

Cabinet



Forest Heath
District Council

Title of Report:	Recommendations of the West Suffolk Joint Growth Steering Group: 26 January 2016 – Mildenhall Hub: Development Brief	
Report No:	CAB/FH/16/006	
Report to and date:	Cabinet	10 February 2016
Portfolio holder:	James Waters Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth Tel: 07771 621038 Email: james.waters@forest-heath.gov.uk	
Chairman of the Steering Group:	David Bowman West Suffolk Joint Growth Steering Group Tel: 07711 593737 Email: david.bowman@forest-heath.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Chris Rand Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) Tel: 01284 757352 Email: chris.rand@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	On 26 January 2016, the West Suffolk Joint Growth Steering Group considered the following substantive item of business: (1) Mildenhall Hub: Development Brief	
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that the draft Development Brief be approved for public consultation, subject to the final content being amended to: (1) Reflect the comments of the West Suffolk Joint Growth Steering Group, with approval of the final text to be undertaken in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Growth and the Ward Members for the Market Ward (Mildenhall); and (2) Add an Executive Summary, for circulation to the Members of the Steering Group for	

	comment, prior to the Development Brief going out to public consultation.		
Key Decision: <i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not 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"/>		
<i>The decisions made as a result of this report will usually be published within 48 hours and cannot be actioned until five clear working days of the publication of the decision have elapsed. This item is included on the Decisions Plan.</i>			
Consultation:	• See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
Alternative option(s):	• See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
Implications:			
<i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Report No JGG/JT/16/001 (The cost of the Development Brief is being met from the Government grant for the Hub project)		
<i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
<i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
<i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
<i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i>	See Report No JGG/JT/16/001		
Risk/opportunity assessment: <i>(potential hazards or opportunities affecting corporate, service or project objectives)</i>			
Risk area	Inherent level of risk (before controls)	Controls	Residual risk (after controls)
See Report No JGG/JT/16/001			
Ward(s) affected:	All Wards, but particularly the Market Ward (Mildenhall)		
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>	West Suffolk Joint Growth Steering Group: 26 January 2016 (Report No JGG/JT/16/001 and Appendix 1)		
Documents attached:	None		

1. Mildenhall Hub: Development Brief (Report No: JGG/JT/16/001)

1.1 Officers explained that the purpose of a Development Brief was to set out the planning issues and constraints and provided guidance as to what would need to be addressed in bringing the site forward for development in a cohesive and phased manner to meet the future demands for public services in Mildenhall. This was a separate process, independent to the actual Business Case for the Hub, which is the subject of a separate report on this Cabinet agenda.

1.2 In discussing the proposed Development Brief, Members recommended that the Brief should contain an Executive Summary, outlining the following areas:

- Explaining the value and importance of the Hub, particularly as a community facility.
- To emphasise the proposals for the leisure facilities.
- To include reference to the previous transport study and how this would relate to this development

1.3 Councillor Ruth Bowman, Ward Member for the Market Ward (Mildenhall), explained the current concerns of residents with regard to the issues of traffic, car parking and pedestrian access, within the area of Wamil Way and Church Walk and how this may also be further affected by other potential development within that area.

Therefore, Councillor Bowman proposed that the Development Brief should be amended to reflect:-

- An appreciation of the current concerns raised by residents within that area with regard to traffic, car parking and pedestrian/cycle access.
- This development was not seen in isolation to other live planning applications in that area.
- An acknowledgment of the current known issues of vehicular access at Wamil Way and Church Walk (including parental 'drop-off' for the current school/pre-school).
- A sympathetic account of the current amenities within the area and how this development could affect them (positively).
- An acknowledgment that this development may also require changes to be made to the road system on Queensway.
- An explanation of how any complementary housing would be accessed.

1.4 With regard to the consultation process, Members also stated the importance of ensuring that the community could fully participate in the process. Members also requested for the consultation period to be undertaken for a minimum of six weeks.

1.5 Members also made the following comments with regard to the Hub development (which were outside the specific remit of the Development Brief itself):

- Ensuring that the appropriate safeguarding issues were in place with regard to the use of the buildings which were to be located on the site (Officers confirmed that that this was a primary consideration).
- That the style of the development should fit into the community and which

- could be seen as a landmark development.
- Consideration of the prioritisation of pedestrians over other forms of transport in use within the area.

1.6 Subject to the recommendations made in paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 above, the Steering Group considered that the Development Brief should be approved for public consultation and their recommendations are contained in (1) and (2) above.