



# IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Community Steering Panel
<b>Date</b>	26 September 2012
<b>Time</b>	15.30
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House
<b>Present</b>	Councillor Carole Jones Chair (CJ) John Norman Vice Chair (Ipswich Society) (JN) Councillor Tracy Grant (IBC) (TG) Councillor Peter Gardiner (IBC) (PG) Barry Reeve (W) substitute for Peter Miller (Westerfield Parish Council) (BR) Barbara Robinson (Save Our Country Spaces) (BR) Councillor David Goldsmith (IBC) (DG) Rod Brooks (Northern Fringe Protection Group) (RB) Anita Seymour (IBC) (AS) Phil Sweet (IBC) (PS) Steve Miller (IBC) (SM) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) Penny Moys Air Quality Manager (SCC) (PM)
<b>Apologies</b>	Fionnuala Lennon (ATLAS), Steve Haines (DLA)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	26.09.2012

### Items:

		<b>Action</b>	<b>Attachments</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Minutes</b>		
1.1	Minutes of meeting on 21 <sup>st</sup> August were noted.	All	
1.2	Matters Arising.		
1.3	A visit to Ravenswood should be arranged for the group.		

1.4	Item 8.1 - BR asked for an early sight of the work undertaken by Suffolk Wildlife Group. The works needs to be in accordance with current EU regulations.		
1.5	BR – Asked that the extensive use of Tuddenham Road as a recreational route (e.g. horse riding) be raised in terms of safety for all users.		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes of DSG and SPWG and matters arising</b>		
2.1	DSG		
2.2	Item 6.4 – Might should read essential.		
2.3	Item 9.1 20nd replace by 20 <sup>th</sup>		
2.4	SPWG		
2.5	Item 5.3 It was agreed that main exhibition should be in the Town Hall – CJ suggested this space should be provisionally booked as soon as possible.		
2.6	Item 6.2 Aspiration should be replaced by essential.		
2.7	Item 9.2 for clarification consultation included Natural England, Environment Agency and Suffolk Wildlife Trust.		
2.8	Matters Arising.		
2.9	BR (W) Noted that the SPD Boundary included land outside the Borough.		
2.10	SM Considered it was appropriate to include the land which was under the control of the developers even if it was outside the borough – for completeness and IBC had written to Mid Suffolk and Suffolk Coastal regarding their potential for inclusion in the country park.		
2.11	The Ipswich School land outside the SPD was also relevant.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Update on retail report</b>		
3.1	PS - confirmed that IBC had received the draft Retail Assessment from Nathaniel Lichfield - the report has yet to be finalized.	PS	Extract from retail report referred to in presentation
3.2	The report takes a number of growth scenarios and looks at the implications for comparison (non food) and convenience (food) retail and how this relates to		

	<p>floor space requirements distributed over local and district centers.</p> <p>3.3 The report will form part of the evidence base for the SPD.</p> <p>3.4 JN - Questioned whether the Local Centre in Scenario one would grow into a District Centre.</p> <p>3.5 PS- Advised that the location of centres was only indicative to inform the SPD.</p> <p>3.6 BR - Asked if the retail provision formed part of the sustainable employment provision for Northern Fringe.</p> <p>3.7 PS - Confirmed that along with health, education retail would provide employment opportunities.</p> <p>3.8 BR (W) - Noted that Westerfield has a small employment area.</p> <p>3.9 CJ - Noted that the retail provision should provide for the Northern Fringe and not complete with existing provision. With smaller retail offers rather than a large anchor store.</p>		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Update on Issues and Options report and draft Options plan</b>		
4.1	PS confirmed that the draft Issues and Options report had been received. It will form the basis of the public exhibition and included three options The report will be made available as soon as possible to the group.		
4.2	<b>CJ – Asked for a special meeting to be held to discuss the report to members 9<sup>th</sup> October at 3.30pm.</b>		
4.3	JN questioned why there were only three options in the report.		
4.4	PS Advised that following the workshops three options had been prepared by DLA. A fourth option had been put together by Officers. The consultants had advised that for an exhibition three options were the ideal number so had revised the options taking into account IBC's option and comments.		
4.5	PS stressed these were only alternative possible options and that the final single preferred option was more than likely to have different elements from all		

4.6	three. CJ was very keen for the group to have an input.		
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Call for Ideas Summary Paper</b>		
5.1	The paper was circulated, members of the group were asked to read the report		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Study Tour details</b>		
6.1	Details for the tour were circulated.		
6.2	BR recommended reading 2006 lessons from Cambourne available at:- <a href="http://www.carltd.com/sites/carwebsite/files/Lessons%20from%20Cambourne%20Report.pdf">http://www.carltd.com/sites/carwebsite/files/Lessons%20from%20Cambourne%20Report.pdf</a>		
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Brett Energy report</b>		
7.1	PS Confirmed that the report was being reviewed by Jonathan Galton from Climate Change Consulting and a meeting to discuss the report with Brett Energy and the Developers would be held.		
7.2	It appeared unlikely that a District Heating System would be taken forward. More likely that the emphasis would be on zero carbon for regulated emissions (Code 5).		
7.3	PS confirmed that Building Regulations are getting tighter however they do not cover everything in the code (mainly cover emissions).		
7.4	RB Pointed out that the statistics used in the report were inaccurate there were more homes achieving certification than stated:- <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/statistics/xls/2203907.xls">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/statistics/xls/2203907.xls</a>		
7.5	SB Agreed that there was no mention of renewable heating and energy initiatives.		
7.6	PS/SB agreed with the group the report appeared weak.		
7.7	PS stated that the approach being taken elsewhere was towards improving the performance of the buildings fabric for example 'passive house' approach rather than dealing with emissions though generation of renewable energy.		
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Infrastructure update</b>		

8.1	SM – Confirmed that work was in progress and a report will be given at the next meeting.		
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Secondary School requirements</b>		
9.1	AJS presented note on Secondary Schools explaining the rise in pupils being experienced in Ipswich currently and future demand on Secondary School places without the development of Northern Fringe. SCC had confirmed that a new secondary school would be required on the development.		
9.2	BR queried multiple starts.		
9.3	SM clarified that Mersea Homes would probably service the whole site and sell off sites to different developers to build out.		
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Highways Presentation by David Watson (DW) of SCC</b>		
10.1	DW - gave a presentation to the group .He explained the Ipswich Traffic Baseline data and the impact of traffic growth on the existing highway as a result of general growth in Ipswich and the Northern Fringe development.		Presentation slides
10.2	The Transport Modeling carried out by SCC and ACOM is at a Strategic level, more detailed transport assessments would be required at planning application stage.		
10.3	The data for the model is from 2008/9, traffic volume and flows in Ipswich have changed little since this date.		
10.4	The data has been extrapolated to take account of the growth of Ipswich projected in the Core Strategy this indicates that the average traffic queues at the morning and afternoon peaks would increase.		
10.5	Detailed analysis of Travel to Work patterns has been undertaken.		
10.6	BR asked for confirmation that travel to school patterns had been included in the data.		
10.7	DW- confirmed that these were included in the model. Travel to Work was considered the most important factor the 5-6pm peak was not influenced by school related traffic.		
	DW explained that Ipswich benefits from (1) having a central focus of employment		

	(2) being a compact form with good opportunities to exploit use of walking, cycling and public transport.		
10.8	DW – Explained the ‘Travel Ipswich’ project’s aims which include more efficient traffic management (bus priority) and modal shift especially for short trips (movement from car trips to buses / bike/foot).		
10.9	The assumptions for traffic generated from Northern Fringe are over stated as they are based on the previous figure of 4500 dwellings – a lesser number of dwellings are now likely to be achieved.		
10.10	<p>ACOM have suggested actions to reduce the impact of the northern fringe on the existing road network including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing demand at source – internalizing trips to school, retail, health and recreational activities</li> <li>• Provision of frequent bus services</li> <li>• Improve cycle and pedestrian links to Ipswich Town centre etc</li> <li>• Travel Plans</li> <li>• Signalised junctions on Westerfield Road and Henley Road to restrict movement of traffic in accordance with Travel Plan</li> <li>• Restrict peak time movements over the railway bridge to buses / bike and pedestrians to prevent rat running</li> </ul> <p>The overall implication of such measures it is estimated would be to reduce traffic volumes by 20% morning peak and 16% in the evening.</p>		
10.11	PM asked if a Low Emissions Strategy was being considered for the buses SM confirmed no.		
10.12	CJ asked if there were any examples of Low Emission Strategies. PM confirmed there was. It was important that this was developed throughout the whole bus network.		Example Attached
10.13	BR asked for an update on the EU situation with respect to potential fines for air quality objective infringements in the UK. Air Quality, including particulate matter and associated health effects of great concern.		
10.14	PM responded that the UK is under threat of EU fines for non-compliance of the particulate matter objective. This is in respect of London and the fine could be passed down to the Districts and Boroughs. The Air Quality Management Areas in Ipswich are		

	<p>for nitrogen dioxide and there is currently no threat of a fine, although this could come about in the future. The Air Quality Action Plan and Ipswich 21<sup>st</sup> Century work is likely to produce a sufficiently robust defense should a fine be levied.</p>		
10.15	<p>SM- confirmed that the Sustainability Appraisal of the SPD will consider Air Quality and any planning applications would fall under the EIA regulations and Air Quality would be addressed.</p>		
10.16	<p>JN – Questioned the restricted access over the railway bridge. SM – this is still under consideration, there were other measures which can be adopted to discourage ‘rat running’.</p>		
10.17	<p>DG asked how many buses were proposed DW responded 6 / hour would provide a frequent enough service to discourage car use.</p>		
10.18	<p>BR (W) Asked if effects of increased traffic on the rural roads connecting through Westerfield had been taken into account. A recent survey had counted 4000 vehicles using Westerfield / day, 400 to 500/hour at peak times, the infrastructure was not there to cope with this volume of traffic, Lower Road and Church Lane were unclassified with no footpaths / lighting with passing places. The increase in rail traffic will increase delays at Westerfield level crossing for vehicles. Can the traffic modeling please take account of the impact of Northern Fringe on Westerfield i.e. N to S/ E to W traffic movements?</p>		
10.19	<p>CJ asked if highway improvements in Westerfield can be included in the infrastructure requirements. SM responded that if Westerfield Parish Council wishes to identify highway improvements to be included in the SPD please submit them in writing.</p>		
10.20	<p>DW confirmed that discussions with Network Rail are ongoing regarding the Westerfield level crossing. A bridge option was not feasible. The level crossing is not linked to the Traffic Management System.</p>		
10.21	<p>RB (W) observed that there appears to be an impasse between SCC/ ACOMs view on traffic management and the developers / Vectos. SM – confirmed that discussions are ongoing a meeting between all parties will take place shortly and the outcome will be reported back to the group.</p>		
10.22	<p>RB Noted that the traffic model assumed that a similar % of employment opportunities would be</p>		

	<p>available in the town center in the future but recent growth in employment opportunities have been to the east and west of the town will the model be updated to include this data. DW confirmed that the model included growth identified by IBC and East of England Regional Plan.</p>		
10.23	<p>JN asked what the speed limit would be in the development and whether there would be a parking strategy – particular concern for buses being able to negotiate the roads. SM confirmed that the design speed would be 20mph which may include Westerfield Road. Parking Strategies would be part of detailed planning.</p>		
10.24	<p>RB asked for clarification on the Tuddenham Road access. DW – ACOM has shown the access as potential, its exact location had not been confirmed and would be subject to a safety audit. SM Ownership issues have to be resolved to use Redhouse Farm access. There was a possibility of a pedestrian and cycle access but this would be subject to agreement.</p>		
10.25	<p><b>CJ Asked that group is updated on Traffic Issues at next meeting</b></p>		
<b>11.0</b>	<p><b>AOB</b></p>		
11.1	<p>BR Requested a session on drainage</p>	<p>Denis Cooper to be invited to next meeting</p>	
11.2	<p>BR (W) Asked that the exhibition included impact on existing communities.</p>		
11.3	<p>BR Ipswich Policy Area work - Haven Gateway and Astral Park Feed should be fed into the SPD.</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/>



**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.

These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
1. That is <b>personal data</b>	
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	