

# Cabinet



*St Edmundsbury*  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

<b>Title of Report:</b>	<b>Recommendations of the Sustainable Development Working Party: 27 January 2016</b>	
<b>Report No:</b>	<b>CAB/SE/16/009</b>	
<b>Report to and dates:</b>	<b>Cabinet</b>	9 February 2016
	<b>Council</b>	23 February 2016
<b>Portfolio holder:</b>	Alaric Pugh Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 07930 460899 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk">alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Chairman of the Working Party:</b>	Alaric Pugh Sustainable Development Working Party <b>Tel:</b> 07930 460899 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk">alaric.pugh@stedsbc.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Lead officer:</b>	Steven Wood Head of Planning and Growth <b>Tel:</b> 01284 757306 <b>Email:</b> <a href="mailto:steven.wood@westsuffolk.gov.uk">steven.wood@westsuffolk.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	On 27 January 2016 the Sustainable Development Working Party considered the following substantive items of business:  (1) Park Farm, Ingham – Adoption of Concept Statement; and  (2) Tayfen Road Development Area, Bury St Edmunds - Masterplan	

<b>Recommendations:</b>	<p>It is <b>RECOMMENDED</b> that, subject to the approval of full Council:</p> <p>(1) <b><u>Park Farm, Ingham –Concept Statement</u></b></p> <p><b>The Concept Statement for Park Farm, Ingham, as contained in Appendix A to Report No: SDW/SE/16/001, be adopted as informal planning guidance; and</b></p> <p>(2) <b><u>Tayfen Road Development Area, Bury St Edmunds – Masterplan</u></b></p> <p><b>The Masterplan for the Tayfen Road Development Area, Bury St Edmunds, as contained in Appendix A, as amended by the changes included in Appendix D, to Report No: SDW/SE/16/002, be adopted as non-statutory planning guidance.</b></p>
<b>Key Decision:</b>  <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <b>do not</b> apply.)</i>	<i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i> Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/> No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As they are full Council decisions.
<b>Consultation:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative option(s):</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002</li> </ul>
<b>Implications:</b>	
<i>Are there any <b>financial</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002
<i>Are there any <b>staffing</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Reports: SDW/SE/16 /001 and 002
<i>Are there any <b>ICT</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002
<i>Are there any <b>legal and/or policy</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002
<i>Are there any <b>equality</b> implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002

<b>Risk/opportunity assessment:</b>		<i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>	
<b>Risk area</b>	<b>Inherent level of risk</b> (before controls)	<b>Controls</b>	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)
See Reports: SDW/SE/16/001 and 002			
<b>Ward(s) affected:</b>		(1) Fornham, Pakenham and Risby (2) Risbygate	
<b>Background papers:</b> <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		Sustainable Development Working Party: 27 January 2016 Reports: <a href="#">SDW/SE/16/001</a> <a href="#">SDW/SE/16/002</a>	
<b>Documents attached:</b>		None	

## **1. Key Issues and reasons for recommendations**

### **1.1 Park Farm Ingham – Concept Statement (Report No: SDW/SE/16/001)**

- 1.1.1 Policy RV6 of the Rural Vision 2031 Local Plan allocates 86 hectares of land at Park Farm, Ingham for leisure, recreation, and tourism development. The site was a sand and gravel quarry and is being restored as arable farm land, species rich grassland and a series of open water lakes. The policy requires the prior preparation and adoption of a Masterplan for the site before applications for planning permission will be determined. The Masterplan is to be based on a Concept Statement approved by the Council. A draft Concept Statement was prepared and subsequently approved for public consultation by the Sustainable Development Working Party on 8 October 2015. The formal consultation process took place from 19 October 2015 to 16 November 2015. The Concept Statement has been amended to take account of comments and suggestions received. Details of these are contained as [Appendix B](#) of Report No: SDW/SE/16/001.
- 1.1.2 The Draft Concept Statement incorporating post-public consultation amendments is attached as [Appendix A](#) to Report No: SDW/SE/16/001.
- 1.1.3 In response to comments made by Councillor Jim Thorndyke, officers undertook to provide minor amendments under existing delegated authority to the text of the Masterplan:
- (a) in the Design Principles Section where the paragraph relating to Phase 2 has some wording that does not quite make sense where it says ‘planting to reach mature further before’; and
  - (b) to change the reference to the Brecks Partnership to Breaking New Ground as this organisation is now known as.
- 1.1.4 The Working Party drew attention to traffic generation issues which would arise once the site was in use as a recreation/tourism facility and which could affect routes from Bury St Edmunds and through nearby villages. Reference was made also to the potential road safety hazards at the proposed access/egress onto the A134 and at points along this road where pedestrians would cross to walk footpaths within the site and the wider parish networks. Officers advised that these matters were outside the remit of the Concept Statement but would be addressed at the later Masterplan and planning application stages. There had been early discussion with officers of the highway authority regarding signage along the preferred routes to the site and other traffic management measures. Nonetheless, the Working Party was of the view that these considerations should be flagged up at an early stage in view of the local concerns expressed.

### **1.2 Tayfen Road Development Area, Bury St. Edmunds – Masterplan (Report No: SDW/SE/16/002)**

- 1.2.1 Policy BV9 of the Vision 2031 Development Plan document allocates land at Tayfen Road, Bury St Edmunds as a mixed development site which seeks to

deliver retail warehousing, food store (around 1,500 sq. metres), leisure uses, residential around 100 units indicative), strategic landscaping and public realm improvements.

- 1.2.2 The allocation was carried forward from Policy BSE9 of the Replacement Local Plan. The policy states that the amount of land available for development, location of uses, access arrangements, mix and design and landscaping will be informed by the Masterplan for the site (noting that the site benefits from a Masterplan adopted in March 2009). A draft replacement Masterplan has been prepared by consultants acting on behalf of one of the landowners. The current Masterplan incorporates the former sports ground of the Railway Club which is currently incapable of use because of its poor condition and is not open for general public use.
- 1.2.3 Consultation was carried out over a 4 week period in October 2015. There were no objections to the principle of re-development of the area. A copy of the Statement of Community Involvement is attached as [Appendix B](#) to Report No. SDW/SE/16/002. This concluded that there was general support for the Masterplan with limited issues being raised. The document has been amended in the light of comments received and these are summarised at [Appendix C](#). A copy of the Masterplan incorporating post-consultation amendments is included as [Appendix A](#). Officers are recommending that the reference in the document to the sports ground being developed 'absolute' for housing be removed as the area is protected by extant planning policy (protection of public open space) and given that the draft Masterplan is not the appropriate vehicle for considering and securing a departure from policy. This amendment to the Masterplan, together with a small number of further minor inconsequential changes recommended by officers, are set out in [Appendix D](#). The promoters of the Masterplan have confirmed that they are willing to make these changes. A request has been made for the Council to adopt the Masterplan as planning guidance.
- 1.2.4 The draft Masterplan is intended as a replacement for the existing Masterplan dating from 2009 which has not been delivered. Given recent major changes in the 'off line' retail market place it is no longer considered that the 2009 Masterplan is deliverable over the Development Plan period (to 2031).
- 1.2.5 The Masterplan under consideration is not entirely consistent with the adopted Concept Statement and seeks to amend the configuration of commercial (non- residential) uses of the site that were envisaged in the previous Concept Statement adopted in 2007. The amendments proposed are a consequence of changed conditions in the retail market. The current Masterplan also proposes residential development on part of the existing allocated 'public open space' to the north of the site.
- 1.2.6 The report advised that if Members resolved to adopt this second draft Masterplan as informal planning guidance, that decision would not preclude future alternative development options from being considered. Such options could emerge in the form of a further amended or further replacement Masterplan or a departure from the adopted Masterplan proposed as part of a planning application (which would fall to be considered on its merits).

- 1.2.7 Whilst the Masterplan under consideration retained the concept of mixed uses for the site, Officers outlined its principal differences with the original Masterplan:
- (i) there was less commercial development proposed, previously the split between residential and commercial had been in the region of 60/40 but was now approximately two thirds residential and one third commercial;
  - (ii) commercial development was located deeper into the site;
  - (iii) the increased residential development along the frontage included a care home; and
  - (iv) residential development was proposed on part of the area of the existing protected open space (the former pitches of the Railway Club).
- 1.2.8 Officers advised in relation to (iv) above that, subsequent to the publication of the report the developers had written to advise that they were in agreement with the recommendation that this proposal should be deleted from the Masterplan although they wished the area to be identified as being for 'potential future housing' and the matter would appropriately be re-visited as part of the subsequent planning application(s).
- 1.2.9 Members raised concerns in relation to the Masterplan which officers responded to as follows :
- (a) **Increased traffic generation** – a statement by the developers that they did not expect more traffic related to an estimate solely based on existing vehicular movements created by the several current uses of the Masterplan area and not general traffic flows along Tayfen Road. A planning application would need to be accompanied by a Transport Assessment which would assess the traffic impacts of the application(s) and make proposals to mitigate these. Members acknowledged that Suffolk County Council's Bury St. Edmunds Transport Strategy 2011 - 2031 had identified that there needed to be improvements to junctions along Tayfen Road but were of the view that there were wider considerations of the need for highway improvements in connection with the re-development of this area of the town and the town centre generally.
  - (b) **Affordable housing** – officers gave an assurance that the starting point for the amount of affordable housing to be sought was 30% in line with the Council's adopted policy. It was acknowledged that the planning application currently being processed in respect of the Masterplan area only contained 10% of affordable housing units but this was a matter which was still the subject of assessment and negotiation and an issue that a lesser percentage was only viable was yet to be agreed, even at officer level. Members re-affirmed the view that that the amount of affordable housing to be provided as an integral part of the overall development should accord with policy expectations.

- (c) **Type of commercial development** – disappointment was expressed that the proposed provision for the lower end of the commercial market was being envisaged. Officers advised that the site was too small to attract a large flagship retailer who in turn would attract smaller, high end of the market outlets alongside it.
- (d) **Pedestrian/cyclist links** – officers gave an assurance that there would be ample opportunities to create such links within the site and with the Station Hill re-development area and ultimately to the railway station.

1.2.10 In conclusion the Working Party asked that the importance it placed on Section 3 of the Masterplan, i.e. 'the Planning Process' which listed and summarised the relevant planning policies relating to the development of the Masterplan area be stressed by the inclusion of an appropriate minute to that effect.

*Note: In the case of public consultation on both of the items above, Officers were satisfied that this had been carried out in accordance with the Vision 2031 Document, the Core Strategy Development Plan and the Council's Protocol for Preparing Development Briefs and Masterplans.*