



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	4 June 2013
Time	09:30
Location	Grafton House
Invited	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) (item 1) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO) Graeme Mateer (SCC) (GM) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) (left before meeting started) John Pitchford (SCC) (JP) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH)
Apologies	Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Kevin Wilcox (Crest Nicholson) (KW)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	30 July 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of Last Meeting (16 April)		
1.1	Item 3.0 SM confirmed detail of meeting with Network		

	Rail. No confirmation in writing as yet. It was concluded that the new bridge was an essential piece of infrastructure but that careful phasing would be key to its delivery.		
1.2	Action – IBC to change emphasis of SC comment at minute 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	CH	
1.3	Item 5.3 SM confirmed that the aim was to send the Draft SPD to Executive Committee on 27 th August, and that there would be a 6 week public consultation thereafter.		
1.4	JP felt that this would align with SCC cabinet committee in September/October.		
1.5	Item 7.4 Assessment of tree plan. DLA still working on integrating veteran trees into public open space (POS).		
1.6	DC queried whether the density range of 30-35dph was across the site. PS confirmed that it was an average over the entire site.		
1.7	Action – IBC to correct reference to Acorn (minute 8.2) to AECOM	CH	
1.8	Item 9.4 DC confirmed the Statement of Common Ground (SCOG) from the Mersea Homes 2010 Appeal states that “all but section 5 of the FRA is accepted by IBC”. Section 5 of the FRA is titled “The Proposed SW Drainage system”. IBC only agreed the strategy illustrated a SUDS scheme can be accommodated on the site.		
1.9	DC gave DSG a SUDS update. The expectation is that a preliminary SUDS Masterplan should be finished by 21 st June. Currently DC is exploring two different options (i) drainage under the railway, and (ii) to drain as per the 2010 Mersea application. Work is proceeding well and a density of 30-35dph appears achievable with swales throughout the yellow residential area. DC has met with SCC SAB / Highways working group regarding acceptable road cross sections including swales in verges. Now that a preliminary road layout has been prepared DC will make comments on how this might be amended to improve cost effectiveness of swales.		
2.0	Viability Assessment		
2.1	SM introduced the item and explained that Peter Brett		

	<p>Associates (PBA) work needed refining. A note on possible approaches to viability assessment and a draft <u>confidential</u> infrastructure delivery chapter had been circulated by IBC prior to the meeting.</p>		
2.2	<p>Discussion was had regarding future assessments of assumptions made within the March appraisals provided to PBA. MK confirmed that he had requested further calculations on how these assumptions were arrived at, but that the developers felt that PBA could complete the work without it.</p>		
2.3	<p>It was agreed by DSG that point 2 from the Viability Note that had been circulated was the right approach, in that the landowners would submit the required information from E. C. Harris to either IBC or ATLAS on a confidential basis, who on receipt of the information from PBA, will transfer the information to the various parties simultaneously in advance of a meeting set up to go through the information.</p>		
2.4	<p>Action - MK will ask PBA for a work-in-progress update on their viability model by 11th June. On receipt the above report MK will ask for E.C. Harris report from NP and swap the findings. A meeting will then be arranged for c. 18th June in an attempt to gain consensus on model inputs and move the viability issue forward</p>	MK	
2.5	<p>FL gave an overview of the draft Infrastructure, deliver and implementation framework chapter that had been circulated prior to the meeting. It was explained that the strategic infrastructure was in one table as it applied to the entire site, and that the three village infrastructure tables were separate. FL felt that the infrastructure was considered to be broadly deliverable, and it was considered that a single application would be preferable with the development starting in the SW corner, with other areas opening up later on.</p>		
2.6	<p>NP wanted more time to discuss the document with colleagues before responding. Agreed all landowners would provide considered response in time for meeting on 25 June.</p>		
2.7	<p>SC felt that a single outline application would not work as any approval would trigger payment / purchase conditions within the legal agreements the developers have with the land owners. Developers would thus not tend to seek any consents unless there was an intention to commence development shortly thereafter.</p>		
2.8	<p>Delivery of the main strategic infrastructure elements was discussed. AO felt that the important issue would be a phasing strategy of two stages, (i) provision of the</p>		

	infrastructure item, and (ii) when it would be delivered.		
2.9	PS stated that IBC were not at this stage thinking of s.106 contributions for main infrastructure delivery but for a Grampian style planning condition. A global infrastructure delivery plan covering the entire site would be expected with each outline application.		
2.10	NP thought that as a result of phased housing delivery, developers could provide s.106 contributions into a pot for certain items of strategic infrastructure delivery by IBC, rather than delivering it directly themselves. This was noted as a key point of principle that would need careful consideration. FL felt that IBC needed to consider the impact of being 'banker' to any s.106 monies for the infrastructure delivery.		
2.11	JP confirmed SCC would lead on delivering the secondary school subject to contributions.		
2.12	SM said IBC would give consideration to multiple starts on site as raised by SC. However regard must be had to matters of Core Strategy review. PS stated that the intention was to avoid piecemeal development and that the building of a community was important from the outset. It was important that multiple starts would need to be coherent and have a logic to the formation of the community and the delivery of necessary infrastructure. SC expressed the opinion that Red House Farm and the SW zone on either side of Westerfield Road could / should reasonably be viewed as a single neighbourhood.		
2.13	MK described CIL implications for a multi start scenario. A maximum of 5 s.106 agreements could contribute towards any single infrastructure project. ML has been looking into City Deal money and confirmed that the LIF loan submission had been sent.		
2.14	FL advised that there should be more joint working between the developers regarding the issue of viability.		
2.15	SC felt thought that if multiple outline applications were submitted that they would be for the three individual village sites in their entirety. They might be in the form of either outlines or hybrids.		
2.16	ML agreed that the draft Infrastructure, delivery and implementation framework chapter could be reviewed by email over the next 2 weeks and that it would be discussed at the proposed viability meeting on 25 th June.		
2.17	Action - Draft Infrastructure, deliver and implementation framework chapter to be reviewed	NP/SC/PW	


	by developers and to comment by email to IBC		
3.0	Transport Chapter		
3.1	PS considered that the difference between the AECOM and Vectos documents was mainly down to style and emphasis, but that there were differences between the SCC AECOM approach regards to the control of the proposed road bridge over the railway, and the design / control of certain site access points. Vectos sought rather more flexibility, SCC more certainty.		
3.2	AO felt that ID had commented on the AECOM document, but that SCC had not commented on Vectos, which was necessary.		
3.3	GM stated that the Vectos document did not adequately represent the SCC view.		
3.4	SC was of the opinion that the level of detail expressed would be expected through a Transport Assessment (TA) rather than as part of an SPD. NP shared this view, and that the document needed to be flexible until a TA is done.		
3.5	PS asked whether DLA could bring the two documents together in the style of the SPD for review by all parties. PS emphasised the importance of all SCC's substantive points being incorporated to minimise any potential basis for objection to the final SPD. DLA agreed to do this within the next week. It was agreed that this would be circulated to all SG members for consideration and comment with a view to agreeing the chapter at the next SG meeting on 2 July.		
3.6	Action – DLA to compile two transport strategy documents into single draft chapter for SPD for circulation and review	AO	
3.7	Action – IBC to put Transport Strategy back on the agenda for DSG on 2nd July	IBC	
4.0	Review of timetable		
4.1	SM confirmed the aim was to get the draft SPD to executive committee on 27 th August but that this timetable would necessarily have to kept under review.		
5.0	Atlas presentation to Community Steering Panel on District Centres (for information)		
5.1	Noted with no further comment.		
6.0	AOB		

6.1	PS confirmed that IBC were looking at occupancy of around 2.5 per dwelling based on advice from SCC. Having given them notional information on housing mix with profile data.		
6.2	SC queried whether this increase would result in more POS being required. PS said IBC recognised that additional POS over and above that currently being proposed was not likely to be sought.		
6.3	MK/PS confirmed that using the right occupancy number was important so that a robust policy position could be established based on the latest/ best evidence that could not be challenged by others.		
6.4	PW asked if IBC were looking at other sources of funding to support infrastructure delivery. ML said IBC were considering this.	ML	
7.0	Date of Next Meeting		
7.1	2 nd June 2013 at 9:30 AM		

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 .	x
	3. Intended for future publication	x
	4. Related to criminal proceedings	
	5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	6. That might prejudice on-going 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 2 Draft Infrastructure Delivery chapter.	x
	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
	12. Other Please describe	