



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	12 February 2013
Time	15:30
Location	Grafton House – Orwell Room
Present	Councillor Carole Jones – IBC (Chair) (CJ) Councillor Bill Quinton – IBC (BQ) Councillor Chris Stewart – IBC (CS) Councillor Tracey Grant – IBC (TG) Councillor Inga Lockington – IBC (IL) Councillor David Goldsmith – IBC (DG) Anita Seymour – IBC (AS) Barbara Robinson – Save Our Country Spaces (BR) Barry Reeve – Westerfield Parish Council (BREVE) Brian Samuel – Northern Fringe Protection Group (BS) Denis Cooper – IBC (DC) Felicia Blake – IBC (FB) John Norman – Ipswich Society (JN) Peter Miller – Westerfield Parish Council (PM) Phil Sweet – IBC (PS) Rod Brooks – Northern Fringe Protection Group (RB) Steve Miller – IBC (SM) Stewart Quantrell – Northern Fringe Protection Group (SQ) Sue Bull – Anglian Water (SB)
Apologies	Councillor Peter Gardiner – IBC (PG) Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS (FL)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	19 March 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of previous meeting 20 November 2012 and		

	matters arising		
1.1	Minutes of meeting on the 20 November were commented on and amended as follows:-		
1.1.1	Item 1.4.2.1 RB requested a change to the wording as follows:-		
1.1.2	The proposed route through the lower part of Christchurch Park was ruled out on safety grounds but consideration would need to be given to encouraging greater use of cycling via the Bridleway.	FB	
1.2	Item 5.2 RB requested a change to the wording as follows:-		
1.2.1	RB pointed out that it was misleading to say ' <i>The review of the Core Strategy is simply reviewing the housing and employment requirement to 2031</i> '. The Inspector stated that it should be reviewed in 2012/13 and prior to the extent of the Northern Fringe development being determined so clearly there should be a dependency and this should be shown on the 'key stages & timetable of the Northern Fringe SPD'.	FB	
1.2.2	Item 5.3 RB requested a change to the wording as follows:-		
1.2.3	RB also pointed out that the Core Strategy was based upon the premise of a jobs-led growth strategy (which was questionable at the time and has failed to materialise) and this had translated into a housing growth strategy. He suggested that a review of the Core Strategy should also revisit this premise as it would be more honest to base housing growth needs on other factors such as population growth and the need for more affordable homes.'	FB	
1.3.	Item 1.3 Initials to be corrected from BR to RB	FB	
1.5	Item 1.6.1 Initials to be corrected from BR to BREVE	FB	
1.6	Item 2.1.10 Initials to be corrected from RB to BR	FB	
2.0	Feedback from current Issues and Options consultation		
2.1	AS gave a brief update on the attendance and general feedback from the Public Consultation and Exhibitions which commenced on the 12 th January and concludes on the 22 nd February 2013.		
2.2	At the time of update (11 January):- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 616 (signed in) attended the walk-in exhibitions • 200 attended the public meeting held at Northgate Arts Centre (29 January) 		


	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23 Individual letters have been received • *UPDATE (23 January) 12 people have completed the online questionnaire, devised by DLA • *UPDATE 26 now received but not analysed • 41 hard copies of the questionnaire have been (received by 11 February) 		
2.3	The general feedback gleaned from the exhibitions was that transport was a big concern for local residents. It was felt there was no clear understanding of future transport implications on existing and new residents.		
2.4	Among the other concerns raised were scale of the development, impact on drainage, rat-runs, density and the need for additional retail, health and community facilities.		
2.5	A Northern By-pass was mentioned by a number of people.		
2.6	46% of respondents indicated a preference for Option 2, with the other 2 options being equal.		
2.7	BR asked for a full breakdown of attendance for each of the dates and venues of the exhibition.	AS	
2.8	AS confirmed approximately 250 people attended the Henley Road Sports Centre and Westerfield Church Exhibitions, the remaining attending the Town Hall. A final report would provide the final figures.		
2.9	AS provided a hand-out which outlined the above.		
2.10	SM thanked Westerfield Parish Council and Peter Miller for their help and support at the exhibitions, which proved useful to the process.		
3.0	Question and answer session with representative from Anglian Water – Sue Bull		
3.1	CJ called this item first to accommodate the return journey for SB.		
3.2	CJ welcomed SB to the meeting, who then gave the panel an update.		
3.3	SB stated AW were currently liaising with developers to reach solutions for water and drainage supply.		
3.4	Notably, dealing with foul drainage might either involve the construction of a new sewer from the site to Cliff Quay or alternatively to pipe sewage to and upgraded treatment works at Donkey Lane, Tuddenham.		

3.5	SB emphasised that assessments were still on-going and that no final conclusions had yet been reached. She was however confident that a suitable solution would be found. End of March was anticipated for the deadline for the current work-stream.		
3.6	PS sought confirmation that any requirements for new sewerage infrastructure would be dependent on the phasing of the new development and SB confirmed that this would be the case.		
3.7	SB confirmed that the cost of any required new infrastructure would be part funded by AW and part by developers.		
3.8	The need to encourage water efficiency for the new development (grey water recycling etc) was raised by JN and SB confirmed that AW would be supportive of this. SM advised that water efficiency was something that could be addressed under the Code for Sustainable Homes.		
4.0	Atlas report on Autumn Study Tours		
4.1	The report was briefly presented and broadly accepted as a good record of the views of those who attended and responded.		
4.2	CJ indicated that, in the light of the report and what had been learnt from elsewhere, in her view the following topics required further consideration and discussion:- (i) the make-up, design and operation of the proposed district centres (ii) the distribution and configuration of greenspace across the site (item to be included on next CSP agenda and Eddie Peters to be invited to attend) (iii) density matters (iv) car parking strategy	PS	
4.3	PS confirmed the Retail Report Study had been finalised.		
5.0	Update on Density / Capacity		
5.1	This item was deferred to a later date to be confirmed.	SM	
6.0	Draft Transport Strategy (Update on information)		
6.1	The updated Draft Transport Strategy (Vectos November 2012) was reviewed by the Panel and commented on as follows:-		

6.2	Para 23 - The N-S cycle route through Christchurch Park is not considered acceptable on safety grounds; a shorter link from Park Road entrance across to the Bridleway entrance might be acceptable.		
6.3	A request was made for definitive maps for footpaths and cycleways on and around the site to be made available.	AS	
6.4	Para. 23 – It was incorrect to say that the Avenue is currently in a fit state for cycling.		
6.5	Para 33. – It was emphasised that that cycleways and footpath links in SCDC as well as IBC should be considered.		
6.6	The location of the proposed new pedestrian / cycle crossing of Colchester Road to link Fonnereau Way with the Avenue need to be carefully considered.		
6.7	Para. 36 – The importance of pursuing direct bus links to Ipswich Rail Station and a suitable cross-town route was emphasised. PS indicated that IBC transport section was to carry out some initial work in this regard.	PS	
6.8	Para. 62 Various attendees reiterated concerns about the adequacy of the modeling carried out to date in terms of gaining a full understanding of likely traffic impact across the various parts of the local network; a request that this be given further attention was made.		
6.9	BREVE expressed particular concerns regarding the impacts of the likely increased traffic flows on Westerfield Road in association with the introduction of new traffic signals and increased freight traffic on the rail line – traffic delays were likely to increase rat-running in his view .		
6.10	Para. 73. It was considered that insufficient detail had been provided in the Issues and Options Report and at the exhibition on this important matter of junction reconfiguration and design.		
6.11	SM advised that further detail would be provided in due course on a range of transport related matters before the SPD is adopted. However he emphasised that Suffolk County Council are the highway authority and thus have major influence on the scope and content of transport and traffic matters that may be included in the SPD.	SM	
7.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
7.1	CJ requested this item be removed from future Community Steering Panel agendas.	FB	
8.0	AOB		

8.1	PS circulated photographs of an existing cycle / pedestrian underpass from the Grange Farm Estate east of Ipswich. RB felt that such a facility had merit to provide safe crossing of Westerfield Road and should be given serious consideration. SM assured him that this would be the case.	SM	
9.0	Date of Next Meeting		
9.1	Tuesday 19 th March 2013 at 4.00pm .	FB	

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		