

Briefing Note

Our ref 23744/01/MHE/Dcr
Date 30 April 2019
To Ms Sarah Housden (c/o Mr Ian Kemp)
From Lichfields
Copy

Subject **MAIN MATTER 3 - Whether or not the plan will secure high quality sustainable design and safeguard and enhance the District's landscape character, natural and historic environment**

WORD COUNT 766

- 1.1 We write on behalf of our joint client, Commercial Estates Projects ('CEP') and Hallam Land Management ('HLM'), in response to Main Matter 3 of the 'Main Matters, Issues and Questions' which form part of the forthcoming examination of the Mansfield District Local Plan.
- 1.2 CEG and HLM have made representations in relation to Policy E2c (Penniment Farm) specifically critiquing the requirement for a comprehensive masterplan to be produced for the site. The masterplan requirement within Policy E2c is intrinsically linked to Policy P4. This is a relevant consideration aligned to our comments made below and our response to Main Matter 5.

Issue – Place Making and High-Quality Design

Question 4: Is the requirement in Policy P4 for a masterplan on large sites (5 hectares or more or 150 dwellings) and public involvement in the design of major development proposals justified and how will this be secured and delivered? Should the considerations set out in paragraph 4.36 be incorporated into Policy P4?

- 1.3 No - There is currently insufficient detail and clarity contained within Policy P4 to explain how masterplans will be delivered that are flexible enough to respond to the different stages of the planning process (i.e. Outline applications and Reserved Matters submissions).
- 1.4 Policy P4 needs to be workable for larger and more complex sites that are being delivered in multiple phases with separate Reserved Matters approvals. For example, outline planning permission was granted at Penniment Farm (site ref. 2010/0805/ST) in December 2012 for a mixed-use (residential and employment) development. A masterplan was submitted as part of that application and reflected in the approved Parameter Plan. The scale of the development has resulted in a phased delivery, with delivery of the residential phases of the site in advance of the employment phases. In light of this, it is anticipated that an application for delivery of the employment phase could be submitted to the Council however, the current wording of Policy P4 implies that there could be a requirement at this time to prepare and submit a masterplan for the full Penniment Farm site. This does not reflect the fact that this matter has already been considered as part of the 2012 outline planning application or that a significant portion of the wider site is likely to have been practically completed by this time.
- 1.5 Any masterplan submitted as part of an application for the employment phase at Penniment Farm will align with the existing consented or developed areas of the site. A requirement

however to draft a masterplan for the full site at this time is not practical or reasonable. Policy P4 should therefore be amended to ensure sufficient flexibility is incorporated so as not to inhibit or incur unnecessary additional costs or delays to developers seeking to deliver complex sites.

1.6 Cognisant of the above, we note that Policy P4 refers to the principles of masterplans in Appendix 8 of the Plan. We acknowledge proposed modifications M133 and M134 to Appendix 8 as set out within the Council’s Schedule of Proposed Main and Minor Modifications to the (Submission) Local Plan, December 2018. This update however still fails to provide sufficient detail regarding the masterplan requirements for different types of applications and it does not reflect how the Council will consider masterplans for phased developments at different stages of the planning process. Appendix 8 should therefore be amended to make it clear that any masterplan produced for a particular phase of a development that already has outline permission should only require details of that phase to be included (albeit consistent with the consented/delivered position of adjacent phases). We recommend that a new paragraph is added to Appendix 8 after the first paragraph which should read as follows: *“Any masterplan produced for a particular phase of a development that already has outline planning permission will only be required to include details of that phase (consistent with the consented and/or delivered position of any adjacent phases).”*

1.7 Further to the above, Appendix 8 should also clearly state that the level of detail required in a masterplan submitted alongside a planning application should not exceed the level of detail that would ordinarily be required at that planning stage, thereby acknowledging the different levels of detail available at the outline stage, in comparison to a full application or a reserved matters submission. We also recommend that reference to Appendix 8 is made within Policy P4 so that it reads:

“On large sites (of five or more hectares or 150 dwellings) a masterplan will be required to be submitted as part of any planning application in accordance with Appendix 8.”