



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Spatial Planning Working Group
Date	9 April 2013
Time	10:00am
Location	Grafton House – 4B
Present	Phil Sweet (Chair) (PS) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Mike Taylor (Urban Design and Conservation) (MT) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Steve Miller (IBC Ops Manager Town Planning) (SM) Matt Deakin (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (MD) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) James Farrar (Atlas) (JF) Robert Coles (DLA) (RC) Felicia Blake (IBC Minutes) (FB)
Apologies	None
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	29 April 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Review of Key Factors affecting refinement or preferred option		
1.1	MD thanked PS for the invite, stating that Suffolk Coastal District Council agreed in principle to the preferred option and processes undertaken for the consultation.		
1.2	It was confirmed that Option 2 had emerged as the preferred option from the consultation and exhibition.		

1.3	There was a discussion on the key issues raised in relation to spatial design – Among them were <i>greenspace, transport, location of district centres/schools and drainage</i>)		
1.4	PS confirmed the number one issue derived from the public consultation was transport –modal shift.		
1.4.1	IBC and Suffolk County Council (SCC) met to discuss the preparation for the SPD. In response to this, it was agreed not to reconvene the TWG at this time, so instead Suffolk County Council will prepare a paper on transport strategy (listing among this, design issues raised for consideration). <i>ACTION: Paper on Transport Strategy to be circulated to DSG before the next Development Steering Group</i>	SCC/IBC	
1.4.2	JC asked about the removal of the level crossing at Westerfield – This would not affect the SPD at this stage.		
1.4.3	PS/FL/SM will meet with Network Rail and Greater Anglia next week to discuss transport implications for the development – SM confirmed there had been no consultation response from NR.		
1.5	<u>Greenspace framework (distribution of greenspace/nature and amount of provision (including outdoor sports))</u>		
1.5.1	PS called for more robust data on shared facilities for schools and playing fields, to address some of the questions raised at the last Community Steering Panel (CSP) – The panel were concerned about community spaces and how they would be managed.		
1.5.2	Would grounds be easily accessible for cycling, parking, operating in school/holiday periods? <i>ACTION: FL to research 'better practices' for this – comparing similar developments</i>	FL	
1.6	At the last CSP Councillor CJ called for greater focus to be placed on the design of the district centre (<i>e.g. size and location – a larger centre would have a dominating presence over smaller ones</i>).		
1.7	JC requested a copy of the INF Land Areas map be circulated to the landowners and developers to comment on before the next DSG. <i>ACTION: SM to get the map modified before sending out – This will also be circulated to CSP</i>	SM	
2.0	Emerging design response to key factors		

2.1	<p>JC identified key design changes:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • garden city character 		
2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individual neighbourhood distinction • interfaces 		
2.2.1	<p>RC of DLA provided A1 maps, sketches and overlays, depicting the 3 key 'village' areas of the masterplan - RC took the group through DLA's brainstorming ideas design and identity of the development – Copies of these plans (A3/A4 scale w ere passed onto PS and SM).</p>		
2.2.2	<p>Among the items raised w ere:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how to characterise the village? • How w ill footpaths respond to existing constraints • front/back gardens • parking strategies • verges • Individual housing designs 		
2.2.3	<p><u>Village 1</u> outlined the playing fields/district centre/Primary school/district park:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access for area • cycle/footpaths • connect and strengthen hedgerow s • minor road links • visions on landscape – sustainable community for a garden suburb? • character and grow th (w hat w ill different densities mean)? • w hat makes each site relatable? • elderly and sheltered accommodation (located near to shops and district centres)? 		
2.2.4	<p><u>Village 2</u> outlined the area around Red House Farm:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential for more SUDs/green corridors • historical buildings and the need to preserve them • tree-line (ancient track line) • more linear design/connecting school facilities • relate housing w ith RHF – Existing homes and creating a green link • IBC and DLA looking at centres as a separate exercise? 		
2.2.5	<p><u>Village 3</u> outlined area around the country park:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identified potential SUDS areas/green connection • parking facilities • strengthening existing hedgerow s? • developing cycling and w alking routes – small grid through middle of houses • pockets of low density in prime locations • look at IBC standards for back-gardens • incorporating street parking – resolving parking 		

	<p>standards issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • these drawings reflect between 30ha and 35ha – to be included in the statistics for the SPD • reintroduce extended hedge-lines to follow contour flow of site 		
2.2.6	<p>ACTION: PS and SM to reflect on drawings and make comments to DLA- possible discussion at DSG?</p>	PS/SM	
2.3	It was agreed a modern approach to map design and illustrations was preferred.		
2.4	Generally it was felt that a more central location for the second school seemed to be most acceptable – The district centre is currently at phase 1.		
2.5	Kesgrave was highlighted as a good example for development (good cycle routes/encouraging kids to walk to school/home) – NM reinforced the need to inspire walking to school and to have good pedestrian and cycle routes – Kilnwood was also noted as a good sample.		
2.6	It was felt there was a strong need to protect the character of Westerfield (this may change) – A review of design quality issues in the SPD will be of paramount importance to new and existing residents.		
3.0	Approach to phasing of development		
3.1	There was a discussion on the phasing and balance of land-use.		
3.2	There was a discussion on the re-distribution of some country space – 3.45ha in isolation from Westerfield, Lower Road and Red House Farm area – The landowners Crest Nicholson (CN) and Mersea Homes (MH) would have to have a say on any land re-distribution.		
3.3	It was agreed that the playing fields would have to be allocated to the 1.94 area of flat land on the development		
3.4	The screening at Bromeswell Road was discussed.		
4.0	Format of draft SPD – Responsibilities for preparing different sections		
4.1	<p>PS circulated TCPA's 'A Sustainable Garden Suburb' for information, to be used as guidance to adapt principles for the SPD.</p> <p>ACTION: Draft a summary of what 'is meant by a sustainable suburb'.</p>	PS	
4.2	Draft Core Objectives may change – Issues & Options report to be referenced and main principles should be restated in SPD–Should the I&O report also to be added		

	as appendix to report? ACTION: SM to confirm	SM	
4.3	Policy base – Developers difference of options on some NPPF issues.		
4.4	Key spatial strategy – Movement Plan/ Greenspace plan/Land Use Strategy.		
4.5	Green Infrastructure – MD of SCDC had no concerns – Quota in IPA is important.		
4.6	Country Park – This should be included in the Greenspace Strategy, which has been broadly accepted.		
4.7	Further issues discussed included:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance on design • Housing mix (family housing/ elderly accommodation/affordable/self-build) 		
4.8	Housing needs to be thought about in greater detail. ACTION: PS/SM to have discussions with RH about statistics	PS/SM	
4.9	Infrastructure and viability needs ACTION: FL to send JC and SM text with drafted Infrastructure list	FL	
4.10	Community Development – It was expected that Developers would be required to be more engaged in this process prior to planning applications – It was acknowledged that Crest Nicholson were taking the role seriously.		
4.11	ACTION: IBC to table a discussion on phasing for the next DSG	IBC	
4.12	SM highlighted a need to be guided by the Core Strategy (consultation begins in September 2013) – Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to be agreed by everyone.		
5.0	Timetable, milestones and project plan for development of draft SPD		Attachment
5.1	FL updated the group on the project plan for the draft SPD.		
5.2	It was decided that the 6-week consultation (to be agreed by Council Executive) should start as soon as possible after 25 th June. ACTION: SM to check for any flexibility in the schedule – 21 May for draft document	SM	
5.3	This would mean that all consultation documents need to be ready 5 weeks in advance of Executive - This		

	includes printing all publication documents (posters/brochures), booking venues and ensuring the consultation database is up to date for mail-outs.		
5.4	It was agreed that 2 weeks was sufficient notice for residents (CSP will be informed of this). The consultation will also be advertised via the IBC website, Customer Service Centre at the town hall (CSC), public notices, in the local press and in libraries.		
5.5	DLA need to have all documents in advance of Executive – DLA have agreed to pay for and organise the exhibition, design, edit and format documents for publication, using the template format of the Issues & Options report. ACTION: DLA to send price quotes on work	DLA	
5.6	Reflecting on feedback from the exhibition, PS suggested larger plans/presentation boards, as people had commented on not being able to clearly see the A4/A3 plans properly.		
5.7	ACTION: SM to speak with DC regarding agreement on the completion of SUDs study, which will inform the distribution of open space – Also important to finalise this, as will have implications for layout and design.	SM	
5.8	Agree approach to distribution of open space and SUDs ACTION: Revise plan by reducing blurb?	PS/SM	
5.9	Reach agreement on phasing strategy for development – Waiting for work from Peter Brett Associates (PBA) ACTION: PS and SM to discuss	PS/SM	
5.10	FL suggested having an interim discussion with (PBA) to gauge what the viability evaluation (expected 30 th April) would contain. ACTION: SM to arrange this	SM	
5.11	Provide copy of preferred option to Hyder Consulting after 16 th April – Draft SPD is needed to do this. ACTION: PS/SM to acknowledge that IBC have taken their comments into account, along with residents, consultees and members of the local community, before publishing the SPD	PS/SM	
5.12	ACTION: SM to draft a covering report for draft SPD as appendix – Final draft of SPD to be edited by DLA	SM	
5.14	Scope key issues to be discussed at the next CSP (retail, transport and emerging SPD timetable). ACTION: SM/FB to rearrange meeting to accommodate presentation from DLA	SM/FB	
5.15	ACTION: Brief CLLR CJ and key members on issues	PS/SM	

	before finalising draft SPD – To take place in a 5-week period		
5.16	ACTION: Decide who will do what when organizing consultation (CH/FB)	PS/FB	
5.17	ACTION: Agree dates for consultation and arrange venues, check consultation database	SM	
5.18	ACTION: SM to amend Project Plan table before next DSG (16 April)	SM	
6.0	Items for forthcoming Development Steering Group (16 April) and Community Steering Panel (25 April) meetings		
6.1	RC agreed to attend the next CSP to present to CSP on Emerging Preferred Option.		
6.2	ACTION: SM to circulate modified INF Land Areas map to landowners and developers before the next DSG (16 April) – to allow them to respond and identify terms	SM	
6.3	ACTION: FL to send Phasing documents – Decide what to table	FL/PS	
6.4	ACTION: SM to circulate revised Project Plan, phasing and Emerging preferred option to DSG before next meeting (16 April)	SM	
7.0	AOB		
7.1	Mid Suffolk District Council (MSDC) and Suffolk Coastal (SC) have been briefed and are happy with development.		
7.2	NM confirmed SCC would need to do further work on the transport strategy.		
7.3	Viability and affordability would be another issue to sort out with developers.		
7.4	FL confirmed that RH had drafted a letter regarding funding.		
7.5	PS confirmed IBC would be appointing a full-time External Funding Officer.		
8.0	Date of next meeting		
8.1	Monday 29 April – 10:30PM (3B)		

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/>



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.

These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
1. That is personal data	
2. Provided in confidence	
3. Intended for future publication	
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	