

Key Decision Required:	No	In the Forward Plan:	No
-------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------	-----------

CABINET

15 JUNE 2011

REPORT OF PLANNING PORTFOLIO HOLDER

A.10 PETITIONS IN OBJECTION TO PROPOSALS FOR GROWTH IN NORTH-WEST CLACTON AND THE SLADBURY'S LANE AREA OF CLACTON

(Report prepared by Gary Guiver)

PART 1 – KEY INFORMATION

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To report back to the Cabinet the receipt, on 14 April 2011, of a 1,008 name petition in objection to the proposals for development in North-West Clacton and a 2,004 name petition in objection to proposals for development in the Sladbury's Lane area of East Clacton. These relate to Key Projects 4, 5 and 6 and 11 in the Council's Local Development Framework – Core Strategy and Development Policies Proposed Submission Document (Regulation 27).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Core Strategy and Development Policies Document was published on 21st October 2010 for just over six weeks formal public consultation ending on 6th December 2010. That document identifies the north-western periphery of Clacton-on-Sea as the location for the largest concentration of new development proposed for the 20-year LDF plan period with three main 'projects' affecting the area:

- Project 4 – St. John's Relief Road: A new road linking the A133 to west Clacton and Jaywick Lane provide relief for the existing road network and provide access to land for new development;
- Project 5 – Hartley Meadows Neighbourhood Development: A development of 3,100 new homes including a new medical centre, primary school, local shops and open spaces; and
- Project 6 – Brook Business Park: A new landmark 'gateway' business park with direct access onto the A133 at the entry to the town.

The Core Strategy also included proposals for a large 'neighbourhood development' on the eastern side of Clacton in the vicinity of Sladbury's Lane.

- Project 11 – East Clacton Neighbourhood Development: A development of 700 new homes, new school, local shops and open spaces and the expansion of Valley Farm Holiday Park.

The 2010 consultation exercise was carried out in full accordance with the relevant planning regulations and during the formal consultation period, a small number of focussed objections to the proposals in North-West Clacton were received but nearly 100 objections to the East Clacton

proposals were received.

On 14th April 2011, the Council was presented with a petition of 1,008 names with the following statement:

“We, the undersigned are very much against the Local Development Framework which contains 3,100 dwellings and a by-pass off St. John’s Road near Jaywick Lane and would ask for further consultation and a re-think on these proposals for Clacton.”

On 26th April 2011, the Council was presented with a petition of 2,004 from the ‘Sladbury’s Lane Protest Group’ with the following statement:

“We the undersigned are against the Local Development Framework which contains plans to build a new housing estate of 700/900 properties (30% affordable) and extend Valley Farm caravan site on the land adjoining Sladbury’s Lane”.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Cabinet notes the content of the two petitions but that any decision with regard to future action is deferred to be considered in the context of the formal responses to the 2010 LDF consultation exercise which will be reported back to the Cabinet in due course.

PART 2 – IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

DELIVERING PRIORITIES

The Local Development Framework is a statutory requirement for all Councils in accordance with the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (as amended).

RESOURCES AND RISK

Agreeing to carry out further consultation, as requested in the first petition, consultation has the potential to further delay the progress of the Core Strategy depending on the scale and nature of consultation.

Any decisions with regard to the future of specific projects within the Core Strategy should be taken with an understanding of potential risks, as advised by Officers in reporting back the findings of the 2010 consultation exercise.

LEGAL

Council Procedure Rule 35 from the Constitution requires that these petitions be reported to the next Cabinet meeting.

The decision whether to carry out additional consultation is at the Cabinet’s discretion. To date, consultation has been carried in full accordance with the planning regulations.

Any major changes to specific projects in the Core Strategy would need to be published for public consultation explaining the reasons for the change to enable third parties to comment and for the changes to be discussed at the Public Examination in front of an Independent Planning Inspector who will be examining the Core Strategy against the 'tests of soundness'.

OTHER IMPLICATIONS

Consideration has been given to the implications of the proposed decision in respect of the following and any significant issues are set out below.

Crime and Disorder / Equality and Diversity / Health Inequalities /Area or Ward affected / Consultation/Public Engagement.

Area or Ward affected – Bockings Elm Ward; Burrsville Ward; St. Bartholomew's Ward; St. John's Ward.

Consultation/Public Engagement – The first petition is requesting further consultation.