



Action Notes

Meeting	Ipswich Strategic Planning Area Board
Date	Wednesday 20 th March 2019
Time	16.00pm
Location	Orwell Room, Ipswich Borough Council, Grafton House
Attendees	<p>Cllr Paul West (Suffolk County Council) (Cllr PW) (Chair) Cllr Carole Jones (Ipswich Borough Council) (Cllr CJ) Cllr Tony Fryatt (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (Cllr TF) Cllr Nick Ridley (Babergh District Council) (Cllr NR) Cllr Glen Horn (Mid Suffolk District Council) (Cllr GH) James Cutting (Suffolk County Council) (JC) Carlos Hone (Ipswich Borough Council) (CH) Sally Minns (Ipswich Borough Council) (SM) Desi Reed (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (DR) Andrea McMillan (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (AM) Tom Barker (Babergh/Mid Suffolk District Councils) (TB) Robert Hobbs (Babergh/Mid Suffolk District Councils) (RH) Anna Roe (Ipswich Borough Council) (AR)</p>
Distribution	Attendees
Apologies tendered in advance	None

	Item	Action	Attachments
1.0	Apologies for absence		
1.1	Martyn Fulcher (Ipswich Borough Council) (MF) Mark Edgerley (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (ME) Philip Ridley (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (PR)		
2.0	Statement of Common Ground		
2.1	AM took ISPA Board members through the updates proposed to the SoCG since the December 2018 ISPA Board meeting, focussing on potential changes that would benefit from further discussion by the Board.	AM to update SoCG	Statement of Common Ground /Schedule of changes to the SoCG updated 19 th March 2019
2.2	<u>Page 1 and 2</u> – the amendments provide points of clarification, including around previous versions.		
2.3	<u>Section 3</u> – It was agreed that the word ‘cross-boundary’ be inserted between ‘strategic’ and ‘matters’. In addition reference to Section 3 of the 2019 NPPF had been inserted to reflect all the duties outlined in terms of the statutory duty to co-operate.		
2.4	Section 5 – As per section 3, it was agreed that the word ‘cross-boundary’ be inserted between ‘strategic’ and ‘matters’, to reflect the Duty to Co-operate. .		
2.5	<u>Section 5A (Alignment of timetables)</u> –It was agreed by the Board that officers should add narrative to explain the current position on the production of each local plan and expectations in the various authority timelines. It was also agreed by Board members that the SoCG should reflect that where Local Development Schemes (LDS) need to be amended, efforts should be made to align local plan production timescales.		
2.6	Cllr CJ seconded this point, advising that the Government wanted to see local planning authorities (LPAs) working together and looking to move forward.		
2.7	<u>Section B (Process of reaching outcomes and agreements)</u> - The Board agreed that a footnote should be added to paragraph B2, cross-referencing to Section 4 of the SoCG, to clarify that the decision making process lies within the individual Local Planning Authorities.		
2.8	<u>Page 6, Section B1 (Vision)</u> - Discussion was had around whether further text was needed in the vision in relation to how it would relate to visions of emerging individual plans. It was agreed that the wording ‘collectively’ and		

	<p>'seek to achieve' would clarify this. SM reminded the Board that the projects listed under Section B1 were all strategic projects which all Suffolk authorities had already signed up to.</p>		
2.9	<p><u>B2 and B3</u> – Discussion was had around how the statements in B2 and B3 relate to the position of Local Plans that are evolving. Wording to clarify this was agreed.</p>		
2.10	<p><u>Section C (Evidence)</u> – A proposed change relating to the new NPPF was agreed by the Board.</p>		
2.11	<p><u>Section C2</u> – The Board agreed to replace 'Ipswich Strategic Planning Area' with 'Ipswich Housing Market Area' as this section relates to housing. .</p>		
2.12	<p><u>Section C3 and C4</u> – The Board agreed changes to the wording including that reference to a comprehensive assessment of deliverability would be inserted into Section C3 to clarify the process should any authority identify that it is not able to meet its housing need or its need for Gypsies and Travellers within its own boundaries.</p>		
2.13	<p><u>Section C3 Land supply</u> – The Board agreed changes to the wording including that reference to a comprehensive assessment of deliverability would be inserted into Section C3 to clarify the process should any authority identify that it is not able to meet its housing need or its need for Gypsies and Travellers within its own boundaries.</p>		
2.14	<p><u>Section D. Consideration of bordering strategic Housing Developments</u> Updated reference to the Transport Modelling Report position was agreed by the Board.</p>		
2.15	<p><u>Section E. Defining the Need for Employment Land - (Process of reaching outcomes and agreements)</u> – BDC/MSDC proposed the following change of wording on page 12. 'The ISPA Board provides a mechanism to 'discuss matters' on how each local authority will approach key employment centres'</p>		
2.16	<p>IBC and SCDC were both concerned that replacing 'inform matters' with 'discuss matters' would be a significant weakening of the role of the Board.</p>		
2.17	<p>Cllr CJ echoed this concern.</p>		
2.18	<p>Cllr GH stated that he saw the ISPA as a discussion forum and was concerned that BDC/MSDC were committing themselves to something that could not be delivered.</p>		

2.19	SM suggested that as a compromise the Board could agree to keep the word 'inform' but add 'these matters' to the end of the sentence. The Board agreed an amendment to clarify the role of the Board in relation to informing Local Plans and to correct a previous error as the statement should read 'employment sectors' rather than 'employment centres' in the paragraph above.		
2.20	<u>Section E (Arrangements for necessary ongoing co-operation)</u> Wording changes were agreed to clarify the role of the Board in informing the production of Local Plans.		
2.21	<u>Section G : Enhancement and regeneration of retail centres, (Process of reaching outcomes and agreements)</u> Wording changes were agreed to clarify the role of the Board in informing the production of Local Plans.		
2.22	<u>Section G (Process of reaching outcomes and agreements)</u> - Wording changes were agreed to clarify the role of the Board in informing the production of Local Plans.		
2.23	<u>Section H: Strategic Infrastructure Priorities, under 1. Ipswich Northern Route</u> The Board agreed to the deletion of the last two sentences from the second paragraph in this section, to reflect the current position in relation to the Upper Orwell Crossings, along with amendments to the Outcomes and Agreements.		
2.24	<u>Section H: Strategic Infrastructure Priorities, under 2. Other Strategic Infrastructure Priorities. (Outcomes and agreements)</u> The Board discussed clarifying the introductory text to reflect that the degree to which these infrastructure priorities are taken forward through individual Local Plans may vary depending upon the circumstances of each area. Changes reflecting this clarification were agreed.		
2.25	<u>Section H: Strategic Infrastructure Priorities, under 2. Other Strategic Infrastructure Priorities. (Arrangements for necessary ongoing co-operation).</u> Discussion was had around the word 'co-operation' and it was agreed that it appropriately reflects the statutory Duty to Co-operate. Changes were also agreed in relation to the Arrangement for Necessary Ongoing Co-operation to clarify the role of the Board in informing Local Plans.		
2.26	<u>Section I Identification of cumulative/cross-border infrastructure requirements resulting from planned growth, and mitigation measures (Process of reaching</u>		

<p>2.27</p> <p>2.28</p> <p>2.29</p>	<p><u>outcomes and agreements</u>) – Amendments were agreed to clarify that the template referred to is in the form of an agreed set of criteria and questions.</p> <p><u>Page 19 (Arrangements for necessary and ongoing co-operation)</u> – Discussion was had around the word ‘co-operation’ and it was agreed that it appropriately reflects the statutory Duty to Co-operate.</p> <p><u>Page 20 Section J: Mitigation of potential impacts upon internationally protected sites (outcomes and agreements).</u> Minor alteration agreed to J1 in order to reflect the current position and the potential for RAMS to be expanded to reflect Local Plan housing growth.</p> <p><u>Page 21 6 - (Process of reviewing the Statement of Common Ground)</u> – New text was agreed under the heading ‘Process of reviewing the SoCG’ to acknowledge that there may be instances where the ISPA authorities are unable to agree on an outcome and in such an instance this should be documented within future versions of the SoCG. In addition changes were agreed to explain how the SoCG would be updated and to reflect the various iterations of the SoCG that had been produced so far.</p>		
<p>3.0</p> <p>3.1</p> <p>3.2</p>	<p>Statement of Common Ground arrangements for signing</p> <p>AM agreed to produce a revised version of the SoCG for circulation to each authority for signing.</p> <p>SM advised that the guidance from the government on signing SoCG advised that the signatory should record their role in the organisation alongside their signature. It was agreed that this would be done.</p>	<p>AM to update SoCG</p> <p>AM to update SoCG</p>	
<p>4.0</p>	<p>No other business</p>		
<p>5.0</p> <p>5.1</p>	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>It was agreed that the date of the next meeting would be finalised outside the ISPA Board meeting.</p>		