other sites in Ipswich should be prioritised over the Northern fringe.</p> <p>More up-to-date population and employment forecasts required to justify release of Northern Fringe.</p> <p>Traffic impact on Tuddenham St Martin has not been</p>

	<p>considered. Particular concerns listed.</p> <p>Early requirement for the proposed secondary school identified.</p> <p>Country park regarded as a key element that must be provided in parallel with residential development.</p> <p>Opposed to option of an expanded foul effluent treatment works at Donkey Lane.</p>
Environment Agency	<p>Pleased that document acknowledges many of the environmental matters identified in letter of 29 June 2012.</p> <p>No preferred option – all similar.</p> <p>Welcome provision of a country park in the northern part of the site where this an area of fluvial flood plain. Support for centrally positioned swale in centre of northern neighbourhood.</p> <p>Support for fully integrated SUDS strategy as so far expressed – further liaison with the EA and Suffolk County Council in developing detail recommended.</p> <p>Note Anglian Water advise Cliff Quay Treatment Works has capacity to accommodate Northern Fringe subject to solution to transmitting flows.</p> <p>Support for biodiversity objectives, establishment of wildlife corridors and restoration of ponds, protection of mature trees and hedgerows, and involvement of Suffolk Wildlife Trust in working up proposals.</p> <p>SPD should consider how development can assist in meeting the objectives of the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Support for requiring high standards of sustainability, including water conservation.</p>
English Heritage	Not received to date
Anglia Water	<p>Water resources are available to supply the total development. Supply network upgrades have been identified</p> <p>The development is within the catchment of Cliff Quay</p>

	<p>Sewage Treatment that has the capacity to treat the foul flows from the development.</p> <p>Developer impact assessment being carried out to scope options.</p> <p>No further surface water connections to combined foul sewer would be allowed. Recommends the use of SUDs</p> <p>Support for measures to minimise use and recycle water wherever possible.</p>
<p>Penny Moys SCC Noise and Air Quality Manager</p>	<p>Whilst a corridor will distance the railway from the development, greenery will have little / no benefit in reducing noise levels. A very dense thicket with under planting would be required – a rule of thumb is 1dB (A) reduction for every 10m of dense planting. There is significant volume of rail traffic on the line, including night freight. Depending on whether the railway is in a cutting or not, additional barriers may be required. Vibration from railways is also a cause for disturbance at some distance from source</p> <p>Important that current and future air quality conditions are taken into account when looking at the overall design and traffic movements over the wider area. It has been acknowledged that the development will generate additional traffic across many of the major junctions across town. I am concerned that by the time air quality assessment work is carried out to support the planning application, the infrastructure design will be too far advanced to take any measures required to mitigate against poor air quality into account. A low emission package of measures needs to be designed to ensure that the development has minimal impact on the existing AQMa. Current indications are that these areas will become more extensive, even without the Northern Fringe Development.</p>

<p>NHS Suffolk</p>	<p>NHSS acknowledges that the healthcare mitigation requirements identified in their earlier submission have been broadly recognised within the SDP Issues and Options Report.</p> <p>Requirement for provision of land, construction and fit out of a new health centre to be 100% funded by the developer in order to mitigate the likely healthcare impacts arising from the INF growth area. 800sqm provision required delivered on a phased basis. Recommended to be part of proposed district centre.</p> <p>Options 2&amp;3 represent an appropriate strategy with regard to the timing of community facility provision to meet the emerging demand and should therefore be developed further.</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Welcomes proposals seeking to protect and enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure, incorporating SUDs and measures to address climate change and provide opportunities for sustainable transport</p> <p>Welcomes creation of strong green infrastructure network and are pleased that developers are working with Suffolk Wildlife Trust to create new reserves and enhancement to biodiversity including the provision of a new country park</p> <p>The development will require significant infrastructure investment including improved access and site drainage and new infrastructure including country park. These need to be implemented ahead of development to ensure development does not have an adverse impact on the environment.</p> <p>No preferred option.</p>
<p>Suffolk Wildlife Trust</p>	<p>Support the references embedded throughout the document seeking to protect and enhance biodiversity and natural environment. Also support provision of country park, significant level of other green infrastructure.</p> <p>Phase 1 ecological survey recommendations largely</p>

	<p>acknowledged and now needs to be worked through in detail.</p> <p>Consider the provision of a large, high quality country park is essential. Should be provided early in the development process alongside appropriate measures for future maintenance.</p> <p>SPD should provide full amount of open space as required by Table 5 (page 72) of Issues and Options Report.</p> <p>It is regrettable that none of the options provide an opportunity to restore the parkland around Red House Farm</p>
Ipswich wildlife	<p>No objection in general as there may be an overall increase in biodiversity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extensive ecological studies must be carried out</li> <li>2. Alongside retained hedgerows there should be verges to allow access to manage them. This would allow a green corridor</li> </ol> <p>Proposed country park to the northern edge is very welcomed. This must be made available at the first stage of development.</p>
Sport England	<p>Proposed development of the existing playing field would need to satisfy Sport England's policies.</p> <p>Would wish to see provision for outdoor sport that meets adopted Core Strategy policy. (12.5ha. based on given assumptions).</p> <p>All new areas of outdoor sport will need to provide for adequate ancillary facilities e.g. changing, car parking.</p> <p>Outdoor facilities should include a wide range of facilities (including MUGAs, tennis courts, bowling greens, and youth facilities subject to an assessment of provision in the locality.</p> <p>Development of this size would generate significant demand for indoor sport facilities. Sport England's 'Sport</p>

	<p>Facilities Calculator' enables demand to be calculated.</p> <p>There is potential for joint usage of educational facilities outside school hours</p> <p>Off site financial contributions towards swimming pool provision would be supported</p> <p>Support the proposal to use Sport England 'Active Design' (2007) guidance</p>
Greater Anglia	<p>Pleased that the development is being located in the catchment area of Westerfield Station</p> <p>Important to optimise potential of Westerfield Station.</p> <p>Important that the proposed network of roads, footpaths, and cycle ways provides direct links to the station.</p> <p>Note that the proposals do not include for the closure of the level crossing.</p> <p>Facilities at Westerfield station are limited funding from the development to secure improvements would be expected</p>

**Table 11 Summary of Stakeholder responses**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
Environment Panel	<p>Developer needs to be aware of biodiversity value of wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Country park needs to be coherent whole, contiguous with the open countryside and should include a visitor centre.</p> <p>Sports fields are important; should not count as part of country park; should be contiguous with the schools but also need to be multi use.</p> <p>Phasing important.</p> <p>Important to enhance Fonnereau Way; particular arrangement of steps and ramps suggested for any proposed new bridge</p>



	<p>across the railway.</p> <p>Suggest link from Fonnereau Way to the proposed road bridge.</p> <p>Cycle routes require a direct alignment to be well used.</p> <p>Grey water systems and renewable energy should be incorporated into designs.</p>
<p>Cllr Inga Lockington (St Margaret's Ward Councillor)</p>	<p>Concerns raised included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic – biggest concern that residents have</li> <li>• Garden City principles – density of proposed development</li> <li>• Drainage – surface and foul water drainage is a big concern for local residents</li> <li>• Flexibility in access planning</li> <li>• Green corridor – respecting impact on existing communities</li> <li>• Water table – effects and conservation of established wet lands</li> <li>• Economic sustainability</li> </ul>
<p>Cllr Carole Jones</p>	<p>Issues raised include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open space allocation across site</li> <li>• Composition of District and Local Centre</li> <li>• Dual location of district and local centres with schools</li> <li>• Access – bus services / cycle routes</li> </ul>
<p>Northern Fringe Protection Group</p> <p>Representing 188 members</p>	<p>Oppose the development on the basis that the jobs growth within Ipswich will not sustain it. It will have a major detrimental affect on the road network and other infrastructure. It will result in the loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Should development take place preferred option to be taken forward is option 2</p> <p>A series of recommendations are presented with supporting</p>

and 55 non-members

explanatory text.

**Recommendation 1**

IBC needs to recognise the dependency of the Northern Fringe Master Plan upon the Core Strategy Review and not pre-empt the findings of the latter by assuming the whole site needs to be developed. This dependency needs to be clearly shown on the 'key Stages & Timetable of the Northern fringe SPD'

**Recommendation 2**

An up-to-date traffic survey be undertaken including existing and potential rat-runs and, together with the latest information on jobs growth in Ipswich Town Centre and surrounding areas, modelling be undertaken to assess the impact on traffic congestion. This should also include scenarios whereby the majority of new jobs are not created in Ipswich but further afield resulting in different travel patterns.

**Recommendation 3**

Measures should be put in place to mitigate the impacts of Northern Fringe traffic on Air Quality Management Areas affected by the development

**Recommendation 4**

A full Initial Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal should be undertaken of all travel issues and options

**Recommendation 5**

IBC need to consider what additional traffic fall-back measures could be implemented if, once the development is built, the Traffic Congestion and Air Quality in North Ipswich becomes intolerable

**Recommendation 6**

The Options and Initial Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal should include and assess an underpass for pedestrians and cyclists on Westerfield Rd.

**Recommendation 7**

Consideration should be given to the merits of a lower housing density, as allowed under the Core Strategy, which would result in a nicer development, somewhere people would aspire to live and reduce the traffic congestion.

**Recommendation 8**

Consideration should be give to providing some sort of green buffer spread around the perimeter of the development to mitigate the loss of country views of existing residents and to give the development a clear identity

**Recommendation 9**

Full details of the proposed sewage and wastewater infrastructure options need to be produced as a matter of urgency, including the timing, cost, disruption and impact on existing communities, along with a detailed Initial Strategic Environmental assessment and Sustainability Appraisal of each of those options

**Recommendation 10**

Full details of the proposed fresh water supply options need to be produced, including the timing, cost, disruption and impact on existing communities.

**Recommendation 11**

A study, risk assessment and impact assessment should be made concerning the discharge from the proposed Sustainable Drainage System via a series of open landscaped Ditches and Swales.

**Recommendation 12**

We believe that further consultation is required on the location of the secondary school to see if it can be made more central and, if so, that the advantages/disadvantages are

The following table of priorities was included with the NFPG response (in order of priority):-

- (i) New roads and improvements to existing roads.
- (ii) Funding of works outside of the Northern Fringe (e.g. junction improvements at the existing networks)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iii) Parks and village greens.</li> <li>(iv) a country park.</li> <li>(v) Primary and secondary schools.</li> <li>(vi) Sports facilities.</li> <li>(vii) New bus services.</li> <li>(viii) Play facilities for teenagers and children.</li> <li>(ix) New footpaths, cycleways, and bridleways.</li> <li>(x) Small independent shops.</li> </ul>
SOCS	<p>There should be no “presumption” that building should commence ahead of 2021 if the CS review demonstrates there is neither a need nor jobs created.</p> <p>SOCS feel that Options have been presented, but the Issues are yet to be adequately identified</p> <p>Inspector’s legally binding report into the Ipswich Core Strategy stated that for soundness it should be reviewed in 2012/13 and <u>prior</u> to the extent of the Northern Fringe development being determined.</p> <p>Nineteen “issues” or areas of concern identified</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IBC promised a proper review of CS before SDP for N Fringe was finalised</li> <li>2. Population increase and immigration</li> <li>3. Pending food crisis and unacceptability of the “sacrificing” of grade 2 agricultural land</li> <li>4. Lack of jobs</li> <li>5. Traffic</li> <li>6. Local roads used for recreation and sport</li> <li>7. No road improvements planned</li> <li>8. Congestion &amp; pollution Public Health Risk</li> <li>9. Future pressures on services</li> <li>10. Health</li> <li>11. Education</li> </ol>

	<p>12. Social Care</p> <p>13. Quality of life Impacts</p> <p>14. Increased risk of flooding</p> <p>15. Damage to biodiversity &amp; habitat; Fynn Valley County Wildlife sites</p> <p>16. Location of park / open spaces</p> <p>17. Ipswich –losing its identity?</p> <p>18. Impact of NF foul effluent being directed to Tuddenham sewage works.</p> <p>19. Inadequate attention given to Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>SOCS support the NFPG statements. Additional comments made in respect of recommendations made by NFPG;</p> <p>Recommendation one - SOCS have not changed their view that adherence to this demonstrated approach is necessary, this is the only approach which will ensure a “credible” NF Issues and Options Report which will deliver a sound, sustainable Supplementary Planning Document which is “fit for purpose”</p> <p>Recommendation 2 - Suffolk SPG on Air Quality MUST be properly followed</p> <p>Recommendation 3 - significant resources must be made available for local Public Health expert to MODEL, MONITOR ASSESS and provide MITIGATION MEASURES for the significant likely adverse Health Impacts of NF traffic on existing and emerging AQMA. This is likely to stretch into other LA areas such as SCDC</p> <p>Recommendation 4 - A Public Health Impact Assessment should be undertaken of all travel issues and options</p> <p>The proposals to leave the building of the secondary school until later in the build are unacceptable.</p> <p>Additional points: Concerns about effective data and <i>actual</i> population levels over time from 1960’s versus projections. Fresh water supply and sewage treatment ; impacts from</p>
--	---

	<p>climate change and climatic weather impacts need consideration especially as IBC have no climate change policy. The masterplan has never referred to the DEFINITIVE MAP which is a major omission.</p>
<p>Mersea Homes</p>	<p>Support the development and are keen to ensure that this new neighbourhood will be an asset to the community as well as delivering homes and economic growth.</p> <p>Concerned that the SPD will attempt to be too prescriptive, and will pre-determine solutions that may not be technically necessary or affordable.</p> <p>Deliverability is of paramount importance; all requirements must be considered in the context of viability. Therefore Core strategy requirements such as affordable housing, decentralised renewable energy, and Code for Sustainable Homes must be considered in the context of a viability assessment for the entire scheme.</p> <p>A number of specific points are made in respect of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making the best use of greenfield land</li> <li>• As scheme will include a country park the scheme cannot be expected to deliver any additional quantities of public open space.</li> <li>• Land for schools should be reserved but not require turn-key completed buildings. SPD should only look to reserve land</li> <li>• Detailed transport assessments in the future should be the basis for decision making</li> <li>• Landscape / open space requirements are agreed in principle but should not be too prescriptive or onerous</li> <li>• Questionable whether Westerfield Road can retain its green character.</li> <li>• SPD should require good national practice rather than exemplar solutions – e.g. sustainability regulations</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure schedule at para. 4.117 has not all been agreed and may not all be deliverable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Options</b></p> <p>Believe the District centre is correct place as shown on options 2&amp;3</p> <p>Secondary school preferably located as shown on option 1</p> <p>Points of access are correctly shown but access onto Henley Road (south of Railwayline) and Tuddenham Road should be denoted as secondary</p> <p>SDP should be clear that the preferred option is illustrative more technical work would be undertaken for the outline application</p>
<p>Crest Strategic Projects</p>	<p><b>Land Use</b></p> <p>Supports the principle of the garden suburb approach and ensuring planned green spaces are key feature</p> <p>Consider connectivity within and between site and existing community must be achieved</p> <p><b>Access and Movement</b></p> <p>Supports the principle of designing the site to reduce transport distances overall, particularly those journeys made by car.</p> <p>Henley Rd is a main frontage and is suitable for main access points including trip generating activities</p> <p>Notes aim to keep peak period congestion to 2011 levels</p> <p>Supports the delivery of a new bridge which needs to be able to accommodate all modes of transport. Key feature in the integration physically and functionally of the NF with existing communities. Considers the district centre needs to be located in close proximity to the new railway crossing, to ensure future cohesion and easy movement between north and south sections of the site.</p> <p>Main community facilities should be located so as to be within easy walking distance of as many homes as possible.</p>

	<p>Considers that NF should not become a stand alone site</p> <p>Supports the principles of ensuring bus services are highly accessible and the concept of walkable neighbourhoods</p> <p>Agrees that transport matters cannot be considered in isolation from other matters</p> <p>Meandering route through site supported to discourage rat running.</p> <p>Level of parking would ensure it provides sufficient spaces for future residents and other users in line with SCC parking standards</p> <p><b>Character</b></p> <p>Supports general design principles average net density of 35 d/ha or less.</p> <p>Considers it essential that an appropriate green buffer is provided for Westerfield Village. Maintains that a successful design solution will be achieved not only through physical distance but also through the design of the landscape, the form of the closest development and the use of intervening space</p> <p>Concerned that locating the district centre adjacent to Westerfield Rd would have a significant impact on the present character of the road and perceived separation of Westerfield village.</p> <p><b>Landscape and Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>The site lends itself to a development in which the landscape is a dominant feature that provides structure and sense of place.</p> <p>Considers that CS open space policies on this matter should be flexibly applied so that the development responds to site characteristics and qualities</p> <p><b>Community</b></p> <p>Supports the co-location of retail and community uses to encourage linked trips and stimulate local activity</p>
--	--



	<p>Maintains best location for District Centre is on Henley Road – high visibility and easy access. Benefit to existing residents at Castle Hill.</p> <p><b>Other Uses</b></p> <p>Supports the inclusion as part of a wider master plan and the employment that will be generated associated with development of these uses</p> <p><b>Environment</b></p> <p>Supports the vision based on excellent standards of urban design incorporating best practice in terms of sustainability.</p> <p>Supports the prioritisation of low energy and water use through all elements of the sites delivery and the use of renewable energy.</p> <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Supports in principle, the list of infrastructure investment at para 4.117.</p> <p>Support for a wide choice of housing and facilities to provide a balanced community with new district centre as main focus for a range of social infrastructure.</p> <p>Support for creation of a strongly defined green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Support provision of country park and proposed location.</p> <p>Maintains that viability is a key matter for the delivery of development of the NF and that a balance of profitable land uses must be achieved on land not used for the country park on land within the northern neighbourhood.</p> <p><b>Preferred Option</b></p> <p>Crests preferred option is option 1.</p> <p><b>Delivery</b></p> <p>Crest considers that the country park should be delivered as a key feature of the early phases but that to achieve this there will need to be flexibility in the phasing of development across</p>
--	---

	<p>the NF and that the implementation of development to the north of the railway line should not be held back</p> <p><b>Railway Bridge</b></p> <p>Considered to be an essential item of infrastructure to properly integrate the development.</p> <p><b>Open Space Typologies</b></p> <p>Need for some flexibility in interpretation.</p> <p><b>Setting of Westerfield Village</b></p> <p>Locating the district centre on Westerfield Road will have a significant impact on the present character of the road.</p> <p><b>Connectivity</b></p> <p>Location the district centre at Westerfield Road would not integrate well with existing communities to the west of the site.</p> <p><b>Phasing and timing</b></p> <p>Supports the principle that the new development will be comprehensively planned and carefully phased to ensure a well ordered expansion of the urban area. Supports the wording in the vision that any given phase is allowed to come forward with the necessary infrastructure to allow it to function well.</p> <p>Core Strategy review needs to allow more flexibility on phasing to (inter alia) ensure the site is comprehensively brought forward and to ensure infrastructure and facilities are phased appropriately and delivered alongside new housing.</p>
Ipswich School	<p>The school supports the principle of planning the site on the basis of a 'garden suburb'</p> <p>Recognises need for links through the site and between the new development and existing community for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.</p> <p>Community facilities, schools and district centre would be key</p>

	<p>to the developments success</p> <p>The SDP should be an illustrative document to guide development, it should be flexible in terms of design subject to viability.</p> <p>The school would support options 2 or 3. Option 1 allocates Ipswich School land for a secondary school and this would prejudice the schools strategic aim to meet the long-term needs of the school including the removal of the existing sports facilities to Tuddenham Road.</p>
Suffolk Local Access Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new dedicated walking and cycling route should be created between the Fonnereau Way and the new proposed road bridge.</li> <li>• Within the proposed country park there should be facilities for those with mobility/disability issues.</li> <li>• Cycling should be encouraged. It was of concern that the report stated that "the majority of routes for cyclists within the site will be provided on roads". SLAF consider that safer alternatives should be considered.</li> <li>• Links between the development and the wider rights of way network and the road network should also be considered to ensure access to the countryside and safe routes for cyclists.</li> </ul>
Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer	<p>Asking whether the provision of traveller accommodation could be considered.</p>

#### Additional papers

- Responses to questions raised at Public Meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013
- Paper on findings from study tours undertaken by Community Steering Panel members

PS/NF/EDITED ....

- Appendix A Questionnaire

## **Ipswich Northern Fringe**

### **PUBLIC EXHIBITION ON ISSUES AND OPTIONS, JANUARY & FEBRUARY 2012**

#### **Questionnaire**

##### **Introduction**

Thank you for your interest in how the land to the north of Ipswich, also known as the Northern Fringe, will be developed in future.

Policy CS10 of the adopted Core Strategy 2011 identifies the Northern Fringe as being capable of accommodating up to 4,500 homes alongside associated transport, open space and community infrastructure. However, initial capacity work has identified that this is likely to be reduced to around 3,500 dwellings along with necessary infrastructure, open space and local facilities.

Ipswich Borough Council and the landowners have jointly explored the issues and options of developing the Northern Fringe in line with the Core Strategy policy. As part of this work, a series of three alternative development options have been generated which illustrate some of the strategic choices that need to be made. This consultation is seeking your views on the nature of the options and some of the distinct choices facing the Council.

We would now like to hear your views on the options. Your views are important to us so please take the opportunity to complete this questionnaire.

The findings of this consultation will be used to inform the choice of a single preferred development option and the emerging Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Northern Fringe. This SPD will provide clear guidance on the expected form, nature and quality of development to be brought forward through planning applications.

Please note that the options are not mutually exclusive and a number of aspects on different options may be combined into the preferred option, or subject to the outcome of this consultation, new features may be introduced.

This questionnaire should be read in conjunction with the exhibition, the accompanying brochure or the website [www.ipswich.gov.uk/northernfringe](http://www.ipswich.gov.uk/northernfringe).

##### **The Options**

There are some consistencies between the options (i.e. the fixed components) that have arisen as a result of the ongoing masterplanning of the site, including:

- the strategic landscape framework;
- the location of the proposed country park;
- the crossing of the railway;
- the broad arrangement of the site into three neighbourhoods (north of the railway, west of Westerfield Road, east of Westerfield Road); and
- the general location of the site access points.

In fixing these components of the scheme, the options explore varying locations for important land uses such as schools and shops. Depending on where these uses are located, the dynamics of activity, movement and character in and around the site could differ.

In this questionnaire, we are asking questions about the fixed and variable components to ascertain your views about the emerging framework plan.

**Yours Views on the Fixed Components**

Please insert  if you agree or  if you disagree with the following, and please indicate the reasons for your answer

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or <input type="checkbox"/>	Please state why you agree or disagree
<p>The strategic landscape framework shows a high level of connectivity throughout the site. It incorporates the existing trees and hedgerows and the current Fonnereau Way.</p> <p>Each neighbourhood has a park or playing fields, and a children's play area.</p> <p>Green corridors will create distance between the railway and the development to reduce noise and visual impact.</p>		
<p>The proposed country park is located in the northern most part of the site where it can create a transition between town and country, with rural space on its northern edge.</p>		
<p>A railway bridge is proposed to allow access between different parts of the Northern Fringe.</p> <p>The railway crossing is determined by the technical requirements of the bridge and the railway track.</p>		
<p>The site lends itself well to three neighbourhood units. Each neighbourhood would have a primary school, a district or local centre, and an open space as a focus for community life. Depending on the final location of strategic land uses, neighbourhoods will have between approximately 1,000 and 1,300 dwellings.</p>		
<p>The exact location of the site accesses is to be determined as the master plan evolves. The intention is to ensure a good level of connectivity between the existing and new development so that over time the Northern Fringe is seamlessly integrated into the existing fabric of the town, as well as providing routes and other facilities that will support public transport, walking and cycling.</p>		

Questionnaire

--	--	--

**Yours Views on the Variable Components**

**Option 1:**

Please insert √ if you agree or x if you disagree with the following elements of Option 1 and, if possible, please state why.

	√ or x	Please state why you agree or disagree
The northern neighbourhood would become the focus for most of the commercial and community activity, with a foodstore, local shops, health centre and community facility located here, along with a primary school.		
The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road would be the location for the secondary school. The secondary school is shown on the Ipswich School Playing fields which would allow much of this part of the site to maintain its current use.  A primary school would be located adjacent to the secondary school to create a larger school campus.		
The neighbourhood to the east of Westerfield Road would have a primary school and potentially a small local centre or community facility, but would not have any substantial educational or commercial uses.		

**Option 2:**

Please insert ✓ if you agree or x if you disagree with the following elements of Option 2 and, if possible, please state why.

	✓ or x	Please state why you agree or disagree
The northern neighbourhood would accommodate a primary school and potentially a small local centre, and would be largely residential.		
The neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road would be the focus for retail and community activity, with the proposed district centre (including a food store, health centre and other commercial and community uses) fronting Westerfield Road.		
The neighbourhood to the east of Westerfield Road would accommodate a primary school and the secondary school – by locating the school here, the playing fields would help to form an area of separation between the existing village and the development.		



**Option 3:**

Please insert ✓ if you agree or x if you disagree with the following elements of Option 3 and, if possible, please state why.

	✓ or x	Please state why you agree or disagree
The northern neighbourhood would accommodate the secondary school and a primary school. The secondary school would front Henley Road and would be accessible to the new residents as well as being close to the existing community.		
The district centre, including the food store, health centre and other commercial and community uses would be located in the neighbourhood west of Westerfield Road. It would be close to existing residents to the south of the site. The neighbourhood would also have a primary school.		
The eastern neighbourhood would include a primary school and small local or community centre.		

**Overall, which option would you prefer to be taken forward?**

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
<i>Please tick</i>			
Please state your reasons:			

**Alternatively, which key elements of any of the three options you would like to see incorporated in the final single development option (i.e. the “pick-and-mix” approach)?**

--



DRAFT

**What kind of development and community facilities are most important to you?**  
**Please rank up to 10 items from the list below that you would like to see provided at the Northern Fringe and rate them according to their importance (1 = least important; 10 = most important).**

I would like to see provided:	1 = least to 10 = most important
More family homes	
New apartments	
Homes for first-time buyers	
Serviced retirement homes	
Affordable homes (e.g. shared ownership, social rented housing)	
Health care facilities	
Nurseries	
Primary and secondary schools	
Supermarket	
Small independent Shops	
Accommodation for local businesses	
A Country Park	
Sports facilities	
Play facilities for children and teenagers	
Community halls and meeting places	
Parks and village greens	
New roads and improvements to existing roads	
Speed reduction measures (e.g. 20mph zones)	
New bus services	
New footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways and improvements to existing	
Facilities for visually or physically impaired	
Funding towards community projects	
Funding of works outside of the Northern Fringe (e.g. junction improvements on the existing network)	
Other (please state)	
Other (please state)	

**Have you got any additional comments?**

**Please include your contact details:**

Name:

---

Address:

---

---

**Please place completed feedback forms in the box provided.  
Alternatively, post them to:**

Felicia Blake  
Business Support Officer (Northern Fringe Project)  
Ipswich Borough Council,  
Grafton House,  
15-17 Russell Road,  
Ipswich, IP1 2DE

[felicia.blake@ipswich.gov.uk](mailto:felicia.blake@ipswich.gov.uk)

Please return your comment form by **22 February 2013**.

A copy of the exhibition boards is available on our website [www.ipswich.gov.uk/northernfringe](http://www.ipswich.gov.uk/northernfringe), where this questionnaire can be completed online.

NF/EDITED CONSULTATION RESPONSES (REVISION 3 30.04.13)