

<b>CABINET</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM No. 9</b>
<b>13 JUNE 2011</b>	<b>PUBLIC REPORT</b>

Cabinet Member(s) responsible:	Councillor Marco Cereste, Cabinet Member for Growth, Strategic Planning, Economic Development and Business Engagement	
Contact Officer(s):	Simon Machen - Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Richard Kay – Group Manager – Strategic Planning and Enabling Jim Daley - Principal Built Environment Officer	Tel. 453475  Tel. 863795 Tel: 453522

**DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT IN SELECTED VILLAGES SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPD) – ADOPTION VERSION**

<b>R E C O M M E N D A T I O N S</b>	
<b>FROM :</b> Paul Phillipson, Executive Director Operations	<b>Deadline date :</b> June 2011
Cabinet is recommended to adopt the Design and Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to form part of the Peterborough Local Development Framework.	

**1. ORIGIN OF REPORT**

1.1 This report is submitted to Cabinet following approval of the Council’s Local Development Scheme by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, to supplement the overarching design policy contained within the Council’s Core Strategy and following approval by Cabinet of a consultation draft SPD on 13 December 2010.

**2. PURPOSE AND REASON FOR REPORT**

2.1 The purpose of this report is to enable Cabinet to adopt the Design and Development in Selected Villages Supplementary Planning Document (adoption version) (hereafter referred to simply as the ‘SPD’).

2.2 The officer-recommended SPD is available at Appendix 1.

2.3 This report is for Cabinet to consider under its Terms of Reference No. 3.2.1, to take collective responsibility for the delivery of all strategic Executive functions within the Council’s Major Policy and Budget Framework and lead the Council’s overall improvement programmes to deliver excellent services.

**3. TIMESCALE**

Is this a Major Policy Item/Statutory Plan?	<b>No</b>
---	-----------

#### **4. The SPD**

- 4.1 The SPD feeds off the other planning policy documents which make up the Local Development Framework (LDF) which in turn are based on the Peterborough Sustainable Community Strategy. The SPD sets out detailed 'development management' design related planning policies for selected rural villages, which will be used day-to-day by planning officers when considering the detailed aspects of planning proposals.
- 4.2 It is important to note that the SPD:
- **does not** set any strategic growth targets for villages (that is a task for the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations DPD); and
  - **does not** allocate new land for development (that is a task for the Site Allocations DPD).
- 4.3 There is no statutory obligation to prepare this document, but the SPD is seen as a very important planning policy tool to control and ensure high quality development in villages. Whilst, understandably, 'city' residents have generally had very little interest in it, there has been high interest from parishes and village communities.
- 4.4 The policies, if adopted by Cabinet, will become extremely important when determining planning applications. They give the Council the power and justification to either refuse or approve something, especially on detailed design matters (which can be very sensitive in local village communities).
- 4.5 This document is in its second, of two, stages of preparation. Informal consultation took place with parish councils during the late part of 2010, and that assisted in preparing a draft version as approved by Cabinet on 13 December 2010. The draft SPD was then formally consulted upon for 6 weeks in February / March 2011 and has subsequently been very slightly redrafted as a final version for adoption by Cabinet.
- 4.6 In summary, the SPD contains:
- An introduction / context etc;
  - A small set of generic policies, which apply to all the villages; and
  - An individual chapter for each of the villages, each around 4 pages long and containing: description/history of the village; recent studies and policy documents for that village; a specific 'policy' for that village; links to wider evidence base; and a map of the village.

#### **5. CONSULTATION**

- 5.1 Officers have undertaken informal consultation with the applicable parishes over the past few months, including attending parish council meetings and undertaking 'walk through' site visits. This helped shape the draft document, and generated significant 'buy in' from those parishes to the production of the SPD. Planning Committee, LDF Scrutiny Panel and the Rural Commission Scrutiny Panel also had the opportunity to comment on the draft version prior to the formal consultation stage.
- 5.2 During the formal consultation period in February – March 2011, we received a small number of representations, virtually all of a supportive nature. Whilst the first impression may be of surprise at the low level of representation, it should be emphasised that a great deal of work went in to the drafting of the document with the parish councils themselves i.e. the wording is largely the parish council's wording and therefore it would have been surprising to have subsequently received objections from them during the formal (and statutory) consultation period.
- 5.3 Of the small number of representations received, the main issue related to Glinton where the parish council, having read within the SPD what the other villages were proposing, requested a few additional policy lines for their Glinton policy. Following discussion with the

parish council, officers are happy to endorse these amendments and they have been incorporated within the final policy attached.

- 5.4 If approved today, the document will be adopted – there are no further planned consultation stages.

## **6 ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES**

- 6.1 It is anticipated that Cabinet will adopt the SPD, and in doing so it will form part of the Peterborough Local development Framework (LDF).

## **7 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 Cabinet is recommended to adopt the SPD because it will help deliver high quality development in villages and will give parishes a clear policy tool for them to use when commenting on future planning applications. There are no overriding objections as to why the SPD should not be adopted.

## **8 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 8.1 Whilst not a statutory requirement to produce the SPD, the alternative option of not producing this document was rejected because:

- Parishes have been left somewhat in limbo since the previous government amended the planning regulations (2004) which effectively ended, for planning purposes, the statutory basis which was previously applied to Village Design Statements or Parish Plans. This SPD directly takes its content from those prepared VDSs and Parish Plans, and, in effect, gives back the statutory weight they once had;
- There is considerable support for the production of the document, especially from the parish councils;
- The document will greatly assist planning officers and Members in determining planning applications, including enabling a consistent and transparent decision making process to be undertaken; and
- The document is entirely in line with the emerging national ‘localism’ and ‘neighbourhood planning’ approach.

## **9 IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 **Legal Implications** - The Council must follow due Regulations in preparing the SPD. If the SPD is adopted by Cabinet, the Council has a legal duty to determine planning applications in accordance with the policies contained within the SPD.

- 9.2 **Financial Implications** – None, other than small costs which have already been incurred associated with arranging and conducting the public consultation and, assuming it is approved, the subsequent printing of the adoption version of the document, which is budgeted for.

- 9.3 **Other Implications** – As with all planning policy documents, there are social, economic and environmental implications with this SPD because it will directly influence how development will be built in village areas.

## **10 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Used to prepare this report, in accordance with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985)

- None

This page is intentionally left blank