



# IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	18 March 2013
<b>Time</b>	9.30
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House
<b>Present</b>	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) John Pitchford (SCC) (JP) Laura Fitzgerald (Vectos) (LF) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Robert Hobbs (IBC Planning Policy Team Leader) (RH) Anita Seymour (IBC Planning Policy) (AS)
<b>Apologies</b>	Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) JC
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	16 April 2013

### Items:

		Action	Attachments
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting 29<sup>th</sup> January 2013</b>		
2.1	Item 2.1 The meeting with Network Rail (David Ward Regional Director) has not taken place. With PS to chase.	SM/ PS	

2.2	Item 5.4 AO confirmed that comment should read 'agreed would be helpful to undertake a high level viability test'.		
2.3	Item 8 RH confirmed the Authority Monitoring Report is with Members for agreement to publish. An Employment and Housing need paper is being prepared for June.		
2.4	Item 12 Energy Strategy has taken place. A note has been circulated for comment. SC confirmed they would be providing feedback.		
2.5	<b>Action – Agenda Item for next meeting.</b>		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Summary of consultation responses</b>		
3.1	AJS confirmed some responses are outstanding once these had been finalised the report will be placed on the web	AJS	
3.2	Responses received were in line with outcomes of discussions which had taken place at the exhibitions. Key concerns were: transport; distribution of open space; flooding; and infrastructure.		
3.3	Most respondents accepted the development would happen but were concerned about how it would look and be delivered.		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Suffolk County Council Response</b>		Attached
4.1	The formal response was circulated.		
4.2	JP highlighted the recommendations. The main issues being: making maximum use of brownfield sites; need to minimise traffic flows from the site and encouraging sustainable means of transport; and collaborative working		
4.3	The County welcomed the inclusion of education facilities as outlined.		
4.4	General discussion took place on SCC approach to transport issues.		
4.5	SC asked if SCC had moved away from their position at the Core Strategy stage.		
4.6	DW No – work still required to assess impacts of the development.		
4.7	JP The importance of minimising traffic flows and encouraging sustainable means of travel was very important to Members.		

4.8	FL asked about Para 20 – road bridge to replace level crossing.	DW	
4.9	JP Concern had been expressed regarding safety of level crossing due to increase in rail traffic and proposed NF development. Aspiration to close level crossings.		
4.10	DW Feasibility work to be undertaken.		
4.11	<b>Action – DW to feed back timescale / update on progress next meeting.</b>		
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Transport Issues – Need to agree <u>principle</u> of commissioning further work in light of consultation responses. Scope and content of the work to be confirmed subsequently. Consider reconvening Transport Working Group.</b>		
5.1	A general discussion took place.  It was agreed that the impact of traffic from the development on surrounding roads and communities was a key concern reflected in the responses made to the Issues and Options Report. How traffic would be managed and sustainable means of transport encouraged need to be better understood.		
5.2	ML Questioned what would be the benefit to the final outcome if extra work was undertaken now .		
5.3	SC Additional work was not required at this stage. The approach was set out in the Core Strategy. Further analysis would come at later stages of the planning process and the SPD should not be prescriptive.		
5.4	DW confirmed that the level of analysis undertaken at this stage was appropriate.		
5.5	AO It was difficult to do more detailed work at this stage as options/sequencing of the development were open and flexibility was required to allow different approaches to be considered.		
5.6	RH It was important to draw all existing transport information together in one paper for clarification. <b>Transport Working Group Action date to be confirmed.</b>	RH	
5.7	DW IBC and SCC need to meet to discuss transport issues further. <b>Action – Meeting to be arranged week commencing 8<sup>th</sup> April.</b>	RH	


5.8	JP Asked if there was clarification as to the approach that the developers would be taking regarding the planning process for example one overarching outline application or a series of applications.		
5.9	SC Confirmed that a decision had not been taken, options were still open.		
5.10	AO The SPD needed to be flexible to allow for different approaches and take account of future developments.		
5.11	JP Questioned whether there was a need for a site wide Transport Assessment to assess cumulative impact. If individual TA's were submitted for each development wouldn't it be difficult to assess robustly traffic impacts?		
5.12	PW The time scale of the project will impact on outcomes as would developments outside the NF.		
5.13	JP Felt that at the SPD stage reassurance would be needed that traffic impacts can be mitigated.		
5.14	FL The SPD would set out high level information on transport mitigation.		
5.15	AO It may be helpful to set out what information would be required at each stage of the planning process to provide clarification.		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Methodology and stages for development of preferred spatial option</b>		
6.1	RH confirmed that PS had spoken to DLA and this was in hand.		
6.2	FL There was a need for the selection process to be robust.		
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Viability work (presentation from Stuart Cock)</b>	x	
7.1	SC circulated a high level viability spreadsheet prepared by Mersea Homes and Crest. He explained the assumptions which had been made, and how changing these assumptions would change the final figure.		
7.2	A general discussion took place.		
7.3	RH confirmed that Peter Brett Associates (PBA) had been appointed to assess viability.		
7.4	FL A strategic level discussion was needed on infrastructure.		
7.5	SC Important that expectations were not raised.		

7.6	ML Agreed that once PBA had analysed the information it was important for the results to be discussed at Steering Group and at Corporate level.  <b>Action Item on next Agenda</b>		
<b>8.0</b>	<b>Phasing and infrastructure delivery</b>		
8.1	FL SPD needs to provide a balance between certainty and flexibility.		
8.2	SC The SPD should be consistent with policy.		
8.3	FL Policy states that the SPD should identify the infrastructure that the development will need to deliver on a comprehensive basis alongside new housing.		
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Potential LIF bid</b>		
9.1	It was agreed that the timescales prescribed in the bid document couldn't be met. However it would be useful to submit an expression of interest to alert the Government to the NF development.		
9.2	<b>Action FL and RH to put together a draft letter for submission. To be circulated for comments asap.</b>	FL/ RH	
<b>10.0</b>	<b>Review of available land area within the SPD area</b>		
10.1	AO This was highly detailed for this stage. Certainty on areas will come forward as the option progresses		
10.2	SC The area included in the SPD boundary has been correctly measured		
10.3	SC noted that the key was incorrect		
10.4	<b>Action – RH to amend.</b>	RH	
10.5	<b>Action – Agenda Item for Spatial Working Group.</b>		
<b>11.0</b>	<b>NLP Retail Report (This report has now been finalised and will be available on the website for viewing and downloading - this will not be circulated with the agenda due to size)</b>		
11.1	Noted for information.		
11.2	Available at:- <a href="http://www.ipswich.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=1594&amp;fileID=4726">http://www.ipswich.gov.uk/site/scripts/download_info.php?downloadID=1594&amp;fileID=4726</a>		

<b>12.0</b>	<b>SUDS update from Denis Cooper</b>		
12.1	DC provided an update on work undertaken to date and confirmed that a Proposal for the Simple Model was nearly agreed. The work would take approximately six weeks.		
12.2	<b>Action – DC to circulate Proposal when signed off.</b>	DC	
12.3	AO Would each landholding cover mitigation for their own surface water?		
12.4	DC Not entirely they would be need to share responsibility at the end points of the system.		
12.5	AO Was it clear as to what was causing the existing flooding problems in Westerfield?		
12.6	DC No there are a number of related issues, the water system needs to be modelled.		
12.7	FL asked if the results would be available in time to feed into the SPD.		
12.8	DC confirmed work would take six weeks to complete.		
<b>13.0</b>	<b>Review of project timetable</b>		
13.1	RH Confirmed work was on schedule at the moment and IBC are working to the published timetable.		
13.2	AO suggested that more information required on the timetable for example key information stages and committee dates.		
13.3	JP Asked if the viability work would be available in time to inform the process.		
13.4	RH Work could be turned round quickly.		
13.5	ML A more detailed project timetable was required.		
13.6	<b>Action – RH to discuss with SM.</b>	RH/SM	
<b>14.0</b>	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b>		
14.1	Item 7		
<b>15.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>		
15.1	SC Asked if any further action was required from him on the Tuddenham Road planning application. RH confirmed no.		

<b>16.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>		
16.1	16 <sup>th</sup> April at 9:30 – 12:00.		

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><b>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</b></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 <b>personal data</b>	
	2. Provided in <b>confidence</b>	x
	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>	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 Item 7 Consultants Viability information</b>	x
	11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>	
12. <b>Other</b> Please describe		