



# IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	4 December 2012
<b>Time</b>	09:30
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House
<b>Present</b>	<p>Laurence Collins(IBC) (LC) Chair            Anita Seymour (IBC Planning Policy) (AS)            Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS)            Neil McManus (SCC) (NM)            Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL)            Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP)            Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW)            Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes) (SC)            Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID)            Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO)            Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM)            Carol Grimsey SCC (CG)            Mark Knighting IBC (MK)            Matthew Ling (IBC) (ML)</p>
<b>Apologies</b>	Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) Martin Blake(Mersea Homes) (MB) Denis Cooper IBC
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	To be agreed

### Items:

		<b>Action</b>	<b>Attachments</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting 6<sup>th</sup> November</b>		
2.1	Agreed.		
2.2	Item 9 – Drainage Email from Denis Cooper circulated. He requested the model data for the watercourse		Email from Denis

	developed by Mersea Homes' consultants for their planning appeal - SC confirmed that Mersea Homes will forward the information.	SC	Cooper
2.3	Item 10- Retail report. SM confirmed amendments to the draft report were being considered. A report will be made to the next meeting. Headlines were – Option 2 preferred location of District Centre with small increase in floor space	SM	
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Update on Executive (27 November) and consequential finalisation of Issues and Options Report</b>		
3.1	Report was agreed.	SM	
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Report on the Transport Working Group</b>		
4.1	Minutes were agreed with inclusion of the agreed amendments to Issues and Options Transport Strategy agreed on 20 <sup>th</sup> November.		
4.2	CG passed her comments on the junction designs to ID		Attached
4.3	LC commented that it was a stated objective of the SPD to retain as many trees along Westerfield Road as possible and the separation of Westerfield Village from Ipswich. These objectives need to be taken into consideration together with SCC requirements some negotiation required	PS	
4.4	<b>Action Group agreed to debate issues raised by CG at next Transport Working Group</b>		
4.5	SC asked if the Network Rail meeting had been arranged. SM agreed to arrange	SM	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>IBC response on Sustainability design (including energy)</b>		
5.1	Report circulated with agenda presented by PS.		
5.2	Agreed that a bespoke code approach maybe appropriate for the NF.		
5.3	<b>Action Meeting to be arranged to agree strategy</b>	PS	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Phase 1 Habitat</b>		
6.1	Attachments previously circulated noted. The EIA will cover these issues in greater detail		
6.2	PS confirmed that the report will be made available on the WEB.	PS	

<b>7.0</b>	<b>Sustainability Appraisal</b>		
7.1	Completed on all three options.		
7.2	SM confirmed appraisal highlighted that additional work required on Sustainable Transport and Waste recycling.		
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Average household size</b>		
8.1	Discussion took place regarding the note provided by PS.		
8.2	SC – observed that any changes in the average household figures would have an impact and therefore needed to be considered in depth before the final option		
8.3	NM confirmed that school contributions are calculated using a figure based on a number of sources including birth-rates and PCT figures. Generally accepted that new communities could have an uplift of 30% (Cambourne effect)		
8.4	FL Need to understand the demographics of new communities.		
8.5	LC noted the need to be consistent across reports.		
8.6	<b>Action report to be prepared for next meeting</b>	PS	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Timetable and venues for public exhibition of Issues and Options</b>		
9.1	Noted.		
9.2	SC requested updated SPD timetable.		
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Star Article</b>		
10.1	Noted.		
<b>11.0</b>	<b>Draft Minutes of Community Steering Panel of 20 November</b>		
11.1	Minutes were noted.		
11.2	LC Cycle path through Christchurch Park was important. Further work would be required as to how and where this may be implemented.		
11.3	Bus routes important from day one. LC confirmed that the area is not well served and that there was potentially already pent up demand for bus services.		
11.4	It was agreed that ID presentation on Transport Issues was well received by the Community Steering Panel.		

<b>12.0</b>	<b>Low Emissions Strategy</b>		
12.1	To be deferred to next meeting.	SM	
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Infrastructure and viability</b>		
13.1	A general discussion took place on general infrastructure and viability issues.		
13.2	MK presented a paper on CIL general discussion took place.	SM	
13.3	LC confirmed that some NF infrastructure costs would be included in IBC's City Deal Bid e.g. bridge. Other sources of funding would be pursued.		
13.4	FL - Asked if developers would be happy for an 'Open book' appraisal at this stage there was agreement to this.		
13.5	SC/ NP confirmed that there was no consortium agreement in place at the moment between them but they would look towards legal agreement on delivery. IBC maybe involved.		
13.6	PW confirmed that they were not looking to develop the playing fields themselves but seek to sell on subject to value with an aim of realising enough funds to invest in school facilities.		
13.7	A delivery mechanism for affordable housing would need to be agreed. Likely that groups of 15-18 affordable houses would be developed together. This was found to be more desirable by provider and occupiers. NP confirmed that you shouldn't see the difference between different occupiers although there were some additional design requirements from affordable housing providers.		
13.8	<b>Action Agreed that an Infrastructure Group would be established to progress issue of viability and infrastructure requirements- IBC to facilitate</b>	SM	
13.9	PS/AJS/FL to review Infrastructure table and action information requirements.	PS	
<b>14.0</b>	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b>		
<b>15.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>		
15.1	NP advised that the owner over whose land the Fonnereau ROW crossed onto Lower Road had been in contact with her (SC confirmed with him too) she couldn't see a problem with this stretch being diverted over Crest Land eventually.	AJS/NM	

15.2	Action was required to sort this out AJS and NM would progress.		
<b>16.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>		
12.1	2.30pm 29th January 2013.		

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>	x
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>	x
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>	x
11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>	
12. <b>Other</b> Please describe	