



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	30 July 2013
Time	10:00
Location	Grafton House – 4C
Present	Matthew Ling – (IBC Chair) (ML) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) Mike Taylor (IBC Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Lawrence Revill (David Local Associates) (LR)
Apologies	John Pitchford
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	29 January 2014

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of last meeting - 04.06.13.		Previously circulated
1.1	SM confirmed that Network Rail have no in-principle objections to a vehicular bridge crossing, and support a bridge crossing for Fonnereau Way.		Detail attached

2.0	Draft SPD		Previously circulated
2.1	JC introduced the draft SPD and explained how the structure of the document had be formulated and laid out. It was noted that a number of comments had already been received from members of the group. Others were due to forward comments directly to DLA.		
2.2	PS/FL explained that the draft SPD had been well received by the CSP (29.07.13) but that concerns regarding deliverability and multiple starts were raised.		
2.3	The group discussion centered on the clarity of the document and whether the correct level of flexibility was included in the detail.		
2.4	The density of the final development at 30-35dph was accepted however LR felt that it would be difficult to convey this detail.		
2.5	PS reiterated that the expectation was for a 21 st Century garden suburb and that density levels lower than that of 30-35dph would be unrealistic.		
2.6	It was raised by members of the group that the consistency of the maps throughout the draft SPD needed reviewing, so that they were more consistent.		
2.7	SC felt that the phasing maps should also be looked at as they may not work (see item 3.0), and that more generic maps would allow flexibility in layout at a later date.		
2.8	JC said that the Development Framework Plan (DFP pg. 33) was the map that the others wanted to follow where there were inaccuracies.		
2.9	With regards to the school provision NM commented that whilst SC wanted flexibility with regards to the size of the schools provision, that at this point in time three primary and one senior school (with 6 th form) would be needed.		
2.10	LR felt that some of the wording required tempering so that the infrastructure provision could be based on the eventual total development.		
2.11	PS confirmed that two community centres would be needed, one within the district centre, and one as part of the visitors centre associated with the country park.		
2.12	MT asked whether the group felt that the Council's design intentions for a 21 st Century Garden Suburb came across in the document. SC felt that it was clear what expectations there were for the development. NP felt that parking courts would not be something that Crest would want included.		

2.13	The issues of parking courts were discussed in relation to SuDs, access to the primary street, and on site garages. DW had no principal objection to this type of access, but cycle routes and buses needed consideration, as did roadside swales (DC). DW also stated that 3m wide cycle routes would be a minimum standard.		
2.14	Action – SCC minimum roads/cycle/footpath widths to be forwarded to JC at DLA.	DW	
2.15	DW commented that the biggest issue with the draft SPD document in terms of highways was access from Westerfield Road (pg119). DW felt that the wording should include ‘provision should be made for signal control’, and that there might be issues if there was only a single site access prior to the railway bridge being built.		
2.16	It was considered that the Access & Movement map (fig 47 pg. 119) should have more elongated areas to show signal control areas, rather than specifying exact junctions, as road layout might change at the detailed application stage. However the principle of traffic control had been accepted.		
2.17	Action – DLA to increase size of traffic management areas on Fig 47 pg. 119.	DLA	
2.18	Action - Members of the group to forward any final comments direct to JC at DLA.	ALL	
3.0	Viability Work		
3.1	MK introduced a discussion on the viability issues, phasing and trigger points, with reference to the Peter Brett and E.C. Harris reports that had been circulated. -----		
3.2	There was a discussion about Chapter 7 of the draft SPD.		
3.3	SC questioned the evidence base for the infrastructure list, and that he felt that the figures attributed to floor areas should be removed from the final SPD.		
3.4	FL stated that the infrastructure listed would be required as part of developing the site in a sustainable way, and that they were required.		
3.5	It was felt by the group that the sequencing maps were unclear and that they would be better separated out for each individual village.		
3.6	Action - One set of sequencing maps per village, with former phase indicated in lighter tone, and one set	IBC/DLA	

	for Major Infrastructure.		
3.7	Discussion about the interdependency of major infrastructure on housing, e.g. bridge delivery sequencing.		
3.8	FL felt that IBC needed to reflect on infrastructure and viability.		
3.9	ML confirmed that IBC would review the viability reports in the light of issues that were raised at the meeting over the impacts of sequencing on SPD delivery, and the relative contents of Chapter. This would be ongoing over the next few days.		
3.10	Action – IBC to continue viability discussion with the landowners in relation to Chapter 7 of the draft SPD.	IBC	
4.0	SuDs Masterplan		Previously circulated
4.1	DC gave a slide presentation on the draft Preliminary SuDS Strategy July 2013 which had been previously circulated to the group The presentation had to be curtailed & rearranged in an effort to to keep to the timetable and it was clear most attendees had not had a chance to read the document.		
4.2	The presentation therefore raised a few queries:-		
4.3	The issue of the amount of space that was going to be required for SuDs in residential areas: DC confirmed the SUDS strategy found 12% of residential areas need to be green space including verges, swales and play areas. the Strategy indicated an overall average housing density of about 32 Homes /Ha of residential allocated land was consistent/ achievable with the type of SUDS as proposed – (on the surface and at source).		
4.4	DC confirmed that the 32 homes per Ha mentioned in Para 4.45 (pg. 68) of the draft SPD was an average net density, and that the 10% public open space requirement in major residential developments (mentioned in IBC Core Strategy policy DM29 is a minimum).		
4.5	SM felt that the perception of the swales would mainly be as useable amenity space within the development, and that the density of 30-35dph should be used.		
4.6	JC felt that the SuDs Masterplan (pg. 69) map was too prescriptive for the final SPD, given that the exact sizes of the strategic SuDs would be subject to further detailed design at application stage. DC pointed out the location of these in valley bottoms was fixed and the shapes and widths shown illustrated the areas likely to be needed based on contours and engineering judgment. More		

	design work would be required for planning applications		
4.7	The drainage of the INF site through SuDs was considered to be achievable and the strategy that DC had drawn up demonstrated this. DC states that it is widely recognized that the SuDS strategy should be a key driver of the final SPD and Masterplan as it has a fundamental affect on appearance of streets. Illustrations and street sections in the SPD should show the SUDS as described in the SUDS strategy.		
4.8	Given the above it was agreed that a more schematic diagram indicating SuDs drainage would be appropriate for the draft SPD.		
4.9	Action: DLA to review SuDs maps, and associated text.	DLA	
5.0	Programme		
5.1	PS outlined the future of the SPD document, with the intention being to take a report to the Council's Executive meeting on 17 th September.		
5.2	The deadline for finalising the draft document that had been circulated was therefore by Friday 9th August, with the viability chapter to be reviewed as per item 3.0.		
6.0	FOI		
6.1	All viability work discussed at the meeting, and circulated prior to it is to be considered strictly confidential.	ALL	
7.0	Any Other Business		
7.1	None		
8.0	Date of Next Meeting		
8.1	Tuesday 24 th September 2013, 9:30 am Grafton House. Room TBC		

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
	1. That is personal data	



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.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 2. Provided in confidence (pt 3.1) | x |
| 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 | |
| 8. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety | |
| 9. That is subject to legal privilege | |
| 10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests | |
| 11. That may not be disclosed by law | |
| 12. Other Please describe | |