

## **Ipswich Northern Fringe Meeting**

Notes of the meeting which took place on Tuesday 12 June 2012

### Present:

Laurence Collins – IBC (Chair)  
Phil Sweet - IBC  
Steve Miller – IBC  
Denis Cooper – IBC  
Neil McManus – SCC  
Iain Maxwell – SCC  
Fionnuala Lennon – ATLAS  
Kevin Wilcox – Crest Nicholson  
Nicholle Phillips – Crest Nicholson  
Paul Wranek – Ipswich School  
Stuart Cock – Mersea Homes & CBRE Investors  
Martin Blake – Mersea Homes  
Arwel Owen – DLA

### Apologies:

None

### **Action**

Introductions were made, welcoming Fionnuala Lennon to the meeting. She had been invited by IBC to attend and will identify areas where ATLAS may be able to assist the Borough in the SPD process.

#### 1. Notes of last meeting and issues arising

The notes of the last meeting were agreed.

Actions from the last meeting were reviewed:

Action 1: DLA had circulated a proposed SPD boundary which was discussed. The relationship of the boundary to the Core Strategy was discussed. IBC to take internal legal advice to ensure boundary is consistent with Core Strategy.

Action 3: There had been press coverage of views expressed by both MPs with IBC likely to formally respond to the points raised.

Action 4: IBC continue to consider whether S106 or CIL would be the most effective way of delivering infrastructure in the northern fringe. Any landowner views would be welcomed.

Action 6: the draft Vision was discussed and agreed as a basis for moving forward, recognising that some areas may be tested during evolution of the SPD.

Action 8: the notes of the transport group were noted.

Action 9: AO confirmed that the landowners would not commission consultants in relation to drainage issues, given Denis Cooper's

involvement in the SG. It was agreed that DC would be invited to attend the next Spatial Planning Working Group.	<b>Action</b>
<b>Action 1: IBC to seek and circulate legal advice on extent of SPD boundary.</b>	<b>SM</b>
<b>Action 2: IBC to consider position in respect of S106/CIL</b>	<b>PS/SM</b>
<b><u>Action 3: DC to be invited to next SPWG</u></b>	<b>DLA</b>

## 2. Management of SPD process

A draft paper was tabled by SM which identified the scope and role of the constituent parts of the SPD process. It was agreed that changes be made to the note to reflect the role and influence of the Community Liaison Group.

**Action 4: SM to update SPD Management note** **SM**

## 3. Feedback from working group meetings

### (i) Spatial Planning Working Group (SPWG)

The notes of the SPWG meeting on 22 May were discussed. Progress on community engagement was noted including the arranged agency briefing sessions (on 21 June) and workshop (on 21 July). Further information is expected from DLA to be reported to the next SG meeting on 3 July.

The scope of the SPD was discussed, informed by a draft note tabled by PS (ref: NF/CORE OUTPUTS 060612). The scope was agreed, recognising that the appropriate level of detail would emerge as the SPD is advanced. It was noted that IBC continue to seek early clarity and agreement on the scope and content of the SPD to ensure a common understanding of the document being produced. .

The need for Sustainability Appraisal of the SPD was discussed. It was agreed that IBC would consider further.

The draft Development Components note was discussed. It was commented by SC and NP that the schedule could only represent a target to be sought, and that only some elements were policy requirements. It was argued that the requirements could not be considered fixed and that master planning would determine the final land use budget. IBC reserved its position in this regard.

The draft Green Infrastructure note was discussed and the broad principles agreed.

Visits to comparable developments were discussed, recognising that more recent developments would not provide reasonable density comparators.

**Action 5: DLA to report details of consultation events at next SG.** **Action  
DLA**

(ii) Transport Working Group (TWG)

The notes of the meeting and briefing note provided by Vectos were discussed. It was noted that there were key decisions required in upcoming meetings, notably in relation to the form of site access, the access characteristics of a new rail crossing, and the principle of whether movement through the site would be encouraged/ accommodated. Recognising that there were divergent views between parties, it was recommended that the TWG seek to agree broad principles/objectives against which more detailed solutions could be tested in due course. [Post Meeting Note: Since the meeting SM spoke to Vectos who confirmed they would present to next SG meeting a critical evaluation of the options in this regard]

**Action 6: the actions from the SPWG were reaffirmed.** **SPWG**

**Action 7: the actions from the TWG were reaffirmed.** **TWG**

**Action 8: the TWG were requested to progress with principles to deal with the main areas of discussion as a step towards identifying specific solutions.** **TWG**

**[POST MEETING: Action 9: Vectos to present transport options to next SG]** **ID**

#### 4. Community Engagement

(i) Stakeholder engagement

The draft Community Engagement Strategy was agreed.

It was agreed that requests for interests groups to attend Steering Group meetings would be declined. It was noted that SOCS and NFPG would be invited to attend sessions at the briefing meeting on 21 June.

IBC confirmed that they were processing the FoI request submitted by SOCS but were concerned that the request was not focused and that it would demand considerable time to provide a full response.

It was noted that there was a possibility that further FoI requests might be made and that any commercial and/or financially sensitive information should be marked as such.

(ii) Update on activity of MPs

IBC would not now be seeking to meet Dr Dan Poulter. A formal response to the points raised by the MP's in the press would be made by IBC.

## Action

### (iii) Response to consultation

It was noted that the 'Top 10' responses received could form the basis of the briefing sessions with those groups, and could feed into the engagement workshop.

### 5. Actions required

No additional actions were identified.

### 6. Forward work programme

A review was requested of the timetable previously circulated by SM.

### **Action 10: SM to update programme**

**SM**

### 8. Any other business

No other business was raised.

### 8. Date of next meetings

The agenda was corrected, with the next meetings confirmed as:

- 3 July
- 7 August
- 11 September
- 11 October 6 November
- 4 December

AO 12.06.12

DRAFT circulated: 20.06.12