



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	20 November 2012
Time	15:30
Location	Grafton House – Orwell Room
Present	Councillor Carole Jones – Chair (IBC) (CJ) Councillor Inga Lockington (IBC) (IL) Councillor Bill Quinton (IBC) (BQ) Councillor Chris Stewart (IBC) (CS) Councillor John Le Grys (IBC) (JL) Councillor Julian Gibbs – Substitutes Councillor P Gardiner (IBC) (JG) John Norman (Ipswich Society) (JN) Barry Reeve (Westerfield Parish Council) (BREVE) Peter Miller (Westerfield Parish Council) (PM) Barbara Robinson (Save Our Country Spaces) (BR) Rod Brooks (Northern Fringe Protection Group) (RB) Stewart Quantrell (Northern Fringe Protection Group) (SQ) Steve Miller (IBC) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC) (PS) Denis Cooper (IBC) (DC) Fionnuala Lennon (ATLAS) (FL) James Farrar (Atlas) (JF) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Anita Seymour (IBC) (AS) Felicia Blake – Minutes (IBC) (FB)
Apologies	Councillor Tracy Grant (IBC), Councillor David Goldsmith (IBC), Sean Salter (IBC), Councillor Peter Gardiner (IBC)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	12 February 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising		
1.1	Minutes of meeting on 25 October were commented on and amended as follows:		
1.2	Item 1.19 BR sought clarity on whether all finalised minutes (as opposed to draft) were available on the website. PS confirmed this would be checked and necessarily updated by FB.	FB	
1.3	Item 3.1 RB wanted to know whether the comments flip-chart concerning the Issues and Options report had been circulated. FL confirmed this had been sent to all members of the panel via email.		
1.4	<u>Technical note – Responses to Transport Comments on Issues and Options Report</u> ID presented the report – he confirmed that the intention was to correct background information and provide clarification on points raised.		
1.4.1	Railway Services JN questioned whether existing services could be increased - ID said that discussions with Greater Anglia have been positive.		
1.4.1.1	IL was concerned that an improved rail station could attract too many people from further afield if generous car parking were to be provided. All agreed proposed size of any additional parking was an issue.		
1.4.1.2	JN commented that the station was far more accessible by bike from Ipswich than the Town Centre Station and improved service would attract greater use.		
1.4.2	Pedestrian/Cycle Facilities ID confirmed a network of pedestrian and cycle routes would be provided throughout the Northern Fringe development to ensure housing was well connected to other proposed uses, including schools, shops and community facilities. It would connect to existing routes outside of the site.		
1.4.2.1	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.		

1.4.2.2	<p>RB expressed a desire for an under pass for Westerfield Road to provide a safe route for cyclists and pedestrians and reduce impact on traffic. However they need to be well designed. Concerns were raised regarding underpasses not being very popular with the general public, due to health and safety aspects – RB cited Milton Keynes and Grange Farm as good examples of how under passes could be deployed.</p> <p>ID stated more consideration would be given into the matter.</p>		
1.4.3	<p>Bus Services</p> <p>Consultations have taken place with First Route Buses and Ipswich Buses on service opportunities for the area, as well as managing peak periods and traffic patterns.</p>		
1.4.3.1	<p>Both service operators have suggested high frequency town centre services between Tower Ramparts and the Northern Fringe, with possibly two separate bus services for the site and surrounding area.</p>		
1.4.3.2	<p>JN suggested a good route service would be one that would run between West Ipswich/Whitehouse and East Ipswich/Cranes. A direct service from the NF to Ipswich rail station was also recommended.</p>		
1.4.3.3	<p>JN noted that Ravenswood was a success and something to consider for this development. A leaflet-drop promoting and informing local residents of bus routes as well as free/subsidised initiatives from the start encouraged bus use.</p>		
1.4.3.4	<p>IL requested that Ipswich Buses be invited to attend a future meeting of the CSP.</p>	PS/FB	
1.4.3.5	<p>BR made the point that hedges on the Red House Farm were not shown on the new Option maps. SM and PS confirmed they should be included, so would check and amend the plan as necessary.</p>	SM/PS	
1.5	<p>Access arrangements</p> <p>ID explained that the access strategy would include a mix of signal-controlled and non-signal-controlled junctions.</p>		
1.6	<p>Traffic</p> <p>ID explained that peak hour traffic congestion was currently widespread and that parts of the network were currently at or near capacity. The new development will generate additional traffic and the SPD will require a strategy to manage the impact of</p>		

	this increase as effectively as possible.		
1.6.1	It was emphasised by BREVE and RB that traffic impact remained the key issue for many local residents. There was discussion around the robustness of the traffic data being used to model impact. Impact on the wider network should not be overlooked.		
1.6.2	JG highlighted changing patterns of working, with more working from home that would progressively impact on traffic flows.		
1.6.3	CJ indicated that reducing car use was an issue for all residents not just those who will occupy the Northern Fringe.		
1.7	CJ guided the panel to look at the Technical Note provided and refer any comments back to ID.	All	Attachment
1.8	It was agreed an electronic copy of the Transport Response to Comments on Issues and Options Report would be circulated to CSP group members.	FB	
2.0	Drainage matters associated with the Northern Fringe Development		
2.1.1	DC addressed the panel on drainage matters for the Northern Fringe, including the sustainable urban drainage system.		
2.1.2	For many years IBC have had in place planning policies and a Drainage and Flood Defence Policy. These effectively ensure flood risk is not worsened by development in line with the new National Planning Framework and the old PPS25.		
2.1.3	This is largely through the implementation of SUDS which manage surface runoff. SUDS mimic natural drainage processes and limit the flows passed on to downstream watercourses to the natural rate before development.		
2.1.4	SUDS may be the infiltration type which soak runoff into the ground, or where ground conditions are unsuitable, the attenuation type. Both types have been in use for some years. SUDS serving the NF will not rely on soakage.		
2.1.5	The attenuation basin (a form of SUDS), adjacent to Victoria Nurseries, is unlikely to remain full for several days. We are unaware of any public safety concerns or operational problems. Side slopes, limited depths of water and deterrent planting all aid safety.		

2.1.6	The Environment Agency's proposed tidal flood barrier will not worsen upstream flooding. The project team includes representatives from Ipswich Borough Council. Extensive, detailed, feasibility studies included analysis of historic records and modelling of the Orwell estuary and River Gipping. The narrowing of the New Cut will have negligible influence on river levels.		
2.1.7	<p>The SFRA and SWMP describe how the barrier works: -</p> <p>The barrier will be closed at low tide in advance of a tidal surge. During the closure period the river channel upstream has adequate capacity to store incoming fluvial and surface water flows and achieve the required level of flood protection.</p>		
2.1.8	The barrier will be operated by the Environment Agency in a manner that avoids raising upstream flood levels. The proposed barrier will not affect villages upstream.		
2.1.9	In the future if the sea level rises and peak incoming flows increase as predicted, then pumps may be needed to help maintain flood defence standards. Provision is made in the design of the barrier to readily enable the future installation pumps.		
2.1.10	BR posed the issue of climate change – DC stated EA could install pumps to stop the overflow of fluvial flow when required - EA are considering tidal and fluvial flooding as part of the design/analysis data collected.		
2.2	FL cited a new development in Letchworth Garden City as an example of effective rainwater harvesting. FL will provide the group with further information – There was feedback on initial teething problems available as some properties were occupied.	FL	
2.3	It was suggested representatives from Anglian Water could be invited to the next meeting to answer any questions concerning surface water and foul sewerage.	PS/FB	
3.0	Feedback from tour on developments and identification of lessons to apply to Northern Fringe		
3.1	On the whole the panel found the tours useful and gave valuable insight into lessons on what “to do” and “not to do”.		
3.2	FL presented the group with slides of recent visits (including Cambourne and Ravenswood). Among the		

	issues discussed were parking, district/local centres, pubs, community halls, verges, country/and retail parks.		
3.3	JN mentioned cars, and how they should interact with district centres – JN also called for public space to be made available for other uses (e.g. markets).		
3.4	RB highlighted the desire for greenspaces, hedgerows, and street trees.		
3.5	RB raised the issue of density - Discussions took place.		
3.6	BQ made the point that affordable housing must be integrated within the development and not be obvious to the general public.		
3.7	BQ also talked about security risks (such as theft). Cycle shelters should be well designed, as there were problems in Ravenswood with cycles being stolen from shelters.		
3.8	The group highlighted to desire to not have bland architecture, as seen on some of the developments visited.		
3.9	CJ called for small shops to have a strong visible presence.		
3.10	FL stated she would separately circulate a copy of the summary of feedback for the visits to Milton Keynes and Cambourne (with some photos provided by SQ and Mike Gregory) to the group. Photographs of Ravenswood were circulated at the meeting.	FL/SQ	
4.0	Update on progress on the Issues and Options Report and draft arrangements for public consultation in January/ February 2013		
4.1	PS confirmed most venues with dates and times had been secured for the public exhibitions (Colchester Road Baptist Church was still to be booked). This information would also be advertised in the Angle newspaper and be available on the website. A copy of the schedule would be emailed to the group once finalised.	PS/FB	Attachment
4.2	SM will attend both the North-East and North-West Area Committees to give an update on the Northern Fringe. SM will report back to the group with comments.	SM	
4.3	PS informed the group that copies of the Issues &		

<p>4.4</p> <p>4.5</p>	<p>Options report and associated documents would be available to purchase for a fee at the exhibition (as this was a large document), but a summary document would also be provided free of charge.</p> <p>BR questioned whether the consultation database was up-to-date and whether agencies/local residents would be informed of the exhibition – PS outlined the proposed consultation strategy.</p> <p>A special event will also be held on the 11 January for the Community Workshop attendees.</p>		
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>5.4</p> <p>5.5</p>	<p>The IBC response to certain issues raised during the “Call for Ideas” consultation</p> <p>It was confirmed this was now available on the website.</p> <p>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'.</p> <p>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.'</p> <p>JG interjected, stating these comments to be inappropriate and unfitting.</p> <p>IBC will review jobs/population requirements in the new year as part of the core strategy review .</p>		
<p>6.0</p> <p>6.1</p>	<p>Draft minutes of the Northern Fringe Steering Group meeting 6 November</p> <p>The reduced assumed household size from 2.5 to 2.35 was noted and queried by members and residents as being on the low side. Particularly in light of what had been learned about the actual demographics at Cambourne (a large number of young families) and problems that had arisen with undersupply of school places and other facilities early</p>		

	on. It was considered that the same demographic considerations could well apply at the Northern Fringe.		
6.2	PS agreed to report back to the next panel meeting with a reasoned justification for the lower figure.	PS	
6.2	SM and PS envisaged slightly higher density in District Local Centres, but an average over the site of 35.		
6.3	AS added work on population and growth was ongoing.		
7.0	Any other Business		
7.1	BR called for Item 4.2 of the CSP meeting of 26 September wording to be amended. FB will check and amend this and upload update on the website.	FB	
7.2	BR also requested an updated hard-copy version of the Issues and Options report. SM/PS confirmed copies of the finalised report will be circulated to panel members (this is likely to be shortly after the meeting of the Executive).	FB	
8.0	Date of next meeting		
8.1	Tuesday 12 th February 2013 at 3.30pm	PS/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>	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.

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	