



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	29 April 2013
Time	13:30PM
Location	IP-City Centre - Ipswich
Present	Councillor Carole Jones – IBC (Chair) (CJ) Councillor Peter Gardiner – IBC (PG) Councillor Chris Stewart – IBC (CS) Councillor Tracey Grant – IBC (TG) Councillor Inga Lockington – IBC (IL) Barbara Robinson – Save Our Country Spaces (BR) Barry Reeve – Westerfield Parish Council (BREVE) Brian Samuel – Northern Fringe Protection Group (BS) Carlos Hone – IBC (CH) Felicia Blake – IBC (FB) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) John Norman – Ipswich Society (JN) Peter Miller – Westerfield Parish Council (PM) Phil Sweet – IBC (PS) Robert Coles (David Lock Associates) (RC) Steve Miller – IBC (SM) Stewart Quantrill – Northern Fringe Protection Group (SQ)
Apologies	Councillor D Goldsmith, Fionnuala Lennon, Mike Penman, Councillor B Quinton, Eddie Peters
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	28 May 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Presentation from David Lock Associates on emerging preferred option		

1.1	CJ welcomed JC and RC of David Lock Associates (DLA), who gave a slide presentation on the emerging preferred option 2.		
1.2	RC took the panel through DLA's potential design ideas and studies for 'developing' and testing the masterplan – RC stated that this exercise will be on-going and is work in progress.		
1.3	<p>Some of the issues discussed were:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring there was a clear and cohesive link to all 3 'areas' of the development • Its core objectives were to look at character, community, connectivity and climate change • housing numbers • density – There would be variables throughout the development • looking at key frontages adjacent to the existing community • ensuring there would be good pedestrian/cycling access for nearby residents (particularly on Valley Road) 		
1.4	IL asked whether cycle lanes were being considered in these studies, with a need to ensure existing routes would connect with the development, using Westerfield and Winesham as an example – DLA confirmed this was being taken into account within the process.		
1.5	It was acknowledged that improvements would be needed to be made to Fonnereau Way.		
1.6	CJ stated that adopting the garden suburb ethos must not preclude contemporary architecture.		
1.7	CJ also referred to taking opportunities to exploit passive solar gain.		
1.8	BS welcomed the landscape led approach to the masterplan and felt that advance planting was important in ensuring measures put in place to ensure subsequent retention and maintenance.		
1.9	JC confirmed that the SPD would cover the important topic of maintenance and stewardship of open space.		
1.10	CJ reaffirmed support for advance planting where appropriate.		
1.11	JN gave the example of Peasenhall, a small village situated in East Suffolk where drainage rills were a feature.		
1.12	JN highlighted residents' reluctance to use parking courts which resulted in excessive on-street parking (e.g.		

	<p>Ravensw ood). All agreed that having the right car parking strategy w ould be key to successfully delivering garden city character.</p>		
1.13	<p>SQ enquired about the numbers of car units per dw elling – RC advised this w ill differ throughout the development (<i>example: 1.5 for 2 beds and 2.0 for 3 beds</i>) – There w ill be a chapter in the SPD that w ill cover car-parking strategy.</p>		
1.14	<p>BR had concerns about w hat she perceived to be higher density development in the Red House Farm zone w hich w ould be out of keeping w ith existing density and character there – PS confirmed that there w ould be sensitivity in planning this out w ith equivalent scales, longer gardens and screen planting being a feature w here new development abuts existing.</p>		
1.15	<p>It w as noted that as a result of the consultation there seemed to have been more green space allotted w ithin the development.</p>		
1.16	<p>CJ raised the issue of incorporating dual use of public open space from the start. (Northgate/Stoke High w ere given as a good example) – IBC confirmed that SCC supported dual use for all school facilities.</p>		
1.17	<p>BR asked for clarity on the area of the Country Park map that w as circulated – A revised copy w as handed out to CSP members.</p>		
1.18	<p>JC took the panel through the key principles of designing an urban garden suburb:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site • neighbourhoods • streets (primary, secondary and minor) • blocks • plots • public openspace 		
1.19	<p>One of the main objectives w as to create a sense of cohesion and visual continuity throughout each ‘neighbourhood’.</p>		
1.20	<p>CJ asked about house designs. JC responded that w hilst standard house types w ould inevitably be used, focusing on the design of the main public buildings and the public realm w ill be key. SM advised that design codes w ould be used at the planning application stage to inform house-type design.</p>		
1.21	<p>BREVE asked about w hat % of the development w ould be allocated to affordable housing – It w as confirmed there w as a policy target of 35% - SM made the point that w hen designed there should not be anything to distinguish</p>		


	affordable housing from other properties.		
1.22	It was highlighted that the IBC steering groups/panel seemed to be 'putting pressure on developers' to adhere to matters raised by the community – All agreed this was positive.		
1.23	IBC confirmed that green corridors were being taken into consideration at the DLA design and testing stage.		
1.24	JN commented that whilst the masterplanning work was encouraging it was really important to consider the site within a wider context to ensure proper linkages.		
1.25	BR referred to possible multiple starts, which in her view would be contrary to earlier statements – SM / JC confirmed that this was still under discussion with considerations of housing land supply being important; some flexibility may also be required around delivery of infrastructure e.g. SUDs (e.g. schools, rail bridge). SM advised that housing land release would be a function for the Core Strategy (CS) review not the SPD.		
1.26	IBC confirmed work on viability and housing supply was on-going.		
1.27	<i>ACTION: DLA to email the presentation to FB who will put this on disc and circulate to CSP members</i>	DLA/FB	
2.0	Minutes of Last Meeting (19 March) and Matters Arising		
2.1	IBC confirmed that work for Item 2.11 (looking at confidentiality issues with regard to information circulated regarding Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and viability) was still on-going.		
2.2	BS wanted to further clarify and to add his comments for Item 3.3 – Amended to as follows:- <i>The proposals for parks & gardens, amenity green space and outdoor sports provision all fail to meet IBC minimum standards regarding Open Space & Biodiversity Policy, resulting in a total deficit of useful open space of approx. 8ha. This is especially concerning with regard to outdoor sports provision, as the Central and North West areas already have a combined deficit of over 23ha, which will be increased by current proposals.</i>	FB	
2.2.1	<i>The numbers presented in the Options diagram do not match those in Table 5 detailing Open Space Provision.</i>		
2.2.2	<i>Clarification is required on reporting of the 3ha of sports field included in the country park to ensure</i>		

	<i>these aren't double-counted.</i>		
2.3	<p>PS explained the open space strategy, which was based on meeting Appendix 6 levels of provision overall (with oversupply if country park factored in), but with some flexibility between categories required due to a lot of land needing to be reserved for green corridors, SUDs and hedgerow protection.</p> <p>The strategy for sports provision was:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) dual use of school facilities for playing pitches (ii) contributions to enhanced off-site provision (iii) provision of smaller sports facilities such as tennis courts within the neighbourhood parks – multi-use games areas (MUGAS) and skate parks could also be considered here (iv) making good use of the informal greenspace for such cycle routes and trim trails 		
2.4	IL asked for a wording correction to be made to Item 3.8.	FB	
2.5	<p>BR asked for wording amendment to Item 3.15:-</p> <p><i>BR made reference to loss of farmland not being properly addressed.</i></p> <p><i>ACTION: BR said she could send certain example documents to SM for consideration</i></p>	BR	
2.6	SM stated IBC had looked at the report from Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT) and that a revised plan referring to the Red House Farm area had been circulated – This included revisions to protect veteran and rare trees.		
2.7	<p>BR referred to Item 6.4 and said that a response to feedback on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Issues & Options Report was still outstanding.</p> <p><i>ACTION: IBC to provide feedback of the responses to the Sustainability Appraisal and Scoping Report exercise</i></p>	IBC	
2.8	<p>SM confirmed that emailed comments from Save our Country Spaces (SOCS) and Northern Fringe Protection Group (NFFPG) referring to the minutes of 12 February would be attached to the minutes of 19 March when uploaded to the website.</p> <p><i>ACTION: FB to do this</i></p>	FB	
2.9	<p>Further information was asked for with regard to Item 7.9 – Looking at local/district centres.</p> <p><i>ACTION: IBC to provide a summary on centres/ units- incorporating pictures with store size and dimensions showing implications of a larger stores and the viability of smaller ones</i></p>	IBC	
2.10	<i>ACTION: SM to give feedback at the next CSP on the meeting with Greater Anglia and Network Rail</i>	SM	

<p>3.0</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p> <p>3.7</p> <p>3.8</p>	<p>Draft minutes of Development Steering Group (16 April)</p> <p>BR referred to Item 7.4 asking for further information on rare and important heritage trees within the development – SM confirmed they will be protected in any scheme.</p> <p>Item 8.15 was referred to – A consolidated transport report is being prepared and hopefully will be reported back at the next meeting.</p> <p>With reference to Item 9.4, it was confirmed there were no further updates at this time on SUDs but work is on-going.</p> <p>Of Item 10.1 – IBC confirmed that RH was looking at the housing mix for the SPD.</p> <p>Draft minutes of Spatial Planning Working Group (9 April)</p> <p>BREVE asked for clarity on Item 1.4.3 and the removal of the level crossing at Westerfield – What prompted this suggestion and what are the implications?</p> <p>IL asked about Item 2.2.5 stating street parking was a key issue to be considered.</p> <p><i>ACTION: Consolidated transport paper to be presented at the next meeting</i></p>	<p>IBC</p>	
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p>Provisional timetable for draft SPD and public consultation</p> <p>CJ stated the public consultation would be more suitable to run at the end of August/early September 2013.</p>		
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p>	<p>Finalised summary of Issues & Options consultation responses</p> <p>BR asked whether the wider public would receive a copy of The Angle newspaper as there had been problems in the past and many people had not received this – PG stated that Archant acknowledged that some areas had not been distributed to and they would try to ensure a larger area was covered this time.</p> <p>The group agreed that the venues used for the last exhibition were suitable for the next consultation, which included <i>Westerfield Church, Ipswich Sports Club, Ipswich Town Hall and Colchester Road Baptist Church.</i></p> <p>BR requested that certain amendments to the record of SOCS response be included in the Consultation summary report.</p>	<p>IBC</p>	

6.0	AOB		
6.1	SM and PS will meet with SCC and AECOM this week to discuss transport – The group asked about the Technical Note that was prepared by SCC. PS stated this would change and that a methodology would be prepared.		
6.2	This would then form the basis of the transport strategy within the SPD with more detailed transport assessments accompanying each planning application. ACTION: IBC to feed back to CSP on the meeting with SCC and provide an update on Transport	IBC	
7.0	Date of next meeting		
7.1	Provisionally booked for Tuesday 28 th May 2013 at 14:00PM		

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> <p>Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the information may be released once the exemption lapses.</p>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	
	3. Intended for future publication	
	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	
--	----------------------------------	--