



Action Notes

Meeting	Ipswich Strategic Planning Area Board
Date	30 th May 2018
Time	16:00
Location	Orwell Room, Grafton House
Present	Cllr Tony Fryatt (TF) (Suffolk Coastal District Council) (SCDC) Cllr Paul West (PW) (Suffolk County Council) (SCC) Cllr Nick Ridley (NR) (Babergh District Council) (BDC) Cllr Gerald Brewster (GB) (Mid Suffolk District Council) (MSDC) Cllr Carole Jones (CJ) (Ipswich Borough Council) (IBC) Tom Barker (TB) (Babergh/Mid Suffolk District Councils) Robert Hobbs (RH) (Babergh/Mid Suffolk District Councils) Martyn Fulcher (MF) (Ipswich Borough Council) Sarah Barker (SB) (Ipswich Borough Council) Philip Ridley (PR) (Suffolk Coastal District Council) Desi Reed (DR) (Suffolk Coastal District Council) Mark Edgerley (ME) (Suffolk Coastal District Council) Andrea McMillan (AM) (Suffolk Coastal District Council)
Apologies	Cllr David Whybrow (DW) (Mid Suffolk District Council) (MSDC) Cllr John Ward (JW) (Babergh District Council) (BDC) Carlos Hone (CH) (Ipswich Borough Council) John Pitchford (JP) (Suffolk County Council)
Distribution	Attendees, Graeme Mateer (Suffolk County Council) and Cllr Glen Horn, Mid Suffolk District Council
Action Notes Agreed	Agreed.


Items:

		Action	Attachments
1.0	Action notes of meeting held on 23rd April 2018 and matters arising.		
1.1	It was agreed that the action notes from the meeting held on 23 rd April 2018 were an accurate record. IBC to publish on ISPA Board webpage.	SB to publish notes on website.	
1.2	Regarding the outstanding issue of the secretariat. It was agreed that the secretariat would rotate annually and IBC would continue to oversee secretarial duties for the remainder of 2018. IBC to publish revised Terms of Reference on ISPA Board webpage.	SB to update and publish Terms of Reference.	
2.0	Review draft Statement of Common Ground (based on the framework presented at the last IPA Board)		
2.1	AM presented changes to the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG).		
2.2	TB suggested that the SoCG should focus on the key issues, identifying housing need and cross boundary infrastructure requirements and suggested that the timing of the SoCG was premature.		
2.3	PR emphasised the need for the preparation of the SoCG to be an iterative process and for common thinking across the Ipswich Housing Market Area and Ipswich Functional Economic Area. The board acknowledged that this was crucial to avoid delays in bringing forward plans and to be robust at Examination.		
2.4	CJ asked whether appropriate wording could be found for the draft SoCG to allay any concerns. TB acknowledged the importance of an agreed position but considered it should not be in the form of a SoCG until the National Planning Policy Framework is revised. PR emphasised the need to set out a common position on growth across the Housing Market Area and Functional Economic Area.		
2.5	Regarding agenda item 2, bullet 1, 'Strategic vision in relation to future growth', ME suggested that the		

	<p>vision could look to reflect the importance of the energy sector to Suffolk Coastal. RH highlighted the challenge of aligning the ISPA vision with vision documents being formulated by other authorities and organisations. It was agreed that a broad, area-wide vision would be most appropriate and that this should be an agenda item for the next ISPA board meeting. It was agreed that the vision should also make appropriate reference to the vision of the Suffolk Framework for Inclusive Growth.</p>	AM to give further consideration to the strategic vision	
2.6	<p>Agenda item 2, bullet 2, 'Basis for identifying housing and jobs targets'...</p> <p>Item 2, bullet 3, 'IBC SHELAA housing capacity estimate', IBC has identified its SHELAA housing capacity as a range of approximately 7,300 to 9,300 dwellings. IBC reported that they are reviewing previously allocated employment sites. The reason for the range is due to the complex nature of remaining sites. Ipswich will continue to work produce a firm capacity figure.</p>		
2.7	<p>Regarding SoCG item D4 'Provision for gypsies and travellers it was agreed that each authority would seek to meet its own need and that the ISPA Board would provide a mechanism for considering and agreeing how to address need that cannot be met.</p>		
2.8	<p>Considering Section F of the draft SoCG, ME indicated that a Port Logistics Study has been completed for Felixstowe and the SCDC employment land figure will need to reflect the Port's national role.</p>		
2.9	<p>Under section I 'Strategic infrastructure priorities' the Board agreed that it was appropriate to split the 'Ipswich northern route' from the 'Other strategic infrastructure priorities'. The importance of working collaboratively to support the business case was agreed.</p>		
2.10	<p>PR recommended acknowledging the importance of Felixstowe Port to the local economy under section I.2 'other strategic infrastructure priorities'. CJ advised that rail and bus travel had been omitted. It was agreed that a commitment to sustainable and integrated travel would be reflected in the vision statement.</p>		
3.0	Any other business.		

3.1	None		
4.0	Dates of Next Meetings.		
4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 16:00, Wednesday 27th June Location – Grafton House.		

The full action notes 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/>

 <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 information may be released once the exemption lapses.</p>	These minutes contain information;	Please insert an “x” if relevant
	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	
	8. Information that could endanger an individual’s health & safety	
	9. That is subject to legal privilege	
	10. That is prejudicial to commercial interests	
	11. That may not be disclosed by law	
12. Other Please describe		