



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	29 July 2013
Time	14:00
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) Councillor David Goldsmith – IBC (DG) Councillor Judy Terry – IBC (JT) Barbara Robinson – Save Our Country Spaces (BR) Carlos Hone – IBC (CH) Denis Cooper – IBC (DC) Felicia Blake – IBC (FB) Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS (FL) Mike Penman – Save our Country Spaces (MP) Peter Miller – Westerfield Parish Council (PM) Phil Sweet – IBC (PS) Rod Brooks – Northern Fringe Protection Group (RB)
Apologies	Barry Reeve (BREVE), Brian Samuel (BS), John Norman (JN), Steve Miller (SM), Stewart Quantrill (SQ)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	14 November 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Discussion of and receipt of comments on the draft SPD		SPD Previously circulated
1.1	Phil gave a brief introduction on the draft SPD produced		

	to illustrate the preferred Option 2 established from the last consultation.		
1.2	It was agreed this was a working document and that there would need to be modifications made to text, imagery and factual information – Any major issues should be reserved for formal consultation in the Autumn.		
1.3	PS confirmed informal comments had been received from Northern Fringe Protection Group (NFPG), Save our Country Spaces (SOCS) and Suffolk County Council (SCC) as well as internal members such as the Portfolio Holder CJ, Eddie Peters (Parks), Denis Cooper (Drainage). The Development Steering Group will consider this at the next meeting (30 July 2013).		
1.4	The panel discussed the SPD chapters:-		
1.5	Chapter 1 – Introduction (pages 8-17) BR called for chapter consistency with regard to maps and boundaries on pages 8, 9 and 11 and to be checked and modified.		
1.6	Chapter 2 – (pages 18-29) PS confirmed this had been reformatted for extra clarity resulting in a more robust model for the long-term vision of the Northern Fringe.		
1.7	BR asked about the retention of trees on page 18 – It was confirmed there had been no tree appraisal work undertaken at this time.		
1.8	Chapter 3 – (pages 30-43) RB referred to the Foreword and that there should be greater aspirations to promote high-speed “ <i>super-fast broadband</i> ” as a term from the onset to ensure there be no need to dig up roads and pathways to upgrade in the future – PS confirmed this to be 24mb.		
1.9	RB asked that there be slight wording amendments made to the paragraphs for home-working opportunities under 2.46 (page 25) and broadband facilities under 3.43 (page 43) in the SPD.		
1.10	BR asked whether the map (page 31) depicting Whitton Church Lane was accurate.		
1.11	It was suggested the SPD may result in under-provided sports facilities (under provision of 6.5ha) - PS said he had worked with Tim Snook (IBC Sports Leisure) and Sports England to ensure this issued had been addressed. Shared use of school sports facilities, are key in this regard.		

1.12	It was confirmed this was fully supported by SCC – It was recognised formal sports provision within the garden suburb was needed (this would be included within S106 agreements/CIL, planning applications guidance/and conditions).		
1.13	JT said it was important to recognise that schools, many now academies would operate dual functions (these agreements would need to be in place). JT also stated it was necessary to link community and sports centres to reduce costs – Libraries could also form part of the community centres, incorporating other facilities.		
1.14	PG stated it was important to maintain a balance of formal v informal and that IBC be aware of who can use informal open space.		
1.15	Chapter 4 – (pages 44-69) PS confirmed the map (page 45) was indicative and was not a tree survey.		
1.16	It was agreed there was an omission (page 51) for hedgerow tracks – PS confirmed this was a context map so not purporting to be an accurate survey.		
1.17	ACTION: PS to check	PS	
1.18	PM asked whether churches and places of worship would be represented within the development – It was acknowledged there were 3 major churches (including Salvation Army's) on the outskirts of the development, but were more needed locally for an area comprising of 4,500 homes? – PS stated this was just a context map but that a couple of areas had been reserved as potential sites for a period of time with a schedule for infrastructure.		
1.19	CJ suggested fruit trees in back gardens, referring to 4.27.		
1.20	CJ asked about soft landscaping under 4.31.		
1.21	Fig 11 (page 66) was highlighted as showing an inconsistency regarding footpaths – PM confirmed Westerfield Parish Council were keen for this to have Right of Way status – PS confirmed this has been requested from SCC.		
1.22	Chapter 5 – (pages 70-109) PS confirmed there to be factual inaccuracies in some of the drawings submitted by SCC to David Lock Associates (DLA).		
1.23	It was agreed the map on (page 81) showed inaccuracies.		

1.24	BR said protected species had not been represented – PS confirmed this would not be in the SPD until confirmed.		
1.25	<u>Carparking section</u> CJ referred to (pages 102-103) stating this section needed some improvements and that cars needed to be shown in situ with photographs. There should be better images (best/worst practice examples) representing residential/commercial carparking – It was crucial this was addressed as it was a big issue.		
1.26	There was also a concern there needed to be more provisions made for home work spaces – PS confirmed standards had been set in place.		
1.27	PS informed the Panel there could be a district centre “hub” facility that would act as a support for businesses and home workers to use (<i>e.g. internet, meeting places</i>).		
1.28	Underground carparking was discussed, but many agreed this to be too expensive to implement – It was agreed it was also important to have clear, written parking space covenants for commercial vehicles (vans), Hayhill being an example of not so successful planning – FL confirmed National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Local Authority (LA) can adopt local parking strategy.		
1.29	RB wanted to know whether parking was included in 75sqm min garden areas.		
1.30	<i>ACTION: PS undertook to clarify whether carparking is included</i>	PS	
1.31	Architecture was discussed, with a keen desire for more modern and contemporary designs across the development.		
1.32	JT added there was no guidance on provision of bins in the SPD and that this would need to be looked at.		
1.33	<i>ACTION: IBC to check</i>	IBC	
1.34	Chapter 6 – (pages110-121) BR said that Linda Chambers wanted to confirm the map on (page 115) was correct, as it currently illustrates a pedestrian / cycle link running through her property.		
1.35	<i>ACTION: Map to be checked and amended</i>	IBC	
1.36	Referring to 6.8 it was agreed that Christchurch Park and the Bridleway are recognised as a likely route to the town centre.		
1.37	PM suggested an addition cycle route (map 115) could be		

	indicated to connect with Westerfield Road – In the same way as the connection under the bridge.		
1.38	DG leaves the meeting at this point.		
1.39	IL said there were too many traffic lights on Westerfield Road, which could deter motorists from using it opting for smaller roads.		
1.40	PS confirmed it was accepted a safe route was needed at Fonnereau Road (because of the school), but that SCC were not keen to go down the route of an underpass – This would need to be considered as part of the transport assessment.		
1.41	Chapter 7 – (pages 122-137) Referring to (page 122), PS offered an explanation for the term ‘multiple starts’ – SPD Uses initial ideas as a starting point – viability, infrastructure and house building rates are taken into account. Multiple starts shown as a sequence of events as a possibility only, and the Core Strategy Review will determine this. NPPF are insistent on local plans being deliverable.		
1.42	FL referred to (pages 124 and 125) stating big items would need early starts.		
1.43	CIL was discussed – Agreements would need to be in place from other neighbouring authorities across Suffolk		
1.44	<i>ACTION: PS said he would seek advice from Planning Policy (IBC) about this</i>		
1.45	BR asked about Grampian conditions (page 30) provisions in place prior to development, subject to monitoring and review.		
1.46	FL stated the Council had taken advice of viability work at the highest level and that they were reasonably satisfied this would be delivered – Developers may submit their own viability studies to negotiate – PG made the point that planning applications were changeable year on year and that viability needs to move with time.		
1.47	RB referred to construction traffic under 7.34 and 7.35 – a requirement to have an integrated construction management plan for each phase that takes account of the proposed multiple starts if these are agreed rather than stand-alone plans for each site.		
1.48	Chapter 8 – (pages 138-139) PS highlighted the need for a good community strategy to be in place.		
1.49	Chapter 9 – (pages 140-141)		

	The Panel agreed the Management Trust should be part of long-term monitoring.		
1.50	ACTION: JT requested a copy of the draft SPD - FB to provide this	FB	
1.51	ACTION: FL to provide a summary of the points raised from open discussion of the document	FL	Summary attached
1.52	<u>Recommendations for formal SPD</u> ACTION: It was suggested that the text be in black rather than white	IBC/DLA	
1.53	ACTION: A glossary to be added to the finalised document	IBC/DLA	
1.54	CJ stated that "Management" had been spelt incorrectly on the chapter title (page 140).		
1.55	ACTION: "Management" spelling to be amended	DLA	
2.0	Minutes of the last Community Steering Panel (28 May) and matters arising		
2.1	Item 1 – PS stated that there was a preference to use an image from the Atlas presentation in May (Kings Hill, in Kent) as an example of a good district centre to go in the SPD.		
2.2	Item 3.0 – BR asked if there had been any further updates on transport modelling – PS confirmed a chapter had been included in the draft SPD addressing this.		
2.3	ACTION: PS to ask Graeme Mateer (SCC) if there are any further updates on what Mersea Homes is doing	PS	
2.4	CJ thanked PS for all the work undertaken with the draft SPD.		
2.5	ACTION: FB to send a copy of these minutes to JT	FB	
2.6	ACTION: FB to add JT to CSP circulation and mailing lists	FB	
3.0	Drainage (SuDS) Presentation by Denis Cooper		
3.1	DC gave a slide presentation on the draft Preliminary SuDS Strategy July 2013 – See attachment for details		See PDF attachment
3.2	A few queries arose:-		
3.3	RB asked about sensitivity analysis – DC confirmed we were working to high standards (100 year return period) – The model had been verified and the sw drainage system would be designed for exceedance & blockages.		

<p>3.4</p> <p>3.5</p> <p>3.6</p>	<p>BR questioned whether there would be any impact on River Gipping and Orwell – DC confirmed there would be no detrimental effect.</p> <p>There was some concern over climate change – DC stated the development would help mitigate climate change as illustrated in the slide show.</p> <p>IL asked about the effect of road salt on verges and swales – DC said salt resistant grasses could be used and that not all roads would be gritted and ponds would help buffer the effect.</p>		
<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p> <p>4.3.1</p> <p>4.3.2</p> <p>4.3.3</p> <p>4.4</p>	<p>Minutes of the last Development Steering Group (4 June) and matters arising</p> <p>Item 1.5 – BR stated she had tree constraint concerns and also asked if a tree plan could be provided, illustrating veteran trees within the development – PS said there was no plan for this stating the plans within the SPD were indicative.</p> <p>Work is on-going and Parks and Open Spaces (IBC) are undertaking a complete review of trees.</p> <p><i>ACTION: IBC to check and provide further information on hedgerow protection</i></p> <p><i>***“Important” hedgerows (as defined in the Regulations) are protected from removal (up-rooting or otherwise destroying) by the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. Various criteria specified in the Regulations are used to identify “important” hedgerows for wildlife, landscape or historical reasons.</i></p> <p><i>Under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 it is against the law to remove or destroy certain hedgerows without permission from the local planning authority. The local planning authority are also the enforcement body for offences created by the Regulations.</i></p> <p><i>Local planning authority permission is normally required before removing hedges that are at least 20 metres (66 feet) in length, more than 30 years old and satisfy one of 5 criteria, the main one being 5 b (ii), that the hedgerow is of a field pattern which is recorded (in a PM document) as a key landscape characteristic.</i> http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1997/1160/made**</p> <p>Items 3.5 and 3.6 – BR asked whether the Transport Strategy would be made available to the Panel – PS confirmed this had been included in the transport chapter</p>	<p>IBC</p>	

	within the draft SPD.		
4.5	IL asked for further updates on traffic monitoring – PS said he would ask Dave Watson (SCC) about this.		
4.6	ACTION: PS to ask Dave Watson for an update on traffic monitoring	PS	
5.0	Note providing updates on Anglian Water position and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)		
5.1	PS confirmed comments made by Anglian Water of the 22 July 2013 to still be accurate – There was no objection.		
5.2	BR still has concerns about mains sewer to Cliff Quay – More reassurance still needed.		
5.3	BR asked that an update be provided on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report by Hyder and the Strategic Assessment of the Issues and Options Report.		
5.4	ACTION: PS to chase up	PS	
6.0	Any Other Business		
6.1	PM asked if there were any dates scheduled for the next exhibition yet - PS confirmed this was not known yet as the draft SPD would go before Executive on 17 th September, but would likely be in October – PM stated late October to be preferable – Dates to be confirmed nearer the time.		
6.2	This would take the form of a 6 week consultation with a view to condense the exhibitions to fewer dates.		
6.3	A discussion will take place on the role of the Community Steering Panel moving forward.		
7.0	Date of Next Meeting		
7.1	TBC		

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/>

	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	1. That is personal data	



Please

indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.

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

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| 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 | |