



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	11 th September 2012
Time	09.30
Location	Grafton House
Present	Laurence Collins(IBC) (LC) Chair Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Neil McManus (SCC)(NM) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Martin Blake(Mersea Homes) (MB) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Lawrence Revill (David Lock Associates) (LR) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Anita Seymour (IBC Planning Policy) (AS)
Apologies	Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) Dave Watson (SCC) Robert Hobbs (IBC)
Distribution	Attendees only (draft)
Minutes Agreed	11 October 2012

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting 7th August		
1.1	Agreed	All	
2.0	Matters Arising		

2.1	FOI needs to be specific item on agenda after AONB	Initials	
3.0	SPD Boundary		SPD Boundary Plan
3.1	Boundary agreed to be that shown in the Core Strategy	All	
3.2	Parcels of land relevant to the development outside SPD boundary to be separately shown, also identifying land outside IBC boundary		
4.0	Update from DLA on work programme (including update on context analysis, agency consultation)		
4.1	A full summary of agency responses would be included in the issues and options paper		
4.2	PCT consultants had requested fully serviced provision, their requirements have been questioned. For options stage a sqm requirement was being used		
4.3	A first draft of a context analysis for the SPD area had been presented to the Spatial Planning Working Group. Initial comments thereon invited by the end of this week.	x	
5.0	Report of Spatial Planning Working Group meeting 10 September		
5.1	Issues raised are covered in the agenda		
5.2	Addition information had been received on surface water constraints		
5.3	A discussion had taken place around the viability of retail provision and need to co locate community infrastructure to support retail.		
6.0	Transport Issues Options Update – Presentation		
6.1	Presentation was made to the group by ID on the Draft Technical Report circulated prior to the meeting	x	
6.2	It was agreed that the Master Plan would lead the onsite infrastructure requirements. Aspiration to apply Manual for Street design principles within the development.		
6.3	Cycle / Pedestrian access Off site cycle and pedestrian routes / constraints had been identified. Further work would progress with the Master Plan		
6.4	Buses Ipswich Buses and First Group have been supportive. It		

<p>6.5</p>	<p>was agreed that the preference would be for buses to connect to the railway station there was however, an issue over capacity on the station forecourt Two routes have been identified each accessing and egressing via Westerfield Road Manual for Street design philosophy accepted rather than traditional distributor road however, careful design detailing required controlling parking to ensure bus routes are clear from obstruction. Bus priority lanes and use of “Hurry Calls” were discussed. Availability of buses from day one was agreed to be important NM noted that incentives might be provided to encourage bus use. LR noted that phasing of services and trigger points need to be carefully considered.</p> <p>Roads UTMC system needs to be extended to all four junctions (Dale Hall Lane, Henley Road, Westerfield Road, and Tuddenham Road) the current improvements do not include Westerfield or Tuddenham Road junctions. ID was not in agreement with SCC that the access points into the development should be signalized. Traffic control should be in his view at Valley Road</p> <p>An option was to provide the infrastructure and commitment to reviewing the situation at set stages of the development with a commuted sum of money to provide signalized option if required this would provide a more flexible approach.</p> <p>FL asked if the findings were backed up with timeline of evidence. ID confirmed there were 10+ years of traffic counts for Valley Road as there was a permanent count facility between Henley and Westerfield Roads. These showed a constant traffic volume at peak times indicating the road has reached (or exceeded) theoretical capacity there had be changes in traffic patters between 6-7 am and 7-8am indicating that travel to work patterns were changing .</p> <p>It was agreed that the development needs to be as permeable as possible but not to create a rat run. For example should there be an incident on surrounding road there must be ability to exit the site from another point.</p>		
<p>6.6</p>	<p>Railway Bridge</p>		
<p>6.7</p>	<p>ID preference that the bridge was available for all traffic and no peak time restrictions placed on users</p>		
	<p>LC concluded that the group recognized the merits of the arguments presented to them but a decision cannot be made by the group at this meeting without SCC present. It was agreed that a meeting should be</p>		

	<p>arranged with ID LC SM and DW to discuss the report and merits of the proposals being put forward by ID. It was felt to be important that an agreed way forward is presented at the 26th September Community Steering Group.</p>		
7.0	<p>Option development (Including DLA scoring matrix against IBC core objectives to be produced – IBC additional option)</p>	x	
7.1	<p>Covered in Item 8</p>		
8.0	<p>Issues and options report</p>		
8.1	<p>An overview of the options was proved by JC</p>	x	
8.2	<p>All options have been developed taking into account of the six options developed at the community workshop and draft land use budget</p>		
8.3	<p>Options need to be refined to take in account surface water constraints, land availability, constraints identified at Spatial Planning Working Group. Revised options are to be made available by next week</p>	JC	
8.4	<p>The meeting agreed that three options are to be developed for the options consultation event. Including;</p> <p>Aspiration to integrate the Country Park into the development by co locating district park / center / primary school with the Country Park</p> <p>Spine road key to connect district and local centres and define the character of the area</p> <p>Looped green routes connecting Henley Road through to Tuddenham Raod, Westerfield Station. Fonnereau Way is an important part of this network</p> <p>Important to keep the visual separation between Westerfield Village and the development.</p>	JC	
8.5	<p>The correct location of the railway bridge must be shown</p>	DLA	
8.6	<p>Main access onto the site should be noted on the plans. Other access can be indicated by arrows as these are flexible at the moment depending upon Master Plan / landscape features and Safety Audit</p>		
8.7	<p>Tuddenham Road access was raised it was the aspiration of the group that this should be included in the SPD</p>		
8.8			

8.9	FL raised concern that options do not show employment land allocation (Employment land tiles were used at the workshop) JC confirmed that this would be addressed.	JC	
8.10	LC raised question about phasing and how this was to be addressed at the exhibition JC agreed to formulate and circulate options on sequence of development for discussion – she agreed that a narrative should be included in the options paper	JC x	
8.11	The draft issues and options report will be made available by 21 September	PS	
8.11	Agreed that the target was to report to Executive Committee on 6th November.		
9.0	Issues and options exhibition		
9.1	Provisional agreement that the issues and options exhibition was to run from 20 nd November to 6 th January 2013	JC	
9.2	JC to provide schedule of costs for publicity/ web design and exhibition		
9.3	AJS to coordinate exhibition	AJS	
10.0	Draft infrastructure schedule and subsequent work steam		
10.1	Discussion on the draft schedule took place and some minor revisions and amendments were suggested	SM	Schedule attached
10.2	LC Raised requirement for Sport and Leisure, PS confirmed that there were no aspirations for onsite sport center type facilities as there was adequate facilities in vicinity of the site and wider Ipswich, there was a need to ensure good pedestrian and cycle access to off site provision. Facilities for informal sport would be provided, community use of educational facilities would be encouraged		
11	Energy strategy update		
11.1	PS confirmed that two reports had been received from DLA Jonathan Galton from Climate Change Consulting has been asked to review them a response is expected by 15 September for further discussion	PS x	
12	Proposed Study Tour		
12.1	The date has been fixed for 1 st October the Community Steering Panel are aware of the date		

12.2	FL and JC are meeting on 12th to discuss programme and site visits	FL/ JC	
12.3	IBC to arrange bus and confirm attendees	SM	
13	Minutes of Community Steering Panel 21st August		
13.1	Noted		
14	Update on sustainability appraisal and retail capacity		
14.1	PS confirmed the SA had been prepared by Hyder Consulting and that, statutory consultations are underway. A report assessing the finalised options would be made available at the same time as the exhibition. A draft report has been received from NLP for IBC assessment	x	
15	Programme review		
15.1	Issues and Options report to Executive 6 November 2012 Exhibition of 3 Options mid November Establishment of Preferred Option and draft SPD Jan-March 2013 Report to Executive in March 2013 with proposed SPD Consultation on SPD May – June 2013		
16.0	AOB		
16.1	PS requested that a tree survey to BS standard should be carried out by developers to inform the options and later planning applications	NP/MB	
16.2	Reports covering Ipswich School land to be provided to IBC	PS	
17	FOI		

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
--	------------------------------------	----------------------------------



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.

1. That is personal data	
2. Provided in confidence	
3. Intended for future publication	x
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	x
8. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety	
9. That is subject to legal privilege	
10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests	x
11. That may not be disclosed by law	
12. Other Please describe	