

Cabinet



St Edmundsbury
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Recommendations of the Sustainable Development Working Party: 28 January 2015	
Report No:	CAB/SE/15/013	
Report to and dates:	Cabinet	10 February 2015
	Council	24 February 2015 <i>(where applicable)</i>
Portfolio holder:	Terry Clements Portfolio Holder for Planning and Regulation Tel: 01284 827161 Email: terry.clements@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Chairman of the Working Party:	Karen Richardson Sustainable Development Working Party Tel: 07894 390815 Email: karen.richardson@stedsbc.gov.uk	
Lead officer:	Marie Smith Strategic Planning Manager Tel: 01638 719260 Email: marie.smith@westsuffolk.gov.uk	
Purpose of report:	<p>On 28 January 2015, the Sustainable Development Working Party considered the following substantive items of business:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Joint Development Management Policies Document Planning Inspector's Report and Adoption; (2) Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham Development Brief; and (3) West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide Consultation Responses and Adoption. <p>Recommendations for Cabinet consideration emanated from Items (2) and (3) above.</p>	

Recommendations:	<p>It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u>: that</p> <p>(a) <u>Erskine Lodge, Gt Whelnetham Development Brief</u></p> <p>The Development Brief for Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham in its current form, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/002, be <u>NOT</u> adopted; and</p> <p>(b) <u>West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide</u></p> <p>(1) Subject to the approval of full Council, the West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide with suggested amendments, as contained in Appendix A to Report SDW/SE/15/003 be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document subject to it being noted in the Glossary on page 28 in respect of the second item 'Building of Local Interest' , reference to 'Birmingham' be deleted and 'the areas' inserted therefor; and</p> <p>(2) the Head of Planning and Growth be given delegated authority to edit/insert appropriate images as part of the final document publishing process.</p>
<p>Key Decision:</p> <p><i>(Check the appropriate box and delete all those that do not apply.)</i></p>	<p><i>Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition?</i></p> <p>Yes, it is a Key Decision - <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No, it is not a Key Decision - <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Consultation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003
<p>Alternative option(s):</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003
<p>Implications:</p>	
<p><i>Are there any financial implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003</p>
<p><i>Are there any staffing implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003</p>
<p><i>Are there any ICT implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003</p>
<p><i>Are there any legal and/or policy implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003</p>
<p><i>Are there any equality implications? If yes, please give details</i></p>	<p>See Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003</p>

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 Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003			
Ward(s) affected:		All Wards	
Background papers: <i>(all background papers are to be published on the website and a link included)</i>		Sustainable Development Working Party: 28 January 2015 Reports: SDW/SE/15/002 and 003	
Documents attached:		None	

1. Joint Development Management Policies Document – Inspector’s Report and Adoption (Report No: SDW/SE/15/001)

- 1.1 The Cabinet is asked to **NOTE** that the Working Party has made its recommendations in respect of the above document directly to the Joint Development Management Policies Committee. The Joint Committee will meet on 11 February 2015 and will be asked to recommend adoption of the Joint Development Management Policies Document by both St Edmundsbury’s and Forest Heath’s full Councils on 24 and 27 February 2015 respectively.

2. Erskine Lodge, Great Whelnetham – Development Brief (Report No: SDW/SE/15/002)

- 2.1 In discussing the proposed Development Brief, Councillor Clements, as Ward Member, referred to consideration given to the allocation of two sites for residential development in Gt Whelnetham in connection with the Rural Vision 2031 document. At that time, a need for 20 new dwellings in the village had been put forward and to fulfil this sites at Fentons Farm and Erskine Lodge had been allocated. It had been envisaged that 10 dwellings would be provided on the first mentioned with remaining development taking place at Erskine Lodge.
- 2.2 Members expressed surprise that the site at Erskine Lodge had been enlarged as a result of re-modelling and subsequent redefinition of the flood plain. As a consequence there was potential capacity for 63 dwellings to be provided at the site (based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare on the site which was now extended to 2.1 hectares).
- 2.3 The Working Party was of the firm view that the developers should be working on the basis on a lesser figure than this given the constraints which existed in respect of the site. In this regard reservations were expressed about the potential for flooding from surface water as a consequence of redevelopment of the site, despite the floodplain remodelling which had taken place. There was anecdotal evidence that existing properties around the site, for example, the Rushbrooke Arms Public House, had been subject to flooding in past years. There were concerns amongst local residents that the run off of surface water which would be created by any development would aggravate existing flooding problems. There were concerns from Members that the Development Brief did not give due regard to landscape considerations, part of the site being an attractive meadow over which there were open views. The proximity of the sewage treatment plant was also referred to as a further constraint. Despite the proposal to create a cordon sanitaire the prevailing south westerly winds would disperse any odours across the site. There were further concerns about the impact of development on the conservation area (part of the site was within this area) and on a nearby rookery which was protected. The Development Brief had not addressed the siting of an electricity sub-station which would be required with any development.
- 2.4 The Working Party therefore considered that the Development Brief should not be adopted in its current form and this is reflected in recommendation (2) above.

3. West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide (Report No: SDW/SE/15/003)

- 3.1 The West Suffolk Shop Front and Advertisement Design Guide (SFDG) has been drafted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to support the policies of each local planning authority's (LPA) Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies Local Plan Document which in themselves relate to all three priorities contained within the West Suffolk Strategic Plan, (2014-2016).
- 3.2 This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will provide detailed guidance on the design of new and replacement shop fronts throughout West Suffolk. The guidance covers matters such as general design principles; materials and colour; signage and lighting; blinds and canopies; and security measures for retail and other commercial properties.
- 3.3 Public consultation took place between 24 November 2014 and 9 January 2015. The consultation was carried out in line with the adopted Joint Statement of Community Involvement. Copies of the documents were available on the Councils' website and could be inspected at both Councils' principal offices. Letters were sent to statutory consultees, parish councils, adjoining councils and relevant selected interest groups, individuals and bodies.
- 3.4 Nine responses were received to the consultation. The comments have been summarised in the report followed by a suggested Council response and amendment.