



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	28 May 2013
Time	14:00PM
Location	Grafton House – Orwell Room
Present	Councillor Carole Jones – IBC (Chair) (CJ) Councillor Bill Quinton – IBC (BQ) Councillor Peter Gardiner – IBC (PG) Councillor Tracey Grant – IBC (TG) Councillor Inga Lockington – IBC (IL) Barbara Robinson – Save Our Country Spaces (BR) Barry Reeve – Westerfield Parish Council (BREVE) Carlos Hone – IBC (CH) Felicia Blake – IBC (FB) Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS (FL) James Farrar – Atlas (JF) Peter Miller – Westerfield Parish Council (PM) Phil Sweet – IBC (PS) Steve Miller – IBC (SM) Stewart Quantrill – Northern Fringe Protection Group (SQ)
Apologies	Rod Brooks, John Norman, Brian Samuel, Councillor Chris Stewart
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	29 July 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Presentation from ATLAS (James Farrar) on District Centres		
1.1	JF took the panel through a presentation on Local and District Centres in response to a number of observations from CSP. This exercise was to illustrate and compare		

	<p>the different designs, locations and how they integrated into the overall layout of these developments. A guidance note on district centres prepared by Atlas was circulated. <i>ACTION: CSP were invited to make any comments or observations to IBC</i></p>	PANEL	Attachments x2
1.2	<p>Among the issues raised at Cambourne in particular were the size and scale of the larger supermarkets and concern that these would not overwhelm the smaller stores.</p>		
1.3	<p>It was agreed it was important to take into account retail provision with community facilities, whilst also creating a good link to schools in key locations.</p>		
1.4	<p>FL highlighted the need for robust design codes from the initial stages of development which should also complement a strong framework.</p>		
1.5	<p>Poundbury in Dorset was highlighted as a good design which incorporated multi-functional use of the car-park and market stalls, a primary school, a mix of office and retail units and a pub – This local centre also serves approx. 1,000 people within a 5 minute walking distance of 400m.</p>		
1.6	<p>Hampton Vale in Peterborough served as an example of a well-thought out local centre, with a good catchment area to schools and practical through routes to prime locations.</p>		
1.7	<p>CJ asked if there was a way to govern the range of goods / size of subsidiaries in larger stores – SM said the only way to really manage this would be to attach conditions at application stage. Officers stated that conditions restricting the scale / subdivision of units were the main control – prescribing particular types of shops was generally regarded as being outwith planning control.</p>		
1.8	<p>CJ asked about a Local Centre Strategy being implemented from an early stage.</p>		
1.9	<p>IL noted that all businesses must still be a viable prospect.</p>		
1.10	<p>BR referred to the Issues & Options report asking whether DLA has taken this into account with the ‘study testing’ results of Option 2 – IBC confirmed this had been done.</p>		
1.11	<p>BR asked about the Retail Assessment by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners being made available to the panel – <i>CJ confirmed this was available on the IBC website to view.</i></p>		

1.13	FL confirmed a temporary unit (<i>e.g. portacabin</i>) could be erected at an early stage to serve as a community hub / meeting place for the community.		
1.14	There was some concern expressed about an apparent option emerging from the SPWG for a district centre straddling Westerfield Road. Road safety was mentioned. SM confirmed that this was an option being considered and that SCC are not opposed in principle. BR said that the constraint imposed by existing trees and hedgerows was very important in this regard.		
1.15	CJ asked for advice on what level of impact on existing local shops could be deemed acceptable. Officers confirmed that the NL Retail report considered this in detail and that the recommendations were designed to limit such impact to acceptable levels.		
2.0	Minutes of Last Meeting (29 April) and matters arising		
2.1.1	CJ asked about Item 1.8 and advanced planting – <i>PS confirmed this could be addressed in the SPD</i>		
2.1.2	Item 1.12 – <i>It was also confirmed the SPD would also include guidance on car parking strategy</i>		
2.1.3	BR wanted the wording on Item 1.25 (paragraph 1) to be amended (in bold) to:- BR referred to possible multiple starts, which in her view would be <i>contrary to earlier established documents on the CS and LDF process (which had been through public consultation), Sustainability Scoping and Appropriate Assessment for the LDF Core Strategy.</i>		
2.1.4	PS confirmed that the issue of sports provision was being reviewed in the round and would come into focus within the SPD.		
2.1.5	BR wanted the wording on Item 2.5 amended (in bold) :- BR made reference to <i>key national NPPF, NEA/DEFRA policy and other LA policies and EU Guidance on</i> loss of farmland not being properly addressed. ACTION: BR said she could send certain <i>relevant policy</i> documents to SM for consideration.		
2.1.6	Item 2.7 – <i>IBC have circulated the email sent from SB of Planning Policy to CSP regarding the Sustainability Appraisal and Scoping Report.</i>		
2.1.7	Item 2.9 – JF has given CSP a presentation on ‘best practice’ District Centres’.		
2.1.8	SM confirmed that NR were not opposed to the rail crossing in principle, and that there would be improvements to the station. NR did not submit detailed		

2.1.9	comments as they did not receive the consultation. <i>ACTION: SM to provide a summary paper at the next meeting on feedback from meeting with Greater Anglia and Network Rail (NR)</i>	SM	
2.1.10	Due to slippage in the project timetable SM confirmed work on SUDS had been delayed a further two weeks, but was expected to be finalised mid June.		
2.1.11	<i>ACTION: Denis Cooper of drainage to be invited to the next CSP to give an update on SUDs – DC will approach SB of Anglian Water to attend or alternatively provide an update.</i>	SM/DC	
2.2	Minutes of Last SPWG Meeting (29 April) and matters arising		
2.2.1	BR asked if there had been any feedback from Greenways – SM confirmed there had not been.		
2.2.2	SQ enquired about strategic SUDs sites along ditched routes on Item 2.2 – There was a concern for effort to be taken to maintain the treatment of ditches and preventing people parking over swales – SM confirmed DC was looking at solutions and that this was still a work in progress.		
2.2.3	In response to Item 2.7 – SQ stated that the 11m minimum back garden allowance DLA recommendation should be maintained and not reduced as per DC's figures – This was in the interest of layout design quality.		
2.2.4	<i>ACTION: DC to attend next CSP to give an update to issues raised</i>	SM/DC	
2.2.5	PS confirmed there would be a strategy for providing sports provision included in the SPD – This would be informed by representations received from Sports England and the views of relevant IBC departments.		
3.0	Transport Chapter		
3.1	SM confirmed this was still being worked on with as view to reconciling SCC views.		
3.2	SM stated there would be no further traffic models or surveys undertaken but that all planning applications would include a traffic assessment.		
3.3	<i>ACTION: IBC will give an update at the next meeting if ready</i>	IBC	
4.0	Update on Viability work		
4.1	IBC have received the viability assessment, but the		

	developers have raised issues on a number of points – FL added this was not an unusual occurrence in the process.		
4.2	BR asked whether this would include Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) or Section106s - SM confirmed that S106 would be the predominant mechanism.		
4.3	<i>ACTION: IBC should be able to provide an update at the next meeting</i>	SM/PS	
5.0	Update on programme		
5.1	IBC confirmed they were working towards reporting to an August Executive with public consultation late August / September.		
5.2	SM stated IBC were not proposing anything in the SPD that would be contrary to what was contained in the Core Strategy Review (CSR).		
6.0	AOB		
6.1	No other business raised.		
7.0	Date of Next Meeting		
7.1	Date of next meeting has been scheduled for Tuesday 2 nd July at 16:00PM.		

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>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an “x” if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	
	3. Intended for future publication	
	4. Related to criminal proceedings	
	5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	



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

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