



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	19 March 2013
Time	16:00
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 Peter Gardiner – IBC (PG) 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) Carlos Hone – IBC (CH) Denis Cooper – IBC (DC) Eddie Peters – IBC (EP) Felicia Blake – IBC (FB) Fionnuala Lennon – Atlas (FL) John Norman – Ipswich Society (JN) Peter Miller – Westerfield Parish Council (PM) Rod Brooks – Northern Fringe Protection Group (RB) Steve Miller – IBC (SM) Stewart Quantrill – Northern Fringe Protection Group (SQ)
Apologies	Phil Sweet
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	29 April 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
--	--	--------	-------------

1.0	Apologies		
1.1	Phil Sweet (PS)		
2.0	Minutes from previous CSP meeting of 12 February and matters arising		
2.1	Drainage (Item 3) – Questions and answer session with representative from Anglian Water – Sue Bull		
2.1.1	SM and DC confirmed SB of Anglian Water accepted Item 3 of the last CSP to be an accurate account of the minutes recorded. It was pointed out that AW was at an early stage of looking at possible options for sewage disposal.		
2.1.2	DC went on to explain the complexities of assessing capacity as BS and others had concerns:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water consumption and hence sewage flows per person are reducing, with Cliff Quay STW (sewage treatment works) constantly being adjusted, maintained/uprated – AW have already made it their centre for sludge treatment • Against this ever-changing background the N Fringe development would take place over a long time period and growth elsewhere would also be underway – Even so, it would be relatively easy for AW to improve the STW - (Cliff Quay has the potential capacity to deal with sewage/ wastewater from the NF development) • Sewerage (the pipe network) capacity could potentially be more of a problem. The upstream parts of the network, close to the NF are relatively small and additional foul flows due to the development are more likely to be less significant. The system is complicated by the presence of storm overflows and tanks • Local improvements may be all that's needed rather than providing new sewer to Cliff Quay STW 		
2.1.3	DC left after this item.		
2.1.4	BS and BR concerned that their comments on drainage were not mentioned. SM agreed more detailed notes from public stakeholder groups taken at the CSP meeting of 12 th February 21 st Anglian Water could be added to the minutes as matters arising.		2 attachments (SOCS and NFPG)
2.1.5	BS suggested it be noted that:- BS had asked whether full environmental and sustainability assessments of the Anglian Water options would be undertaken – SM confirmed they would.		
2.2	Item 2.2 – BR requested it be noted that there was approx. 300 (and not 200) in attendance at the NF Public		

	Meeting of the 29 January.		
2.3	Item 3.5 – The end of March deadline was referred to – Current work-stream is on-going.		
2.4	Draft Transport Strategy (Update on Information) (Item 6)		
2.4.1	It was thought these minutes should be sent to the TWG for perusal.		
2.4.2	BR suggested it be noted that additional text be added to 6.3 paragraph (*):- BR request was made for the Definitive Maps for footpaths and cycleways on and around the site to be made available *and factored into the process forthwith. BR also called for a survey for recreational uses outside the CS area (Suffolk Coastal Area).*		
2.4.3	BR suggested it be noted that additional text be added to 6.10 paragraph (*):- *BR asked whether previous proposals at Tuddenham Road access point which depended on the demolition of existing properties were being considered – SM stated that there were no proposals to demolish homes.*		
2.5	PM stated there was no reference to the issue of railway services from Westerfield and the future of Westerfield Station – CJ agreed to have this amended.		
2.6	A meeting was being sought with Greater Anglia and it was suggested that Westerfield Parish Council be presented at this meeting.		
2.7	RB also stated he would like it noted that in his opinion it was a mistake not to present the traffic options at the exhibition.		
2.8	<u>Update on Issues & Options Exhibition</u> AS confirmed that a written response had also been received from Westerfield Parish Council - It was acknowledged the Survey Monkey was unable to provide WPC or others with a unique reference number at the point of submission.		
2.9	BR asked about the Review of the Core Strategy – SM and CJ said this was a separate issue and that these <u>questions had already been addressed.</u>		
2.10	Minutes from Development Steering Group 29 January 2013 (and matters arising) BR asked for this information and referred to a FOI		

<p>2.11</p> <p>2.12</p> <p>2.13</p>	<p>regarding the table as it was not flagged as confidential according to DSG agenda/minutes?</p> <p>ACTION: FL to look at confidentially issues with regard to information circulated regarding CIL and viability - SM will make provisions for this – FL to work alongside PS (NB not needed, as this was addressed last year).</p> <p>Minutes from Development Steering Group 4 December 2012 (and matters arising) ACTION: BR to email city BID **(UPDATE: This information was contained in the DSG minutes of 4th December 2012).</p> <p>It was acknowledged that these minutes were not discussed at the proceeding CSP meeting of the 12 February. Issues concerning junctions and railway bridge were mentioned – Developers would have to pay for the bridge over the railway.</p>	<p>FL/PS</p>	
<p>3.0</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p> <p>3.3</p>	<p>Green space strategy</p> <p>EP gave a brief summary on greenspace. It was established there was a great need to maintain existing hedgerows, trees/veteran trees as much as possible.</p> <p>EP confirmed 64ha of open space (including the country park). It was the intention to designate hedgerows (thoroughfares) and provide a linkage between 3 areas, including open space and the town centre. Hedgerows will feature significantly in the development, as well as foot/cycling areas.</p> <p>Other issues discussed:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of the country park - Conclusions need to be reached with regard to identifying protected • ACTION: SM to look again at Suffolk Wildlife Trust's recommendation for restoration considered for Red House Park • trees, what goes where and the design of the open spaces in relation to Red House Farm • Country park, - considered to be small • Preferred dedicated open space (viable size 28ha being the preferred option) • District centres – to be close to main open spaces acting as a gateway • In principle to design open space areas with strong links to the development and to recreational facilities <p>Some felt that the design of open space build around development to be of poor standard – Problems cited were:-</p>	<p>SM</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deficiency in outdoor sports facilities (with figures suggesting a 8ha deficiency) <p>ACTION: SM to look at and confirm figures and address issues raised</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible access difficulties with school opening/closing times Organised sport – Potential issues with no access to changing rooms/tennis courts – A loss to casual users of these facilities Car parking difficulties at the various venues, due to opening/closing times 	SM	
3.4	SQ mentioned Fonnereau Way as an example of no lighting – Increased problems for dark evenings.		
3.4	AS said there would be ways to alleviate lighting problems which would not affect bats – This could be reviewed.		
3.5	FL stated new model designs of shared use were currently being done by SCC (including faith schools) – Further work would be undertaken.		
3.6	AS stated, principally that facility design would be subject to future planning applications with a proviso covering community access within the conditions– Joint management ACTION: CJ asked for a Best Practice example for this	IBC	
3.7	It was felt there would have to be a clear commitment from schools from the start with regards to ground usage and availability.		
3.8	IL questioned how allotments would be integrated within the community – Pesticides on farmland could be allocated within areas not sprayed in the past.		
3.9	EP agreed more detailed planning would give a good opportunity to revisit allotment site locations to make any necessary revision – CJ sited Dales Road as an example.		
3.10	RB enquired about buffer zones – Screening of railway – 10m of dense foliage would have a negligible (not negative) impact on noise – More buffers needed for areas adjacent to housing?		
3.11	CJ thought about fruit trees being planted in gardens – Suggested speaking early with developers about this, so that this could be part of the development at the outset.	FL	
3.12	BR referred to tree buffers near Westerfield Road- could already be planted.		
3.13	EP explained that scale and depth of the option 1 greenspace plan would be hard to gauge.		

	<i>ACTION: SM to provide clarification for key items on the diagram as these often did not add up table 5 - further issues presented would be considered</i>	SM	
3.14	BR mentioned mitigation on Deben Road/Orwell estuaries – Adjacent to Fynn Valley required as part of the Appropriate Assessment Sustainable Environmental Assessment– BR questioned whether the strategy on greenspace was robust enough and would meet the Sustainability tests.		
3.15	BR made reference to loss of farmland not being properly addressed. <i>ACTION: BR said she could send example documents to SM</i>	BR	
3.16	BR referred to the Newsletter 6, which included “an invite and call for ideas”, including the Review of the Core Strategy, stating elected members of the CSP and other stakeholders had not received this. <i>ACTION: FB to check contact details are on the consultation database</i>	FB	
3.17	BR asked EP whether the up to date Draft Open Space and Biodiversity Policy/Strategy report was available on the website.		
3.18	EP confirmed this had been uploaded.		
3.19	<i>ACTION: The panel agreed submit questions and comments</i>	ALL	
4.0	Wildlife Audit (Category 1 Sites)		
4.1	In EP’s personal opinion, he concurred with the conclusions of the draft audit produced by Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT).		
4.2	Most people welcomed the report and acknowledged this was being taken seriously – BR stated it was regrettable that none of the options restore the parkland at Red House Farm as pointed out by SWT.		
4.3	BR pointed out that none of the options allow for parkland around Red House Farm – CJ also had concerns about this. <i>ACTION: BR and asked for this to be looked into more rigorously, as the matrix drawn up initially factored in little of the available information held by the Borough into the Hyder Scoping Report for the SA and with possible constraints. This may well render the process not fit for purpose.</i>	SM	
4.4	BR referred to Site 149 (Land North of Millennium Cemetery) - suggesting this needed to be incorporated		


	into the Suffolk Wildlife Document released and on the web as it was incorporated in the Wildlife report delivered at the DLA pre-meeting on the Issues & Options exhibitions.		
5.0	Draft report on summary of consultation responses from the Issues and Options Exhibition		
5.1.1	AS introduced the draft report summary of the results derived from the consultation. Responses were received in the form of:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal communication • individual letters • paper / on-line questionnaires (via Survey Monkey) 		
5.1.2	The data received will be collated and analysed, along with any late representations received after the consultation end date. The summary of responses will form the statistical facts and figures for spatial options.		
5.1.3	SM confirmed Suffolk County County's response to the consultation had been received, which would be included with all previous information collected.		
5.1.4	When this work has been completed, this will be published on the website, along with the Study Tour report prepared by Atlas.		
5.1.5	IBC response to questions raised at the public meeting (29 January 2013) document		
5.2	BR asked for it be noted that there was close to approx. 300 (head counted) rather than 200 attendees previously reported at the meeting.		
5.2.1	AS asked for her name to be deleted from all NF email streams as this would be her last day.	ALL	
5.2.2	CJ and the panel thanked AS for her hard work – RB also complimented AS on the work undertaken.		
5.2.3	RB pointed out slight typo's within the document – <i>ACTION: AS suggested emailing corrections to PS/FB to amend</i>	RB	
5.2.4	<i>ACTION: BR requested all future NF produced documents and reports be dated, page numbered, with defined version / revision references to ensure clearness – CJ and SM agreed this to be fair</i>	FB	
6.0	The next steps in the preparation of the SPD and review of timescale		Attachment handed out

6.1	SM said nothing had changed, and that we were on course according to time scales.		
6.2	Work was now being done with David Lock Associates to analyse the data of responses from the consultation – this would continue over the summer, with the aim to go to Executive in June/July 2013.		
6.3	The Transport Working Group and Spatial Planning working groups would reconvene shortly.		
6.4	The Sustainability Appraisal was being dealt with by Sarah Barker of Planning Policy <i>ACTION: RB asked about Sustainability work</i>	IBC	
6.5	SM confirmed the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) should be available to view on the website by the end of the week.		
7.0	NF Retail Study – This report has now been finalised and will be available for viewing and downloading – this will not be circulated with the agenda due to size		
7.1	SM confirmed this was for information and was viewable on the web – This was not circulated via email as too large in file size.		
7.2	It was stated that consultant information and comments from the consultation would inform the SPD.		
7.3	CJ questioned whether we should accept the developer's assumptions on what was needed from the consultant report - There was general conflict between the need for large supermarkets and smaller units.		
7.4	RB said there were no surprises with the report, and that it was a professional job, although there were some issues.		
7.5	RB referred to facts and figures on page 63 of the report:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • total number of shopping trips • total number of trips per week • both-way journeys • car trips undertaken by NF residents - 80%, 1000 trips per day from outside the outside NF development • and looking at impact on existing retail (Fircroft Road showed a 11.5% reduction and Meredith Road 11.3%) 		
7.6	IL also stated some of the smaller wards did not have any centres, and that Victoria Nurseries could go.		
7.7	JN mentioned the operation of supermarkets and restrictions on size.		

7.8	PG also commented on size and ensuring it didn't become a free for all. PG offered Ravenswood as a good example to follow. It was acknowledged the car park was not big enough, but there was a good mix. The advantage the NF has though would be that it doesn't have to be on the fringe.		
7.9	CJ asked SM whether there was a need for a large supermarket – Why not 3 smaller supermarkets within local centres?		
8.0	Minutes of previous other meetings		
8.1	CJ and SM specified that any additional/revised corrections for minutes should be added to the matters arising section.		
8.2	PM referred to any new developments from other groups, notably the TWG – PM asked whether they were listening? SM confirmed there had been no further TWG and SPWG meetings since last year – to be reconvened.		
8.3	Development Steering Group 29 January 2013		
8.3.1	Item 5.4 – An addendum to the minutes was emailed - Wording change - AO agreed that testing viability at this stage would be helpful		
8.3.2	Item 5.7 – CJ asked about the Infrastructure Table ACTION: This would be updated in two weeks, as stated	FL/AS	
8.3.3	5.8 – CJ asked about the appraisal Crest and Mersea Homes are to provide of the finalised table.		
9.0	AOB		
9.1	BR asked whether the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) document was on the website, as previously discussed with Robert Hobbs. ACTION: FB to ask RH when this will be available	FB	
9.2	BR stated that SOCS and NFPG represented roughly 1500 people in NF matters, and urged for more detailed minutes and promised information to be placed as agreed on the IBC website (this was not always the case).		
9.3	The Public Meeting at Northgate as an example (these did not capture fully what was discussed at the meeting).		
9.4	PG stated that as a representative and being present at the meeting, if the minutes did not capture word for word what was stated – The rep should be able to report back		

9.5	with their personal conclusions. BR referred to the Openbook Appraisal - IL also asked if there was agreed profit? SM confirmed yes and that profit had been agreed – Effectively 20%. ACTION: SM to provide confirmation of what open book is (infrastructure/viability)	SM	
9.6	BR asked about S106 (CIL) – passive listeners		
9.7	It was confirmed the next Development Steering Group meeting was on the 16 th April.		
10.0	Date of next meeting		
10.1	CJ requested booking the Orwell Room for the next meeting as it was a large panel.		
10.2	**UPDATE: The next meeting has been moved from Thursday 25 th April to Monday 29 th April (times to be confirmed).		

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	x
	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	



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	12 February 2013
Time	15:30
Location	Grafton House – Orwell Room
Present	<p>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 Quantrill – Northern Fringe Protection Group (SQ) Sue Bull – Anglian Water (SB)</p>
Apologies	<p>Councillor Peter Gardiner – IBC (PG) Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS (FL)</p>
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	TBC

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 		

Comment [B1]: This is a factual correction to the minutes of the meeting of 20th November, which ruled out the proposed route through Christchurch Park. As reported in 6.2 it was then mentioned at this meeting (12 Feb) that cycling on the top part of the park could be considered.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 200 attended the public meeting held at Northgate Arts Centre (29 January) • 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	<p>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. <u>RB requested that it be minuted that not exhibiting the NF traffic options was a mistake.</u></p>		
2.4	<p>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.</p>		
2.5			
2.6	<p>A Northern By-pass was mentioned by a number of people.</p>		
2.7	<p>46% of respondents indicated a preference for Option 2, with the other 2 options being equal.</p>	AS	
2.8	<p>BR asked for a full breakdown of attendance for each of the dates and venues of the exhibition.</p>		
2.9	<p>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.</p>		
2.10	<p>AS provided a hand-out which outlined the above.</p> <p>SM thanked Westerfield Parish Council and Peter Miller for their help and support at the exhibitions, which proved useful to the process.</p>		
3.0	<p>Question and answer session with representative from Anglian Water – Sue Bull</p>		
3.1	<p>CJ called this item first to accommodate the return journey for SB.</p>		
3.2	<p>CJ welcomed SB to the meeting, who then gave the panel an update.</p>		
3.3	<p>SB stated AW were currently liaising with developers to reach solutions <u>for water and drainage supply.</u></p>		


Comment [B2]: Please can it be clarified that this includes wastewater/sewage.

3.4	<p><u>When questioned by BS, SB confirmed that there was insufficient existing capacity at Cliff Quay for the Northern Fringe development and that reinforcement would be required and that there was insufficient capacity in the existing sewer system to Cliff Quay for the Northern Fringe development.</u></p>		
3.5			
3.6	<p>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, <u>which may require a pumping station.</u></p>		
3.7	<p>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.</p>		
3.8	<p>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.</p>		
	<p>SB confirmed that the cost of any required new infrastructure would be part funded by AW <u>(and passed through to their customers)</u> and part by developers. <u>Income from new homes on the NF over the initial 12 year period would be netted off against the cost to developers.</u></p>		
	<p><u>SB commented on the price review regulatory process and that AW's asset management plan (AMP) for major infrastructure, as required for the NF, would have to be approved by Ofwat. The next period for this is AMP6, which runs (2015-2020) followed by AMP7 (2021-2026)</u></p>		
	<p><u>BS asked if it was possible to secure approval if detailed proposals weren't submitted under AMP6 under the Price Review 2014. SB confirmed that this was possible but wasn't straightforward or the norm.</u></p>		
	<p>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.</p>		
	<p><u>BS asked whether full environment and sustainability assessments of the Anglian Water options would be undertaken. SM confirmed that they would.</u></p>	SM	
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	<p>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:-</p> <p>(i) the make-up, design and operation of the proposed district centres</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(iii) density matters</p> <p>(iv) car parking strategy</p>	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. <u>It was noted that train services from Westerfield station had been recently cut and consequently IBC agreed to arrange a meeting with Greater Anglia (or whatever the rail franchise operator is called this week) and Westerfield Parish Council to discuss future services.</u>	<u>IBC</u>	
6.6			
6.7	The location of the proposed new pedestrian / cycle crossing of Colchester Road to link Fonnereau Way with	PS	

	the Avenue need to be carefully considered.		
6.8	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.		
6.9	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.		
6.10	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.		
6.11	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. 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	RB-PS circulated photographs of an existing cycle / pedestrian underpass from the Grange Farm Estate east of Ipswich. HeRB 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		



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 Quantrill – 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	TBC

Items:

		A	Att
		cti	ac
		on	h
		me	nt
		s	s

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 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	
	Item 5.2 RB requested a change to the wording as follows:-		
1.2	RB pointed out that it was misleading to say 'The review of the Core Strategy is simply reviewing the housing and employment requirement to 2031'. 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	
1.2.1	Item 5.3 RB requested a change to the wording as follows:-		
1.2.2	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.'		
	Item 1.3 Initials to be corrected from BR to RB		
1.2.3	Item 1.6.1 Initials to be corrected from BR to BREVE	FB	
	Item 2.1.10 Initials to be corrected from RB to BR		
1.3.		FB	
1.5		FB	
1.6		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	<p>At the time of update (11 January):-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 616 (signed in) attended the walk-in exhibitions • 200 (correction needed approximately 300) attended the public meeting held at Northgate Arts Centre (29 January) • 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	<p>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. RB requested that it be minuted that not exhibiting the NF traffic options was a mistake.</p>		
	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.		
2.4	A Northern By-pass was mentioned by a number of people.		
	46% of respondents (clarification needed; questionnaires, questionnaires AND written? Actual numbers who commented on options please) indicated a preference for Option 2, with the other 2 options being equal.		
2.5	BR asked for a full breakdown of attendance for each of the dates and venues of the exhibition.		
2.6	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.		
2.7	AS provided a hand-out which outlined the above.	AS	
2.8	SM thanked Westerfield Parish Council and Peter Miller for their help and support at the exhibitions, which proved useful to the process.		
2.9			
2.10			

3.0	<p>Question and answer session with representative from Anglian Water – Sue Bull</p>
3.1	<p>CJ called this item first to accommodate the return journey for SB.</p>
	<p>CJ welcomed SB to the meeting, who then gave the panel an update.</p>
3.2	<p>SB stated AW were currently liaising with developers to Explore several options and possible solutions for water and drainage supply.</p>
3.3	<p>When questioned by BS, SB confirmed that although there was some existing capacity at Cliff Quay, capacity for foul drainage was “challenging”. Existing combined systems are no longer an option; they must now be separate from SUDS</p>
3.4	<p>According to the Water Framework Directive compliance requirements; although there was some capacity at Cliff Key, “extensive upgrades” and huge investments would be required for the NF to be accommodated.</p>
3.5	<p>This work stream would have to be processed through AW business plan ; within AW Business Cycle which is overseen by OFWATT. The next business cycle will be 2015-2021.</p>
3.6	<p>Sustainability will be the top issues and will require an EIA which MAY lead to a cost effective option in thee shorter term.</p>
3.7	<p>This may not be achievable within the current SPD time frame and future phasing proposals. The costs are likely to be considerable and the developers will always go for the easier options.</p>
3.8	<p>Notably, dealing with foul drainage might be addressed by several preliminary alternative options; the construction of a new sewer from the site to Cliff Quay or an alternative option might be considered eg to pipe sewage to an upgraded</p>
3.9	<p>treatment works at Donkey Lane, Tuddenham, a pumping station maay be needed. IBC initially had no identified this as a constraint as they had an impression from previous dialogue this would not present a problem, however, the Issues & Options report has thrown up significant challenges and possible viability issues.</p>
3.10	<p>SB indicated,</p>
3.11	<p>1. Requirements specify there should be “nil detriment’ to existing systems.</p>
3.12	<p>2. Costs of proposed options will be determined through a “cost/ benefit” analysis which must be reviewed under review of AW’s Asset Management process which OFWAT oversee within he business cycle . Amendment to existing business cycle might be explored but this in not the norm.</p>
3.13	<p>SB emphasised that assessments were still on-going. AW will explore a Developer Impact Assessment which should offer a number of feasible development solutions which she hoped would be completed by the end of March 2013. To date, 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 (consideration of possible options to be resolved between developers and AW)</p>
3.14	<p>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.</p>
3.15	<p>SB confirmed that the cost of any required new infrastructure would be part funded by AW (and passed through to their customers) and part by developers. Income from new homes on the NF over the initial 12 year period would be netted off against the cost to developers.</p>
3.16	<p>SB commented on the price review regulatory process and that AW’s asset management plan (AMP) for major infrastructure, as required for the NF, would have to be approved by Ofwat. The next period for this is AMP6, which runs (2015-2020) followed by AMP7 (2021-2026)</p>
3.17	<p>BS asked if it was possible to secure approval if detailed proposals weren’t submitted under AMP6 under the Price Review 2014. SB confirmed that this was possible but wasn’t straightforward or the norm.</p>
3.18	<p>The need to encourage water efficiency for the new development (grey water recycling etc) was raised by JN and SB with JN noting that AW would be supportive of this. SM advised the water efficiency issues was something that would be addressed under the Code for Sustainable Homes.</p>

S
M

<p>4.0</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p>Atlas report on Autumn Study Tours</p> <p>The report was briefly presented and broadly accepted as a good record of the views of those who attended and responded.</p> <p>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:-</p> <p>(i) the make-up, design and operation of the proposed district centres</p> <p>(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)</p> <p>(iii) density matters</p> <p>(iv) car parking strategy</p> <p>PS confirmed the Retail Report Study had been finalised.</p>	<p>PS</p>	
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p>	<p>Update on Density / Capacity</p> <p>This item was deferred to a later date to be confirmed.</p>	<p>S M</p>	

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	BR request was made for the Definitive Maps for footpaths and cycleways on and around the site to be made available AND FACTORED INTO THE PROCESS FORTHWITH).She also called for a survey of recreational uses outside the CS area(Suffolk Coastal Area).	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. It was noted that train services from Westerfield station had been recently cut and consequently IBC agreed to arrange a meeting with Greater Anglia (or whatever the rail franchise operator is called this week) and Westerfield Parish Council to discuss future services.	IB C	
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	BR asked whether previous proposals at Tuddenham Road access point which depended on the demolition of existing properties where being considered. SM stated there were no proposals to demolish homes. 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.	S M	
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.	S M	
9.0	Date of Next Meeting		
9.1	Tuesday 19 th March 2013 at 4.00pm .	FB	

<p>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>		
<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	
	1. Provided in confidence	
	1. Intended for future publication	
	1. Related to criminal proceedings	
	1. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	1. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	
	1. That could prejudice the conduct of public affairs	
	1. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety	
	1. That is subject to legal privilege	
	1. That is prejudicial to commercial interests	
	1. That may not be disclosed by law	
1. Other Please describe		