



IPSWICH BOROUGH COUNCIL

Minutes

Meeting	Northern Fringe Development Steering Group
Date	29 January 2013
Time	14:30
Location	Grafton House
Present	Matthew Ling (IBC) (ML) Anita Seymour (IBC Planning Policy) (AS) Phil Sweet (IBC Senior Projects Officer) (PS) Neil McManus (SCC) (NM) Fionnuala Lennon (Atlas) (FL) Nicholle Phillips (Crest Nicholson) (NP) Paul Wranek (Ipswich School) (PW) Stuart Cock (Mersea Homes) (SC) Arwel Owen (David Lock Associates) (AO) Steve Miller (IBC Operations Manager Town Planning) (SM) Mark Knighting (IBC) (MK) Martin Blake (Mersea Homes) (MB) Denis Cooper (IBC) (DC) Graeme Mateer (SCC Highways) (GM)
Apologies	Ian Dix (Vectos) (ID) Dave Watson (SCC) (DW) Carol Grimsey (SCC) (CG)
Distribution	Attendees only
Minutes Agreed	19 March 2013

Items:

		Action	Attachments
2.0	Minutes of Last Meeting 4th December 2012		
2.1	Item 4.5 The meeting with Network Rail (David Ward Regional Director) has not taken place.	SM/ DW	
2.2	Item 5.3 Energy Strategy meeting to be arranged.		

2.3	Item 8 house hold size – more work to be undertaken. Census data at ward level expected in March this will inform the process. Group agreed to keep a watching brief.	PS	
2.4	Item 9 The latest position in on IBC web site.		
2.5	Item 13.8 Infrastructure Group- Group agreed that this was now a priority.		
3.0	Drainage Strategy Update		
3.1	DC provided an update on work undertaken to date by his team.		
3.2	The drainage team have been engaged by SCC to participate in the development of the SPD to ensure sufficient provision is made for SUDs in the master plan.		
3.3	DC had attended a recent project exhibition at Westerfield and several residents expressed concern about flooding of the road and gardens at Lower Road (several times in last year). SUDs used to serve the development might also be used to help alleviate the flooding.		
3.4	DC stressed the plans on display did not show all the SUDs that will be required - there will need to be some SUDs within the yellow or blue development areas as well as along ditch lines. This could affect the allocation of POS or density. It was pointed out that 10% of the residential areas could be POS.		
3.5	At a previous meeting DC had been asked to produce a proposal for producing a rudimentary SUDs master plan which would establish approximate areas and locations for SUDs. This would probably involve modelling the watercourse, ditches and simplified/strategic SUDs and investigating whether the flooding could be alleviated by the site SUDs scheme. The intention is not to produce a final design - more a strategy. The model could easily be used to examine alternatives and refinements.		
3.6	In preparing the proposal IBC have obtained and processed LIDAR ground level data for the sites from the Environment Agency and have imported Mersea Home's model of the Westerfield Watercourse.		
3.7	However there is insufficient detailed information to model /investigate the flooding problem or include the ditch network.		
3.8	DC's intention was to model the site and watercourse as existing to verify/investigate the flooding problem and		

	then create a post development model which includes a simple representation of the volume of SUDs required in each of the 4 main parts of the site.		
3.9	The area of SUDs will depend upon agreement of certain details with SCC (as the future SUDs adoption body and as highway authority) on type of SUDs the distribution of land uses and topography. The appearance of the development will be influenced by the extent and form of the SUDs.		
3.10	National SUDs standards will most likely may apply to the scheme - As a first choice SUDs should be on the surface and close to source – this would avoid the need for deep surface water sewers/gulley etc.		
3.11	The initial SUDs masterplan would also need to include allowable discharges from various parts of the site, more details on the proposed pipe crossing under the railway, phasing and typical street cross sections /sketches.		
3.12	General discussion took place it was noted that; Allowable discharge rates in the future are likely to be lower than now .		
3.13	ML - More works needs to be done how do we proceed?		
3.14	DC - Will need to complete the modelling of the existing position then once the final option is agreed, the SUDs requirement for the development can be modelled. There is no apparent conflict between the different options at the moment.		
3.15	NP - Can DC identify what survey work is required (ditches) to complete the modelling? She would pay for any necessary survey work.		
3.16	SC anxious not to do more than is required for the SPD stage.		
3.17	Action - DC to complete the proposal for developing a rudimentary SUDs masterplan for inclusion in the SPD and submit it to Steve Miller who will discuss with NP / SC	DC/ NP/ SC	
4.0	Update on current public consultation and responses so far		
4.1	A short summary giving feedback from the exhibitions and responses received to date was circulated.		
5.0	Viability testing arrangements / timetable		
5.1	SM - IBC are refining the high level Infrastructure table.		

5.2	NP confirmed she had instructed consultants to undertake an appraisal of option 2 for internal purposes.		
5.3	FL - At the last meeting the Crest and Mersea Homes had agreed to undertake an open book appraisal of the finalised infrastructure table.		
5.4	AO agreed that testing viability at this stage would be helpful. PS we need to understand developers take on viability. SC agreed that it is important to understand viability to inform the SPD.		
5.5	SC - Infrastructure needs to link to number of units delivered.		
5.6	GM confirmed that highways comments on the infrastructure table would be available later in the week.		
5.7	Action – FL / AS agreed to update the Infrastructure table (two weeks).	FL/ AS	
5.8	Crest and Mersea Homes to provide appraisal of finalised table.	NP/ SC	
6.0	IBC draft brief for consultancy advice on viability		
6.1	A general discussion took place. It was agreed further work would need to be undertaken.		
7.0	Phasing and Infrastructure delivery		
7.1	PS/ SM - Identified a need for a route map on phasing and delivery.		
7.2	NP - The phasing plan comes after the infrastructure costs and constraints are identified.		
7.3	The group agreed that the following work stream was necessary:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Infrastructure table with triggers to be completed • Developers undertake a first cut at viability • IBC to instruct consultants to assess Developers and IBC Infrastructure costs and viability information 		
7.4	Outcome a sequence / phasing plan which would deliver development.		
7.5	AO confirmed DLA were working on service requirements Anglia Water – a response to a pre development inquiry was awaited.		

8.0	AMR/SHLAA update		
8.1	RH confirmed that housing completions would have appeared to have bottomed out with 119 completions by March 2013. Completions are expected to grow in 2013/14, for example Colchester Road Fire Station site will be coming forward the 2013/14 figure is expected to be 437.		
8.2	Figures are hard to predict beyond 2 years. SC stated the 5 year land supply figure should be viable. He was keen to understand the AMR/ SHLAA to give confidence in future developments.		
8.3	SC asked if the draft AMR could be circulated. ML agreed IBC would look into whether it could be circulated to the group.	ML	
9.0	Core Strategy Review update		
9.1	IBC are working with colleagues within Ipswich Policy Area.		
9.2	Ipswich Economic Development Strategy will be considered at Executive next week and it is expected that the Core Strategy Review will show that housing need is led by population growth rather than employment growth. There is unlikely to be less need for housing and this housing need must be clearly communicated.		
9.3	SC Will IBC be reviewing % of affordable housing. SM - Affordable housing is subject to viability on a development by development basis.		
9.4	SC - CIL is showing that affordable housing levels are not viable, IBC needs to demonstrate if affordable housing is achievable.		
10.0	Sustainability Appraisal of Options		
10.1	Noted for information.		
11.0	Atlas report on CSP Study Tour		
11.1	Noted for information.		
11.2	SC noted that Ravenswood was well thought of by the group.		
12.0	Other Updates		
12.1	Energy – meeting to be arranged.	PS	
12.2	Transport – PS confirmed that this was the area of most concern for residents.		

	NP details will be teased out with Transport Assessment SM needs to establish principles on how issues will be addressed.		
12.3	Retail – Report for next meeting.		
13.0	Freedom of Information (FOI)		
14.0	AOB		
15.0	Date of next meetings		
15.1	18th March 9:30 – 12:00 16th April 9:30 – 12:00 14th May 14:00 – 16:00 4th June 9:30 – 12:00 2nd July 9:30 – 12:00		

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/>

	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an "x" if relevant
<p>Please indicate opposite any exemptions you are claiming.</p> <p>Remember that some exemptions can be overridden if it is in the public interest to disclose – as decided by the FOI multi-disciplinary team.</p> <p>Exemptions normally apply for a limited time and the</p>	1. That is personal data	
	2. Provided in confidence	
	3. Intended for future publication	
	4. Related to criminal proceedings	
	5. That might prejudice law enforcement	
	6. That might prejudice ongoing external audit investigations	
	7. That could prejudice the conduct of public affairs	x



information may be released once the exemption lapses.

information may be released once the exemption lapses.	8. Information that could endanger an individual's health & safety	
	9. That is subject to legal privilege	
	10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests Item 6 Consultants Brief	x
	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
	12. Other Please describe	