



# IPSWICH

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

# Minutes

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Meeting</b>        | Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel  |
| <b>Date</b>           | 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2012  |
| <b>Time</b>           | 15:30   |
| <b>Location</b>       | Grafton House (Orwell Room)   |
| <b>Present</b>        | Councillor Carole Jones Chair (CJ) – IBC<br>John Norman Vice Chair (JN) - Ipswich Society<br>Steve Miller (SM) – IBC<br>Fionnuala Lennon (FL) – ATLAS<br>Councillor Bill Quinton – (BQ) IBC<br>Councillor Inga Lockington (DG) - IBC<br>Councillor David Goldsmith (DG) – IBC<br>Councillor Tracy Grant (TG) – IBC<br>Councillor Christopher Stewart (CS)-IBC<br>Peter Miller (PM) - Westerfield Parish Council<br>Stewart Quantrill (SQ) substitute for Rod Brooks - Northern Fringe Protection Group<br>Barbara Robinson (BR) – Save Our Country Spaces<br>Anita Kittle (AK) substitute for Felicia Blake (FB)– IBC (minutes) |
| <b>Apologies</b>      | Councillor Peter Gardiner – IBC, Phil Sweet (IBC)   |
| <b>Distribution</b>   | Attendees   |
| <b>Minutes Agreed</b> | 26 September 2012   |

### Items:

|            |                                     | Action | Attachments |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------|
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>Minutes</b>                      |        |             |
| 1.1        | 3.12 Change 'haven' to 'having'.    | FB     |             |
| 1.2        | Ensure correct spelling of Stewart. | FB     |             |

|            |  |    |  |
|------------|--|----|--|
|            |  |    |  |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>Matters Arising</b>   |    |  |
| 2.1        | 3.3 and 3.9 It was agreed that timescales were important. BR queried which neighboring authorities had been consulted.   |    |  |
| 2.2        | SM advised that letters had gone to interested parties, Suffolk Coastal, Mid Suffolk though no response had been received. They would continue to be consulted.  |    |  |
| 2.3        | SM advised that the minutes of the meetings would be put on the website over the next few days.  | FB |  |
| 2.4        | It was confirmed that the Transport Group referred to was the Transport Working Group set up for the Northern fringe meetings. Further minutes are to note if the reference to 'Transport Working Group' refers to any group other than the Northern Fringe Transport Working Group.   |    |  |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>SPD Programme Update (Verbal update by SM)</b>  |    |  |
| 3.1        | SM advised that work is continuing. The first Planning for Real event has taken place and a second Planning for Real will take place in October though the location of the event is to be decided. Options will be produced at this meeting. An Exhibition will take place with the Development Steering Group to determine the approach to Phasing Viability and Infrastructure delivery in October 2012. |    |  |
| 3.2        | Location of exhibition is considered important with a main exhibition at the Town Hall and other smaller exhibitions. It was proposed smaller exhibitions could be provided at the libraries and Tuddenham and Westerfield Village Halls though this would depend on the programme proposed.   |    |  |
| 3.3        | It was proposed that all experts should attend at the one larger exhibition.   |    |  |
| 3.4        | Concern was raised over the environmental assessment of the proposals. Options need to be viable before the options are consulted upon. Suffolk Wildlife Trust and Transition Ipswich would need to see proposals and feed into the production of the SPD before it is finalised.  |    |  |
| 3.5        | The exhibition should ask for feedback on which part of which option is acceptable or not, not just which option is preferred.   |    |  |
|            | Transport studies need feeding into the programme. SM  |    |  |

|            |  |       |  |
|------------|--|-------|--|
| 3.6        | advised that a definitive programme is expected by 11/9/12 which will be reported to the Community Steering Panel. Concern was raised that the transport studies would be based on out of date information which were undertaken in school holiday periods. It has been minuted that the transport group have an issue with AECOM figures. BR suggested that the A14 study should be referenced. |       |  |
| 3.7        | It was agreed that an Ipswich Transport representative be appointed onto the Transport Group and that the data must include September road data.   | PS/SM |  |
| 3.8        | Concern that schools had not been consulted and that young people needed to have an input  |       |  |
| 3.9        | SM advised that a Transport report would be produced for meeting of the next Community Steering Panel.   | SM    |  |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Presentation by Finnouala Lennon of Atlas on 'What Makes a Good Place' followed by group discussion</b>   |       |  |
| 4.1        | FL advised that other presentation slides would be made available.   | FL/FB |  |
| 4.2        | A general discussion concerning the merits of Lightmoor Urban Village, Hampton Peterborough and Cambourne. Agreed that size of supermarket needed to be established, Cambridge was not a good comparison with Ipswich. Urban extensions should only be considered as a comparison.   |       |  |
| 4.3        | Integration is important with plenty of informal meeting places.   |       |  |
| 4.4        | Bus services must be available from first day  |       |  |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Vision and Core Objectives Document</b>   |       |  |
| 5.1        | There should be an emphasis on reducing water use, and greenspace. The Country Park provision is for 30 ha, with additional 30ha interspersed as greenspace. All houses are to have a garden in accordance with the Core Strategy Policy. There needs to be an emphasis on the quality of the soil for landscaping. Vision to be redrafted to incorporate this.                                  | PS    |  |
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Report of Master Planning Workshop</b>  |       |  |
| 6.1        | BQ advised that reference should be made on page 3 to  | PS    |  |

|            |   |    |  |
|------------|---|----|--|
|            | creating a brand new community. Report to be altered to reflect this. New and existing residents need consulting. TG agreed. BR suggested a center for rural crafts to reflect the agricultural environs.   |    |  |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>Study Tour</b>   |    |  |
| 7.1        | October 1 <sup>st</sup> agreed. FL to seek comments from panel members on what interests the panel and what they would like to see in the development then consult with David Lock Associates on study location. 2 sites planned for visit such as Upton and Hampton. Ravenswood to be a separate meeting   | FL |  |
| <b>8.0</b> | <b>Minutes of Spatial Planning Working Group meeting of 31<sup>st</sup> July, Steering Group Meeting 7<sup>th</sup> August, Transport Working Group 1<sup>st</sup> August</b>   |    |  |
| 8.1        | <u>Spatial Planning Working Group</u><br>Evaluation criteria at top of p.2 is essential. IL advised on importance of wildlife. BR advised little work done in Ipswich area by Suffolk Wildlife trust but a lot done over Suffolk. Need to recognize dearth of material CJ requested details of date of Phase One Habitat Survey.  | PS |  |
| 8.2        | JN didn't understand p4 Item 1; SM explained photograph and CJ requested clarification of boundary for next meeting.  | SM |  |
| 8.3        | <u>Transport Working Group</u><br>CJ requested transport representative from IBC to attend meeting.   | PS |  |
| 8.4        | SM confirmed that development is not likely to be more than 4000 dwellings.   |    |  |
| 8.5        | BR advised there are serious concerns about safety issues, especially on Tuddenham Road given its agricultural nature. Need to know how these will be addressed.  |    |  |
| 8.6        | JN commented that assumptions are being made about traffic signals being installed.   |    |  |
| 8.7        | CJ requested presentation on traffic issues which will be debated at next meeting. Presentation to address serious concerns about safety issues particularly on Tuddenham Road between bridges, that it is an agricultural road with limited visibility, traffic signal issues, entry and access points proposed location and number, 20mph speed limit and does this really work, must have a map with recreational routes for cyclist, walkers, joggers, horse riders and deal with level crossing problems and solutions. SM to approach Transport department to prepare and present presentation. | SM |  |

|            |   |       |  |
|------------|---|-------|--|
| 8.8        | <u>Development Steering Group</u><br>CJ requested that Suffolk Coastal are written to about Country Park before next meeting (26 Sept) and queried why this development would be exempt from Community Infrastructure Levy. SM advised that S106 may be better to deliver the infrastructure, but a decision on which charge is most appropriate is still being considered. | SM/PS |  |
| <b>9.0</b> | <b>AOB</b>  |       |  |
| 9.1        | BR advised that the Council must recognize its obligations under the Statement of Community Involvement until it is reviewed.   |       |  |
| 9.2        | CJ advised would discuss this further outside of this panel as this was not the appropriate forum.  |       |  |
| 9.3        | SQ advised Ipswich School have bought Sports Club Rushmere and was there any further news on this. SM confirmed that there was none.  |       |  |
| 9.4        | CJ advised Study Tour 1 <sup>st</sup> October.<br>Ravenswood Meeting date would be confirmed at the next meeting.   |       |  |
| 9.5        | Barry Reeve will deputise for Peter Miller at the next meeting.   |       |  |
|            | <b>Date of next meeting</b><br>SM confirmed dates of next panel meetings-26 September<br>3.30 Orwell Room Grafton House<br><br>25 October Room 3b Grafton House<br><br>20 November  |       |  |

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 <b>personal data</b>    |                                  |



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 <b>confidence</b>  |  |
| 3. Intended for <b>future publication</b>                                     |  |
| 4. Related to <b>criminal proceedings</b>                                     |  |
| 5. That might prejudice <b>law enforcement</b>                                |  |
| 6. That might prejudice ongoing <b>external audit</b> investigations          |  |
| 7. That could prejudice the <b>conduct of public affairs</b>                  |  |
| 8. Information that could endanger an individual's <b>health &amp; safety</b> |  |
| 9. That is subject to <b>legal privilege</b>                                  |  |
| 10. That is prejudicial to <b>commercial interests</b>                        |  |
| 11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>                                   |  |
| 12. <b>Other</b> Please describe  |  |