



# IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Minutes

<b>Meeting</b>	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
<b>Date</b>	24 <sup>TH</sup> April 2015
<b>Time</b>	11.30
<b>Location</b>	Room 4B, Grafton House
<b>Invited</b>	Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (Chair) (SM) James Cutting (SCC) (JC) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Rosalynn Claxton (IBC Town Planning) (RC) Carlos Hone (IBC Town Planning) (CH) Mark Knighting (IBC Town Planning) (MK) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes and CBRE Investors) (SC) Duncan Innes (Crest) (DE) Kenny Duncan (Crest Strategic Projects) (KD)
<b>Apologies</b>	Matthew Ling (IBC) (ML)
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees only

### Items:

			<b>Attachments</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Minutes of Last Meeting</b>		
1.1	SM asked DK whether Crest would be submitting an application in the summer as per pt 2.4. KD confirmed that this was now unlikely and that Crest would let the Core Strategy (CS) Review take its course. An application is likely in not less than 6 months. Geotechnical survey work had been undertaken and was being updated as necessary; however transport modelling etc. had not started.		
1.2	Minutes agreed.		<b>To Circulate</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>IGS Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Core Strategy Review</b></li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IDP Commission</b></li> </ul>		
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Core Strategy Review</b></li> </ul> <p>RC updated the group on the Core Strategy review. Headlines – about 1000 representations received, with majority of these consisting of the proforma type comments from Save Our Countryside Spaces and Northern Fringe Protection Group. The type of comments received relating to IGS fell into two main types: (i) general comments about infrastructure, environmental impact, multiple starts, piecemeal development, and location of the secondary school; and (ii) specifics about Policy CS10 being too prescriptive, lacking evidence, and no co-ordination for infrastructure delivery.</p>		
2.2	RC confirmed that the next step would be for comments to be reviewed and a report is expected to go to Executive Committee on 16 <sup>th</sup> June.		
2.3	SC asked whether the CS review was still on target for the time frames set out. RC confirmed that it was and that submission was due in July.		
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>IDP Commission</b></li> </ul> <p>RC confirmed that 3 bids were received and that any interviews and a final decision on the appointment would be undertaken by 8<sup>th</sup> May. Following an appointment it was hoped that the first inception meeting could be arranged for the following week.</p>		
2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning application progress</b></li> </ul> <p>RC highlighted that the message from applicants was they were still working to a timetable with an end of April submission for revised material. SC said that Mersea were still waiting for the finalisation of the traffic modelling, prior to submitting extra supporting evidence, and that this is likely to be available in weeks, rather than months.</p>		
2.6	SM stated that a further extension of time to cover additional time could be possible. SC agreed.		
2.7	RC said that IBC had appointed Bespoke Property Consultants (Andy Leahy) for an independent assessment of the CBRE/ Mersea homes viability information. A letter of response is due by the end of the month. The likely response is that further information from CBRE/ Mersea homes will be required.		
2.8	SC reiterated that a full viability submission, alongside all other works (pt 2.3) is due in 2 weeks.		
2.9	<b>Action: IBC summary of CS Review representations to be circulated to group.</b>	<b>RC</b>	
3.0	<b>Updated Secondary School information</b>		

3.1	RC had circulated pupil forecasts prior to the meeting. JC stated that SCC has to deal with the significant level of pupils that are expected by 2020/2021 and thereafter.		
3.2	Additional places are needed for the background growth, and it was anticipated the secondary school at the IGS would accommodate this. SCC will need to consider alternative means of meeting this demand if the IGS secondary school is not delivered on time. SCC are getting close to the point where a decision on this will be necessary.		
3.3	It was agreed that the figures circulated showed nothing that the DSG didn't already know in terms of school place demand.		
3.4	SC asked whether redistribution across the 4 catchment schools (Northgate High School, Copleston High School, Ormiston Academy, and Westbourne Academy) would be possible. JC confirmed that Ormiston has extra capacity in land terms, to potentially enable an increase in numbers, however that in education terms, it needs significant improvement. Also the impact from additional pupil numbers on the highway network would need to be considered with SCC colleagues.		
3.5	SC said that Mersea/CBRE had reviewed its delivery number, and that they would double check the figures and circulate. Based on revised delivery the development would be completed in 2041.		
3.6	A discussion was had regarding school place delivery and whether compulsory education until the age of 18 would have an impact, or whether 6 <sup>th</sup> form college funding changes might change provision. KD considered that A/H delivery at the IGS and Faith School provision locally may impact this 6 <sup>th</sup> form place delivery, however was satisfied that if there was a consensus regarding any future s.106 agreement, that this is unlikely to be brought up. JC was happy to have a discussion on these points as and when necessary.		
3.7	In conclusion JC stated that secondary school provision needed consideration, and a decision was going to have to be taken by SCC at the point of investment, sometime after Feb 2016.		
3.8	<b>Action: Mersea/CBRE to circulate IGS estimated delivery document.</b>	<b>SC</b>	
4.0	<b>IDP Commission - discussion of tenders received</b>		
4.1	SM confirmed that the three tenders had been circulated to the interested parties prior to the meeting. RC went on to		

	introduce the tenders.		
4.2	A round the table discussion was had and feedback from all parties on the quality of the submission in response to the original brief was noted.		
4.3	FL felt that it would be very beneficial if the developers were part of the decision making process on who is chosen. SM agreed that a single person (representing all the land owners) could be present at any interviews arranged, in an observational capacity. DE said that the same person should be at both interviews to ensure consistency, and was happy for SC to take that roll.		
4.4	<b>Action: IBC to keep developers/landowners updated on the arrangement of any interviews and further evaluation of the submissions.</b>	<b>RC</b>	
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Freedom of Information (FOI)</b>		
5.1	Commercially confidential information discussed at pt 4.0 is not included in minutes.		
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Any Other Business</b>		
6.1	SM announced that ML was leaving at the end of May, and that a new 'Head of Development' would be employed as a replacement. Either this post, or the new Planning and Building Control Ops Manager would chair the DSG meetings after May 2015.		
6.2	<b>Action: Duncan Innes (Crest) to be added to the invitee list for future DSG meetings.</b>	<b>RC</b>	

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 <b>personal data</b>	
2. Provided in <b>confidence</b>	Financial details of 4.0
3. Intended for <b>future publication</b>	x
4. Related to <b>criminal proceedings</b>	
5. That might prejudice <b>law enforcement</b>	
6. That might prejudice ongoing <b>external audit</b> investigations	
7. That could prejudice the <b>conduct of public affairs</b>	
8. Information that could endanger an individual's <b>health &amp; safety</b>	
9. That is subject to <b>legal privilege</b>	
10. That is prejudicial to <b>commercial interests</b>	
11. That <b>may not be disclosed by law</b>	
12. <b>Other</b> Please describe	