

IPSWICH NORTHERN FRINGE SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

MINUTES OF TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP 27 JUNE 2012

Attendees- Steve Miller (SM) Phil Sweet (PS) Dave Watson (DW), Carol Grimsey (CG), Steve Haines (SH), Stuart Cock (SC), Nicholle Phillips (NP), Ian Dix (ID), Paul Wranek (PW), Martin Blake (MB), Graeme Mateer (GB).

1. Minutes of last meeting 14 June 2012 – AGREED
2. Purpose of meeting – to resolve items 3-5 on Agenda – AGREED
3. Overall Transport Strategy was AGREED:-
 - (1) Minimise Transport Demand
 - (2) Enhancing and encouraging the use of non-car transport modes
 - (3) Manage residual traffic so that it does not cause severe delay on the highway network .

AGREED residential parking standards in SCC draft to be used

4. Areas of agreement
 - (1) general approach to non-car traffic measures/modes- principles not the details
 - (2) Internalise traffic impacts as far as possible to reduce impacts on wider network
5. Areas of disagreement
 - (3) The number of access points onto Westerfield Road/Henley Road/Tuddenham Road . DW to consider and report to Steering Group next week
 - (4) Form of accesses – strong disagreement between DW and ID. DW pointed to need to not worsen traffic on surrounding network which could only be achieved by traffic lights onto Westerfield Road and Henley Road to regulate flows onto network. AECOM had produced draft strategy which is the approach that is likely to be required by the highway authority throughout the planning process for the northern fringe. ID disagreed and said 7-8 priority junctions would adequately dilute impacts, and that these more suitable for character of Westerfield Road (which would have to be made 30mph). DW advised that decisions on speed limits rested with SCC Cabinet Member and no presumptions could be made in the SPD about this.
 - (5) Railway Bridge – DW wanted the bridge not to be available to cars in peak hours, for traffic management reasons.SC happy with this concept. ID said full access desirable for permeability reasons and rat-running could be designed out.

SH said land allocations for the different uses may help to distill some of the access issues

SC said the SPD did not have to resolve these access differences but only identify the access points. The projected outline planning application for the whole area (which all parties agreed would be submitted) would have to cover this matter.

SM/PS said SPG must convey some sort of resolution to these differences.

AGREED- ID to do a summary note of the above for the SG and justify in more detail his recommended approach, and why the AECOM/DW approach should be set aside.

- 6 Update on previous actions
 - (6) DW still to meet NR
 - (7) ID still to meet First Group
 - (8) Subways- SC awaiting landowner response

Date of next meeting 1 August 2012 at 1pm Endeavour House

SM 27 June 2012