



IPSWICH

BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Spatial Planning Working Group
Date	10 September 2012
Time	10:00
Location	Grafton House
Present	Phil Sweet (Chair) (PS) James Farrar (JF) substitute for Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicole Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Joanne Cave (David Lock Associates) (JC) Steve Haines (David Lock Associates) (SH) Gail Broom (Urban Design and Conservation) (GB) Jason Wakefield (IBC Drainage) (JW) Anita Seymour (IBC Planning) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Felicia Blake (IBC Minutes) (FB)
Apologies	Steve Miller
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	Minutes of the meeting dated 31.07.12 were agreed as an accurate record.

Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Minutes of last meeting		
1.1	Matters arising and action points from last SPWG and Steering Group Meetings.		
2.0	Matters arising		
2.1	PS confirmed the debrief from the Community Engagement Day and the Summary of the "Call for ideas" are now available for viewing on the IBC website.		

2.2	Agency consultation; a finalised comprehensive report is still required from DLA. A full summary would be included in the Issues and Options Report.	JC	
2.5	Final delineation of the SPD boundary – to be resolved at Steering Group tomorrow.		
2.6	Infrastructure: An initial schedule had been devised FL - Had commenced scoping work for this to assist IBC.	FL	
3.0	Update on DLA work programme		
3.1	Context analysis JC presented and ran through a first draft of a context analysis for the SPD area. Any initial comments thereon invited by the end of the week.	All	
3.2	Agreed that consideration would be given to the contextual issue of defining a new urban edge for Ipswich. .	JC	
3.3	NP stated that Crest are currently involved in a project at Bewbush, Crawley seeking to implement garden city principles for a medium density (30-35dph) scheme. She would endeavor to provide sight of some material on this that may be of relevance to INF.	NP	
3.4	DLA reported latest Transport work was to be circulated by Vectos today (10 th) for consideration at Steering Group tomorrow. SH/JC advised that no fundamental conflicts with the evolution of the masterplan were apparent.		
4.0	Development of spatial options		
4.1	JC presented and explained the three draft options formulated by DLA following the July workshop.		
4.2	It was advised by JC that a land-use budget of 10-20ha. of land should be allowed for the primary road infrastructure within the site. PS queried the size of this allocation (the DLA briefing note that accompanies the options states 8ha. for “physical infrastructure”) – this needs to be clarified and applied consistently to all options.	PS / JC	

4.3	PS questioned the location of the railway bridge as indicated on the three DLA options– it is understood that the preferred location may have previously been fixed at 268 metres from Henley Road. Needs a revision on all options	DLA	
4.4	PS advised that the privately owned land on Lower Road should be identified as its deliverability as part of the Country Park needs assessment. Land owned by Crest fronting Henley Road outwith the SPD boundary should be indicated by a dotted line and indicated as <u>potential</u> additional land for the Country Park as has been done with the equivalent areas further to the east.	DLA	
4.5	<p>PS presented a fourth option developed following further analysis: This option encapsulates the current thinking of a range of officers (planning, urban design, drainage, and parks and open spaces) on shaping the masterplan. Key components include:-</p> <p>(i) a preferred option for the alignment of the edge of built development based on detailed site visits (SH questioned the inclusion of a field close to Westerfield for development which may affect the setting of the latter as discussed at Inquiry).</p> <p>(ii) A preferred general distribution of strategic open space around the site which includes community greens and seeks to integrate a district park with both the district centre and the country park;</p> <p>(iii) A suitable location for the district centre and the secondary school. District centre located towards Henley Road with its larger scale and urban character compared with the more rural feel of Westerfield Road.</p> <p>(iv) Secondary school located centrally to optimize catchment in line with Option 2 of the Barton Willmore evidence to the 2010 enquiry.</p>		
4.6	<p>A general discussion on all four options followed which focused on the following:-</p> <p>1. Deliverability of a secondary school on the current site of the Ipswich School Playing fields.</p> <p>2. The need to ensure a commercially viable location for the district centre (frontage to an existing main road likely to more attractive to retailers and more capable of early delivery. Differing opinions as to whether Henley Road or Westerfield Road presented the best option.</p> <p>3. Secondary school located to north of Red House Farm zone considered to be too isolated and likely to impact adversely on the rural setting of Westerfield. AS indicated a preference for locating the SS in the central zone</p>		

	<p>between Westerfield Road and the railway.</p> <p>4. The strong wish on the part of IBC to ensure Country Park was well integrated with the heart of the development by other POS and green corridors.</p> <p>5. The benefits of co-location district centre and secondary school were discussed.</p> <p>6. A vehicular access to Tuddenham Road may not be deliverable due to ownership issues.</p>		
4.7	<p>JW presented further information on drainage constraints and opportunities across the sites for SUDS. He commented that the IBC Option 4 was potentially SUDS compliant. He undertook to provide some more detailed comment in respect of Options 1-3 to enable further revisions to be considered by DLA.</p>	JW	
4.8	<p>Agreed that, following discussion at Steering Group and receipt of further drainage information and comments from JW, DLA will refine the existing 3 options (they maintain a view that just 3 options are the optimum number for public consultation) in the light of various points raised seeking to incorporate the key elements of the IBC draft option as far as possible. Consistent format for all options required.</p>	DLA	
4.9	<p>James Farrar urged caution in ensuring that the alternative options still accurately reflected practicable and viable ideas that were generated by the community engagement day.</p>	DLA	
5.0	<p>Issues and Options Report / Exhibition</p>		
5.1	<p>PS advised that the I&O report will need to be presented to the Community Steering Panel for comment and the IBC Executive for approval for public consultation. Progress on the report at DLA is well advanced and a draft will be circulated shortly (possibly next week). Agreed that the Executive Meeting on 6 November was the earliest meeting that could be targeted given the lengthy period required for reports to be compiled at IBC.</p>	DLA	
5.2	<p>Public exhibition consequent on the above is now likely to be in mid/late -November. It would be prudent to make draft arrangements for the exhibition before Executive but these cannot be actioned before 6 November for obvious reasons.</p>	DLA / IBC	
5.3	<p>DLA to consider and prepare a timetable for the period up to the exhibition whereupon IBC will locate suitable venues and make provisional bookings.</p>	IBC / DLA	
5.4	<p>PS advised that the relevant publicity arrangements as</p>	IBC/DLA	

5.5	set out in the current IBC Statement of Community Involvement will apply. Responsibility for all aspects of preparing for and running the exhibition need to be clearly agreed and funding arrangements agreed. IBC and DLA to discuss further to ensure smooth running. Anita Seymour may be the relevant day-to-day contact on this for IBC	IBC/DLA	
6.0	Draft Infrastructure Schedule		
6.1	This was tabled by PS. JC questioned the basis for calculating the required POS land requirement. PS advised he would check and get back on this.	IBC	
6.2	The evidence base for requesting a library was queried. IBC to respond.	IBC	
6.3	Could more precision be provided on the type of community hall provision required?	IBC	
6.4	Health Care facilities still to be resolved.	DLA / IBC	
7.0	Energy Strategy Update		
7.1	Report now received from DLA. IBC will take their own consultancy advice and respond. A meeting can be arranged if required.	IBC	
8.0	Proposed Study Tour Arrangements		
8.1	DLA and ATLAS are liaising on arrangements. IBC to advise on numbers and book a bus.	DLA/ FL IBC	
9.0	Update on Retail Study and Sustainability Appraisal		
9.1	PS reported that the draft retail study had been received from Nathaniel Litchfield. This will be released as soon as finalized.		
9.2	The Scoping Report for the SA by Hyder has been finalised and will now go out to consultation. In the meantime Hyder are starting to assess the 4 spatial options currently tabled – it was suggested that they might be requested to hold fire on this work for a few days to enable the revised options to be developed.		
10.0	Date of Next Meeting		
	<u>The date of the next meeting was confirmed as</u>		

Wednesday 26 September at 10.00am at Grafton House.

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	