



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
Date	25 October 2012
Time	15.30
Location	Grafton House
Present	John Norman Vice Chair (Ipswich Society) (JN) Councillor Tracy Grant (IBC) (TG) Councillor Peter Gardiner (IBC) (PG) Councillor Inga Lockington (IBC) (IL) Councillor Bill Quinton (IBC) (BQ) Sean Salter (IBC) (SS) Sarah Barker (IBC) (SB) Barry Reeve (Westerfield Parish Council) (BREVE) Peter Miller (Westerfield Parish Council) (PM) Barbara Robinson (Save Our Country Spaces) (BR) Councillor David Goldsmith (IBC) (DG) Rod Brooks (Northern Fringe Protection Group) (RB) Steve Miller (IBC) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC) (PS) Fionnuala Lennon (ATLAS) (FL) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO) Anita Kittle (IBC) (AK) Minutes
Apologies	Councillor Carole Jones
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	20 November 2012

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of previous meeting and matters arising		
1.1	Minutes of meeting on 26 September were commented on amended as follows.		

1.2	Item 2.5 BR advised exhibition timing would need revisiting. Public holidays need taking into account. SM responded this was being reconsidered.	SM	
1.3	Item 4.2 BR noted that the date for the special meeting had previously been agreed for 9 October 2012. This was noted and the reasons for the changes are explained.		
1.4	Item 9.3 BR not sure about multiple sites and queried if different starts were proposed on different sites.		
1.5	SM responded that multiple starts may be permitted within a given phase but not between phases.		
1.6	Item 11.1 RB to be changed to BR.	FB	
1.7	Concern was raised over traffic data and it was confirmed that some additional traffic data/surveys were being carried out by VECTOS.		
1.8	Item 10.7 IL queried if there are other centres of employment which were being incorporated in traffic modelling.		
1.9	JN confirmed that Dave Watson had advised that the major focus of employment was in the town centre.		
1.10	Item 10.10 IL queried what sort of bridge was referred to.		
1.11	JN confirmed a new road bridge. There is an on-going debate whether this is a 24/7 bridge or for buses and cycles only during peak periods.		
1.12	There was some general concern that specific responses to the "call for ideas" (as opposed to the summary) had not yet been finalised and were not yet on the website.		
1.13	It was confirmed that a response had been compiled and circulated in mid-September but that some further comment had been requested and a further response would be finalised as soon as possible and placed on the website.	PS/SM	
1.14	JN confirmed discussion on responses once finalised could be a future agenda item.	PS/SM	
1.15	SB advised that Hyder were doing a Sustainability Appraisal of the Options prior to their report to the Executive Committee.		
1.16	Item 3.9- JN advised that the scale and format of retail provision requires further discussion.		
1.17	4.4- RB commented that public open space standards		


	should not be compromised in developing options. SM responded that the Core Strategy requirements for open space as set out in Appendix 6 would generally be met.		
1.18	GENERAL COMMENT BR stated that not all minutes of all meeting appeared to be on the website.		
1.19	It was agreed that a check would be made to ensure that all finalised (as opposed to draft) minutes were in place.	IBC/FB	
2.0	Presentation of Issues and Options Report		
2.1	A presentation was given by Arwel Owen from David Lock Associates on the various Options. This was essentially a preview for the benefit of the Panel and not formal consultation at this stage. It was emphasised that the options being presented were close to finalisation but they remained "work in progress" and that further revisions would be incorporated between now and consideration by the Council's Executive.		
3.0	Discussion of Issues and Options Report		
3.1	Fionnuala Lennon invited comments on the Issues and Options report and recorded these on a flip chart (to be circulated to all Panel members.)	FL/IBC	
3.2	Concern was expressed by some that group members were not being given sufficient time to respond. It was agreed that individual comments could be submitted up to and including Friday 2 November but it was hoped that any substantive comments could be received at the meeting.	ALL	
3.3	Concern was expressed about the accuracy of the tree survey information and associated TPOs. DLA stated that this was a presentational issue rather than anything more substantive and there was no question about the principle of retaining important trees wherever possible. SM undertook to look into reviewing the TPO coverage of the site at an appropriate time.	IBC	
3.4	An issue about the possible presence of great crested newts in off-site locations (within 500M) was raised by BR. AO stated that this was not really an issue for this Issues and Options Stage and would receive full coverage at the planning application stage.		
3.5	The absence of sufficient information on the key issue of transport in the draft report was highlighted. This was acknowledged by IBC and DLA and a further insertion was planned. It was emphasised that there was no disagreement between Suffolk CC and the transport	DLA	

	consultants Vectos on matters of principle only detail.		
3.6	It was argued by RB and BR that updated data was required on transport. SM stated that an update was being undertaken by Vectos rather than a full survey. It is accepted that certain parts of the network are at or close to capacity at certain times; the challenge is to manage any additional traffic appropriately to mitigate impact. BR said that any impact on villages outside of Ipswich needs to be assessed.		
3.7	RB questioned whether an assumed average net density of 35dph could deliver the garden city character for the development aspired to. He noted that the report acknowledged this and also that the adopted Core Strategy permitted a reduction below 35dph where special circumstances dictate. He asked that consideration be given to reducing target density in the interests of achieving an appropriate character for the development.	IBC/DLA	
3.8	BR expressed a view that at present the report was deficient in terms of several aspects of the evidence base including, surveys of topography, archaeology, habitats and biodiversity and the local list.		
3.9	RB asked that the option of locating the proposed secondary school shown in an earlier option to the west of Westerfield Road be reconsidered.		
3.10	BREVE requested on behalf of Westerfield PC that further consideration be given to off-site drainage as an issue particularly with regard to Lower Road. The drainage plan included in the current draft of the report would alarm local residents.		
3.11	RB requested more detail on cycle-ways and walking routes. A suggestion that underpasses under Westerfield Road should be given consideration was made.		
3.12	BR asserted that the currently available demographic information and latest statistics need to be revisited and linked to the Core Strategy review. She considered that the document does not acknowledge that the CS review may reduce or slow requirements for new housing at the Northern Fringe.		
3.13	BR requested paper copies of the final Issues and Options Report (December) to be provided.		
4.0	Format and dates of upcoming consultation events		
4.1	BR requested that a public meeting at Northgate be included in the public consultation arrangements for the Issues and options stage. SM indicated that a public		

	meeting was unlikely to be helpful at this stage and that the Council was unlikely to agree to one, but that any request should be routed through Councillors. The exhibition and web-site would provide better opportunities to channel constructive comment on the SPD.		
5.0	Review of timetable for producing the SPD		
5.1	An updated timetable for the preparation of the SPD was circulated.		Attachment
6.0	Minutes of other meetings		
6.1	Minutes of NF Development Steering Group 11 October - noted.		Attachment
6.2	Minutes of NF Spatial Planning Working Group 02 October		Attachment
6.3	4.4- RB commented that public open space standards should not be compromised in developing options. SM responded that the Core Strategy requirements for open space as set out in Appendix 6 would generally be met.		
7.0	AOB		
7.1	It was requested that the next meeting of the Panel include agenda items on retail provision and drainage.	PS	
7.2	Environment Agency to be invited to attend.	PS/FB	
7.3	Feedback for the site visits (including Ravenswood TBA) was still outstanding.		
8.0	Date of next meeting		
8.1	This was confirmed for the 20 November 2012 at 15:30		

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/>

Please indicate opposite	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	

<p>any</p>  <p>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>	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	