

Ipswich Northern Fringe SPD Transport Meeting 2

Meeting Note

| | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Location | Wolsey Room, Endeavour House | |
| Time & Date | 1500, Thursday 14th June 1012 | |
| Attendees | Dave Watson | - SCC |
| | Phil Sweet | - IBC |
| | Paul Wranek | - Ipswich School |
| | Stuart Cock | - Mersea Homes |
| | Nicholle Phillips | - Crest |
| | Martin Blake | - Merchant House |
| | Ian Dix | - Vectos |
| | Chris Evans | - Vectos |
| Apologies | Carol Grimsey | - SCC |
| | Graeme Mateer | - SCC |
| | Steve Miller | - IBC |
| | Arwel Owen | - David Lock Associates |
| | Steve Haines | - David Lock Associates |
| | Laura Fitzgerald | - Vectos |

Minutes of the Last Meeting

1. The circulated minutes of the first Transport Working Group were agreed.
2. ID ran through the actions from the last meeting and confirmed that the programme for the SPD had been circulated and that the transport vision had been discussed.
3. DW said that the meeting with Network Rail was still to be organised.
4. ID confirmed that the high level ideas for the site wide Travel Plan had been circulated, but to date no comments had been received.

Update from Steering Group

5. PS provided an updated from the steering group and confirmed that the vision had been broadly accepted.
6. PS suggested that a person from the transport group should be at the next steering group meeting. It was agreed that DW and ID would attend.

7. ID reported that following a discussion with Steve Miller that it has been suggested the report from the Transport group for the Steering Group should list the key areas of agreements and disagreement. ID suggested that the next Working Group needs to concentrate on producing this update and it was agreed that the pros and cons of the options where there is a disagreement would be set out.
8. PS asked whether the broad principles of transportation assessment against which all development can be tested against in the future should be agreed? SC asked whether “nil detriment” was the appropriate test.
9. ID said that the “nil detriment” test was previously included in HA guidance and that this had been superseded by the NPPF where the guidance is that development should only be resisted where there is a “severe residual impact” after a package of mitigation has been implemented. ID said that there is currently no definition of “severe”.
10. DW confirmed that nil detriment is not required or expected and that there is a recognised need for housing that has been included in the Core Strategy.
11. SC suggested that “nil detriment” not being required be recorded as being agreed by the Working Group.
12. SC requested that ‘nil detriment not being required’ should be a point agreed by the Transport Working Group > All parties agree that the NPPF is the current source of policy being the most up to date Central Government planning policy.

Scale of Development/Potential Land Uses

13. ID said that one of the ways of reducing transport demand was to ensure that key facilities and service were provided as part of development. He asked for confirmation of size of the secondary school/district centre/foodstore to be able to determine whether they could be supported by the development alone or could generate traffic in their own right.
14. PS stated that supporting infrastructure being assessed is : a Secondary School will be circa 1200 students 8FE on around 8 hectares of land, 3 Primary Schools, a ‘mixed’ centre consisting retail and employment/local centres/open space.
15. PS stated they expect to see employment space in mixed centre, not a business park. ID said that any employment could not attract HGVs. He suggested care homes as part of employment allocation as they are employers but do not generate significant levels of traffic.
16. PS said that the report on retail requirement to be presented in August. Additional reports on Healthcare, housing and schools to be undertaken. These will help define any additional traffic that may be generated.
17. PS said there was no requirement for a sports centre as the approach is to use the schools facilities off peak. It makes sense to include sports facilities within the 1st primary school.

Potential Vehicular Access

18. DW re-iterated SCC’s position that the number of vehicular accesses to the site should be minimised to 3 signal controlled junctions with traffic signal control to provide bus priority

and safe pedestrian and cycling facilities. The idea being to control the flow of traffic as it leaves the development.

19. ID said that he did not agree with this approach and that his view was to provide 6 or 7 accesses that were simple priority junctions. This would mean that traffic signals are not needed to provide bus priority or safe crossing locations as there would be much smaller traffic flows at each junction as traffic would be distributed more evenly. ID believes that there is the potential for 3 accesses onto Henley Road, 2 north of the railway bridge and 1 to the south, 2 accesses onto the western side of Westerfield Road and one or two to east, plus potentially one access onto Tuddenham Road. ID to assess options for these potential junctions that the group can review.
20. DW said that he did not agree with this approach as it would allow traffic to leave the area without control. ID said that he did not disagree with the approach of controlling traffic flow, but that this should be done at Valley Road. DW said that there was a need for traffic signals to ensure priority for buses and to provide safe facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. ID disagreed and said that if traffic flows were lower, that bus priority would not be needed and that pedestrians and cyclists would be able to cross safely.
21. It was agreed that this is an area of disagreement. Both in terms of the approach to the number of access junctions and in the form of the junctions.
22. PS stated that the location of secondary school, district centre will influence decision on access number and type.
23. ID suggested that on Westerfield Road that the railway level crossing is maintained with the proposed upgrading of the equipment (DW confirmed that this is programmed to be undertaken in 2014) and that the speed limit to the south of crossing is reduce to 30 mph this can be achieved with some traffic calming/management measures that are consistent with the nature of the road and its appearance as a rural lane. This would also allow more flexibility on the form of the accesses.
24. PS indicated access to Tuddenham Road is desirable for permeability and access to the east of the site including the potential new school's sports facilities. ID said that he believed that an access could be provided and that a Tuddenham Road access should be included an option for SPD, although it would not strictly needed.
25. PS said that the land included on the plans prepared by Vectos needed to be amended so that the only the area included with the Core Strategy is covered by the SPD. (ie to exclude Ipswich School's land).

Internal Roads/ Potential new railway bridge

26. ID said that he believed that there is agreement that the road within the site will be designed in accordance with the principles of Manual for Streets with 20 mph design speeds. There was no disagreement to this approach.
27. PS asked whether home zones would be provided and ID said that a home zone style approach can be used in some areas. NP said that Crest's experience with home zones has

not been as good as expected and that internal design should be carefully aligned with MfS, but should stop short of being a home zone, especially in relation to parking facilities.

28. ID said that as part of the internal highway design that the parking strategy needs to be in place to ensure that the risk of parking abuse is minimised through design.
29. ID said that MfS allows direct frontage access to the primary street and that parking should be provided on plot with some parking in dedicated laybys.
30. SC agreed from a developer point of view as residents need to park by their house if we are to avoid problems of the past and that any parking strategy should have this at its core. The parking provision should also be sufficient to cater for the number of vehicles per household, but not so much that it encourages car travel.
31. ID proposed that primary street is the only street with segregated cycle lane as low vehicle speeds on the other roads with the scheme should allow cycling to be safe on roads. There would of course be additional dedicated cycle routes as appropriate.
32. ID commented that some of the Ravenswood development design features are good and can be incorporated into the area, especially the bus only 'tank-trap' design for bus priority. ID advised that some of the vertical deflection features are not good and should not be used.
33. PS mentioned that the Ravenswood development is used as a Borough bench mark, designed in the late 80's and has generally stood test of time
34. ID stated that the location of the vehicular bridge crossing of the railway is fixed from previous work though. There is some work to do in relation to the design of bridge and how it is used. The big question is whether the bridge is open to all traffic or is bus only during peak hours. ID said that his view is that the bridge is open to all traffic at all times to ensure that there is a variety of accesses to houses north of the railway line. DW said that SCC's view is that it was bus only during peak hours. ID said that this is a second issue where there is disagreement. This is another area to report to the Steering Group with pros and cons of the options.

Public Transport

35. ID informed the Working Group that a meeting had been held with Malcolm Robson at Ipswich Buses. He advised that 2 x 20 minute services looping through each section of the site (east and west of Westerfield Road) which would equate to a 10 minute frequency from Site –town centre – council offices– railway station. The development should be able to accommodate full sized buses.
36. There are transponders on all Ipswich Buses already so bus priority should be implementable from the outset. This would allow priority at the junctions with Valley Road and onto the town centre gyratory.
37. The bus company currently give all new residents at the Ravenswood development a month's free travel and this should be encouraged at the Northern Fringe.

38. Ipswich Buses would be against diverting existing bus services into the site as their most commercially viable routes are straight from the town centre to the development and back. The longer the route the less likely residents are to use the service.
39. Overall Ipswich Buses confirmed the suggested approach of providing loop bus service(s) between the site and the town centre the best approach.
40. ID said that consideration also need to be given to bus services to link to the hospital and key employment areas outside the town centre. DW advised that a meeting with First Bus should also be held and that his colleague could help to provide the appropriate contacts.

Pedestrian and Cyclists

41. ID raised the issue of an additional potential footbridge crossing of the railway line either where the existing right of way (the Fonnereau Way) crosses the railway line or at the Westerfield rail station. From initial consideration the only location adjacent to the station for a footbridge would be from platform to platform at the station and this would not contribute to the SPD objectives.
42. ID said that a footbridge could be provided at the location of the existing at grade pedestrian crossing of the railway line. NP said that Network Rail may not ransom for footbridge in replacement for removal of RoW and at grade pedestrian crossing
43. After discussion of this, it was agreed that this would be considered further, but in the context of the costs of all of the highway/transport infrastructure and whether this is affordable.
44. SC suggested that the rights of way under the existing tunnels to the east of the Westerfield Road need to be considered as a solution. ID asked PW if access could also be given to the school's land to allow this to be considered further. PW confirmed that this is possible.
45. With regard the general principals of the scheme DW suggested that controlled pedestrian crossing facilities could be provided as part of signal controlled access junctions. ID said that he did not believe that a signal controlled would be needed if the vehicle speeds could be managed.
46. ID suggested that a toucan crossing on Valley Road could be provided as part of a UTC system and that an off-road cycle route through the park to the town centre could be linked to this as it is the most direct route. At the moment the park closes at dusk and the opening hours should be extended to accommodate commuters from the development. There is a need to discuss this and to further investigate land ownership of the private road that is part of this route.
47. SC view is to access Picton Avenue and then on the road on Westerfield road as an alternative to the Park route primary cycle route to the Town Centre.
48. SC/NP informed that Crest has land north of Westerfield station to help introduce a potential east-west cycle route through the site. This area of land not shown in SPD controlled area.

Travel Plan – Measures and Initiatives

49. ID confirmed that no comments had been received in response to the circulated note.
50. DW suggested that there needs to be some text included within the SPD about how a Travel Plan will reduce traffic. Travel Plans should be provided for the schools/retail/employment uses with supporting evidence of how traffic generation would be reduced.

Potential Offsite Highway Impacts

51. ID stated that there is little need to undertake any further modelling as the Aecom report covers all of the scenarios.
52. ID advised the group that Malcolm Robson at Ipswich Buses is of the opinion that Ipswich as a town does not suffer with congestion.
53. PS stated that if any more junction modelling is to be undertaken the period that would highlight a worst case scenario is in September because of the schools on Henley Road
54. SC said that another issue to consider as it was very important to existing residents is the potential rat running along Lower Road and Church Lane.
55. DW suggested that any offsite improvement works should include bus priority and be in line with the improvements suggested by Aecom.
56. ID suggested that the offsite assessment should not extend further than Ipswich town centre gyratory.

Way Forward/Programme

57. ID said that the next step will be to produce the update note for the Steering Group that will identify the areas of agreement and disagreement.

AOB

58. ID said that he had envisaged the transport section as being 2-3 pages with documents to provide supporting information.
59. SC suggested that a Technical note on transportation issues and plans should be circulated. ID said that this would be part of the update for the Steering Group.

DONM

60. 2pm on Wednesday 27th July, 5th Floor, Endeavour House
61. After this the Transport Working Groups will be co-ordinated to tie in with the Steering Group meetings.

Actions

- DW to arrange a meeting with Network Rail
- Vectos to arrange a meeting with First Group
- ID to look at access point design option to be reviewed by group

- PW/ID will investigate for a access to the north via the existing subways under the railway lines
- Transport Working Group to prepare a note of areas of agreement and disagreement for discussion at the Steering Group