



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	16 April 2013
Time	9:30
Location	Grafton House
Present	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Graeme Mateer (SCC) (GM) Mark Knighting (IBC Planning Policy) (MK) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Carlos Hone (IBC Planning Policy) (CH) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Caroline Dawson (CD) Planning Potential Robert Coles (DLA) (RC) Lawrence Revill (DLA) (LR) Jason Wakefield (IBC Drainage Engineering)
Apologies	Denis Cooper (IBC Senior Drainage Engineer), Mike Taylor (IBC Conservation Urban Design Officer), Kevin Wilcox (Crest Nicholson), Joanne Cave (DLA), Arwel Owen (DLA), Robert Hobbs (IBC Planning Policy Team Leader).
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	To be agreed

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting 18th March 2013		
1.1	SC Sought clarification RE pt 5.4. whether parking levels		

	would be part of the SPD or a summary document on future TA work.		
1.2	ML Confirmed as part of later TA.		
1.3	Action – IBC to change minute accordingly.	CH	
1.4	SC Pt 4.8. Queried IBC position on an additional Road bridge over railway?		
1.5	SM - Having met with Network Rail (NR) the additional bridge would not be dependent on the NF development, and not a requirement of the SPD.		
1.6	SC Pt 9. Asked whether the Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) bid was going ahead?		
1.7	SM - Confirmed that agreement had been sought regarding the letter, and that now it could be sent to the Homes and Communities Agency.		
1.8	SC - Pt 15.1. Queried the status of the Tuddenham Road planning application for a single house.		
1.9	SM - Confirmed the planning application house had been approved.		
1.10	SC - Showed a strip of land on the most recent Land Ownership Areas plan (03.04.13) to the east of Westerfield Road which should be within the CBRE Investors land, and a finger of land towards Tuddenham Road which should be identified as in the ownership of Red House Farm.		
1.11	PB - Also confirmed that a small 'L' shaped section of Land attributed to Ipswich School on the Land Ownership Plan was not in their ownership.		
1.12	Action - IBC To change land Ownership Plan accordingly.	PS	
2.0	Minutes of last Community Steering Panel (19 March)		
2.1	Noted. No comments from the group.		
3.0	Update on meeting with Network Rail and Greater Anglia		
3.1	SM - Updated the group on a recent meeting with NR, who are not looking for a ransom as part of the rail bridge work, but are seeing this part of the project as an engineering / construction issue only. IBC awaiting confirmation in writing.		
3.2	No comments from the group.		

4.0	Key responses to Issues and Options consultation		
4.1	PS - Gave a summary of the key issues being raised from the public consultation process.		
4.2	SM - Confirmed that approximately 50% of those respondents preferred Option 2 from the Issues and Options (I&O) consultation document.		
4.3	SC said he wished to have it recorded that he was disappointed at the level of response to public consultation and that this limits the weight that can be attached to such responses in his view.		
4.4	ML - Asked if the group were comfortable with Option 2.		
4.5	No objections were raised by the group. Option 2 agreed.		
5.0	NF Project Plan / timetable (revised)		
5.1	PS - It was explained that the preparation of the SPD was under significant time constraints if IBC wanted to stick to the most recent project plan timetable.		
5.2	SM - The intention is to have the full draft SPD (including viability) signed-off by the Executive Committee in June. Consequently it is important to have the Peter Brett Consultants report in the next 2 weeks to enable Council consideration, and further discussions, in time for DLA deadline for drafting further content.		
5.3	ML - Confirmation that the timetable would be assessed in two weeks. ML - Confirmation of what will go into the SPD and An aim to have an agreement on viability.	PS/SM	
6.0	Skeleton of SPD		
6.1	PS - Introduced the topics and headings for the draft SPD. With regards to the content it was felt important to have clear guidance within the SPD for how to deliver Garden Suburbs at 35dph. PS was keen to keep the document succinct, however it was also important to use, where relevant, information from the I&O report.		
6.2	ML - Asked whether the group had any issues regarding the skeleton of the SPD content.		
6.3	No objections were raised by the group to the SPD content		
7.0	Preferred Option (NF Land areas map)		

7.1	PS - Described the Councils response in spatial terms to the comments regarding Option 2 which had been received from the consultation process, including those from the Suffolk Wildlife Trust (SWT). This included a proposed shift of some 2ha of the Country Park land towards the SE of the NF area, to provide public open space near to Red House Farm / heritage trees already within the site; a shift of 1.2ha towards the centre of the site possibly for playing fields; and the retention of 0.9ha in the NW corner.		
7.2	SC - Questioned the SWT response to the I&O regarding the additional green space at Red House Farm.		
7.3	PS - Explained that the intention was to have a broad open space strategy across the entire NF site, which accommodates space for all, within the site.		
7.4	SC - Questioned the quality of the heritage trees within part of the site. A plan showing a draft assessment of the trees within the central block of land to the north of Bromeswell Road was provided.		
7.5	SM - Confirmed that the tree plan would be assessed.	PS/SM	
7.6	CD - Questioned why the secondary school playing fields would not be used to provide the requisite sports pitch provision.		
7.7	SM - To meet the requirements for meeting Sport England provision within the NF development it would be necessary to have some form of community access/use to the school playing fields.		
7.8	SM - Confirmed that the dual use of the Secondary School playing fields would be part of the SPD.	PS	
7.9	Density – IBC will use a 30-35 dph range for the SPD		
8.0	Update on Transport Strategy – Graeme Mateer		
8.1	GM - Summarised the main principles of the Transport Strategy for the SPD.		
8.2	ID - Questioned the reliability of the existing SCC AECOM data, as it had been derived from a larger development proposal. It was felt that the 'town wide basis' should fall outside of the provisions of the SPD, and it was felt that the wording should reflect a need to contribute to Travel Ipswich, rather than as currently worded within Transport Strategy Principles (TSP) that GM summarised.		
8.3	PS - The SCC work in drafting the TSP was due to There being a general concern regarding travel demand.		


8.4	ID - Principles of SCC are not in dispute, but it was considered that it was not possible to be more prescriptive within the SPD with the current SCC Highways approach.		
8.5	GM – Not requesting prescriptive detail on car use Level as part of SPD detail.		
8.6	SC - Had issue with Point 1, and felt the travel demand should be to a 'tolerable level'.		
8.7	SM - Also felt point 1 should be removed, as all the detail would be covered by the Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the Outline Planning Application.		
8.8	SC - Confirmed that he agreed on the overall strategy, but not on point 1 of the TSP.		
8.9	ML - Points 1 & 2 require revision.		
8.10	ID - Said he would draft a response to the TSP then would ask to arrange a meeting.		
8.11	SM - Requested clarification as to whether there were any working models of points 5 & 6 of the TSP (penalties for non-compliance with agreed car trip targets; and queuing within the development site should peak hour trips exceed level that can be accommodated).		
8.12	ML - Raised concern regarding point 6, and agreed that Review of the TSP is needed.		
8.13	Action. Confirmed that ID to produce comment / Chapter within 2 weeks based on the SCC TSP principles.	ID	
8.14	Action. Examples of working models of points 5 & 6 from the TSP to be provided.	GM/ SCC	
8.15	Action – since DSG, SCC have commissioned AECOM to provide further input into SPD		
9.0	Update on SUDS work		
9.1	JW - Joined the meeting and opened the discussion with the Option 2 SUDS phasing possibilities.		
9.2	SC – Thought that there had been a previous agreement that 1100 homes could be developed without needing the central SUDS route.		
9.3	ML - Asked for clarification regarding SUDS phasing capacity work.		

9.4	Action. Agreed that there should be a review of the former planning appeal work on SUDS phasing for SPD wording. DC to clarify whether CBRE land can be drained as per previous appeal proposal (i.e. not involving Crest/Fonnereau land)	DC/JW	
10.0	Viability work update		
10.1	NP - Felt that a housing mixed level was not appropriate for the final SPD, as this would be dependent on the market at the time, and an updated SHLAA to be submitted with the planning application/s.		
10.2	SC - Confirmed meeting could be had with NP regarding housing mix/coverage.		
10.3	MK - Made the distinction between the SPD viability and the viability of any planning application. No further comments from the group SC - Left the meeting		
11.0	Presentation by DLA on emerging design guidance		
11.1	RC - Made a detailed PowerPoint presentation on developing and testing the Masterplan in response to the need to develop the character of the three areas. It was stated that the work had been done in response to landscape features and other constraints, and was not a detailed design. RC Confirmed that the process had resulted in a varied cross site density of between 23 – 41dph dependant on the locations proximity to the district/local centres.		
11.2	NP - Agreed that a variable density across the NF would be required, although a target was to be proposed in the SPD.		
11.3	PS - Didn't want an expectation for an exact amount of houses within the SPD.		
11.4	NP - SPD needs to be flexible given constantly changing markets.		
11.5	LR - Proposed that the DLA work be more graphic for final SPD		
11.6	SM - Confirmed that dph to be a requirement of the Outline Stage within a masterplan document.		
11.7	ML – Agreed with the group that the DLA presentation was very helpful.		
12.0	Potential INF Sequencing Options and associated		

	note		
12.1	SM - Introduced 2 separate options. The need for a sequenced approach would be guided by the Consultants report on viability. Agreed that the proposed road bridge over the railway would not be required unless/until development started on northern side of the site.		
12.2	NP - Confirmation that Option 1 phasing would only be acceptable if delivery of the bridge was required after 1000+ houses trigger point.		
12.3	SM - Stated that if multiple starts are proposed across the site then an Outline planning Application for the entire site would need to be submitted.		
12.4	NP - A phasing strategy has to be flexible as the infrastructure plan still has to be confirmed, but multiple starts could provide more up front infrastructure.		
12.5	CD - Also confirmed that she felt that multiple starts would be most logical.		
12.6	LR - The proposals could be submitted with co-ordinated outline applications, and that three could be permitted with the similar conditions.		
12.7	PS - Apps could be submitted with a developer collaboration with 1 masterplan and 1 infrastructure delivery plan at Outline stage. This detail could inform the routemap for the SPD.		
12.8	PR - Viability will have an impact on the phasing and is to be looked at once the consultants report has been received.		
13.0	Update on Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) bid		
13.1	PS - Clarified the issue of Gap Funding and the impact on large development scheme viability.		
13.2	SC - Confirmed the wording of the letter drafted by RH had been agreed. No other comments from the group.		
13.3	Action. Agreed LIF bid letter to go to HCA	RH	
14.0	AOB		
14.1	None was raised.		
15.0	FOI		
15.1	N/A		

16.0	Date of Next Meeting		
16.1	14 May 2013 at 14:00PM		

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/>

 <p>Please indicate opposite any 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>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
	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 Item 10 & 12 Consultants Viability information and phasing	x
	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
12. Other Please describe		