



# Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	23 <sup>rd</sup> July 2014
<b>Time</b>	10:30
<b>Location</b>	Grafton House
<b>Invited</b>	Matthew Ling (IBC Chair) (ML) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Nicolle Phillips (Crest Strategic projects) (NP) John Terry (Crest Strategic Projects) (JT) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Denis Cooper (IBC Drainage) (DC) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only
<b>Minutes Agreed</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> September 2014

**Items:**

			<b>Attachments</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Apologies –</b> Eddie Peters (IBC Parks and Open Spaces) (EP) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RCI) James Routledge (CBRE Investors) (JR)		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Minutes from last meeting (11<sup>th</sup> June)</b>		
2.1	Prior to the start of the meeting comments from Arwel Owen (DLA) (AO) were received.		
2.2	Minute 2.5 changed.		

2.3	Minute 3.5 changed to include AO comments.		
2.4	Minute 3.6 AO comment included.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Minutes from 14<sup>th</sup> May meeting to be agreed following input from SC</b>		
3.1	Minute 2.2 amended.		
3.2	Minute 2.9 SC comment included.		
3.3	Minute 3.5 SC comment included.		
3.4	Minute 3.5 SC comment included.		
3.5	Minute 3.6 SC comment included.		
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Update on actions from last meeting (11<sup>th</sup> June)</b>		
4.1	Action item 1.4 – Minutes to be circulated to SC / PW - Completed.		
4.2	Action item 2.12 –Discussions between Network Rail/ landowners to include IBC. Incomplete.		
4.3	Action 3.9 – DLA to discuss application prior to submission – Application now submitted.		
4.4	Action item 3.10 – Draft IDP to be circulated by SC – Incomplete.		
4.5	Action 4.5 – Meeting between IBC and SCC about secondary school. Completed.		
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CBRE / Mersea Homes Planning application</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IDP – Proposals for strategic infrastructure provision such as secondary school and railway bridges</b></li> <li>• <b>Summary of transport impacts and mitigation proposals</b></li> </ul>		
5.1	SC updated the group on the planning application which had been submitted to IBC in the past week, and included an IDP / TA / Phasing plan and summary.		
5.2	Reduction in number of dwellings owing to SUDs and amount of developable area. Therefore dwelling numbers had fallen from 900 to 815. The TA is still based on a 900 dwelling figure, and would be a density of 32dph net, which would equate to 2925 across the entire site.		
5.3	800 dwellings in residential areas and 15 in the district centre. The DC will be as per the SPD, green infrastructure 1.9ha and 2.0ha for the primary school.		
5.4	JT questioned whether a Design Code had been submitted. SC said that the application was detailed for the first 80 houses and that this would inform the design code. FL made the point that the SPD detail helped to inform the design code for the entire SPD site.		

5.5	DC asked whether the SUDs part of the SPD was being followed. SC said that the development was compliant with the FRA submitted with the application.		
5.6	A discussion was had about whether the reduction in the number of dwellings would have an impact on the number of primary schools required. NM said that SCC would need the land for the Primary School site. SC said that the application was compliant with the requirements of the SPD – for the primary school and showed a 2ha site.		
5.7	FL explained that the delivery section of the SPD was based on assumed population projections only.		
5.8	SC said that the TA was submitted with a suite of information and that it was expected that there would be a lot of dialogue with SCC regarding the exact nature of any road improvements / transport options.		
5.9	SM asked whether the sustainable transport strategy included a railway bridge. SC said that it did show a bridge going in. NP made the point that there would be other reasons for the need of the rail bridge such as school use, and use of the country park.		
5.10	SC outlined the IDP to illustrate when the Ipswich School site might be brought forward. A general discussion about housing completion rates was had. PW said that this provided some clarity from the Ipswich School position.		
5.11	SC asked when SCC might put in a planning application for the secondary school. NM explained that it was not scheduled in yet but that it was expected that it would be fully open in 2021. NM clarified that if housing numbers were lower than originally expected in the SPD that developers wouldn't be expected to contribute the entire amount (for the secondary school).		
5.12	Discussion on schools delivered by Crest in Kent using a contractor etc (all OJEU approved). No objection raised to this approach in principle and JT offered to send in further information on this.		
5.13	<b>Action: SC to provide disc of presentation (of the application) to Crest.</b>	<b>SC</b>	
5.14	<b>Action: 'Swindon' Design Code to be sent to SM.</b>	<b>Crest</b>	
5.15	<b>Action: Step-by-step guide for secondary school delivery timescales to be circulated.</b>	<b>NM</b>	
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Update on draft SPD changes</b>		
6.1	SM outlined the changes expected to the SPD, and that		

	the amended document was being sent to Executive Committee on 12 <sup>th</sup> August. (all can attend – 6pm)		
6.2	Principally there were two main changes. 1) Secondary School now had no trigger point but would be secured by means of an agreed timetable. 2) Health Centre would now be a serviced site. Other triggers were to remain.		
6.3	<b>Action: Press release regarding Network Rail statement regarding Westerfield Station to be circulated.</b>	<b>SM/RCI</b>	
6.4	<b>Action: A joint meeting with Network Rail /developers/IBC to be pursued.</b>	<b>RCI</b>	
7.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
7.1	None		
<b>8.0</b>	<b>AOB</b>		
8.1	JT invited members of IBC to view Crest developments at Kilnwood Vale, Crawley, and Finbury, Ashford which Crest considered to be very high quality in terms of Design Codes, use of materials, public realm design and general place making objectives.		
8.2	SC raised the point that under the draft SCC Parking Standards that are currently under consultation there would be a requirement for an additional 50% of visitor parking that would further reduce the developable area of the site. Agreed parties need to view and comment as appropriate.		
8.3	SM advised that he make representation on the consultation in 8.2 on the basis that the planning applications for IGS would be heavily promoting sustainable transport modes.		
8.4	ML confirmed that IBC had not heard whether the application for capacity funding to the DCLG had been successful. FL advised that a number of councils had been informed and were being asked for further information.		
8.5	<b>Action: IBC to speak to members of Crest about design codes they have developed elsewhere.</b>	<b>Crest / RCI</b>	
8.6	<b>Action: Check with DCLG about capacity funding bid.</b>	<b>RCI</b>	
<b>9.0</b>	<b>Date of next meeting</b>		
	Wednesday 13 <sup>th</sup> August 10:30.		