

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------|
| Subject: | Shoreham Harbour: Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) Update | | |
| Date of Meeting: | 15 September 2011 | | |
| Report of: | Strategic Director, Place | | |
| Contact Officer: | Name: | Mike Holford | Tel: 29-2501 |
| | Email: | mike.holford@brighton-hove.gov.uk | |
| Key Decision: | No | | |
| Ward(s) affected: | South Portslade; Wish; Hangleton & Knoll | | |

FOR GENERAL RELEASE

1. SUMMARY AND POLICY CONTEXT:

1.1 The report seeks approval to adopt an update of Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) for Shoreham Harbour. Prior to the production of more formal planning policies to guide the regeneration of Shoreham Harbour, Interim Planning Guidance has been jointly produced with Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council and adopted by all three Councils in January 2009. The IPG has now been updated to reflect factual changes since then. Cabinet Member approval for public consultation on a draft updated IPG was given in May 2011. Amendments have been made to the IPG following consultation in July 2011 and approval is now sought to adopt the updated IPG. Adur District and West Sussex County Councils will also be adopting the IPG. A copy of the updated IPG is attached as appendix 1.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Cabinet Member agrees to adopt the Shoreham Harbour: Interim Planning Guidance update, subject to any minor grammatical and non-material text and illustrative alterations agreed by the Strategic Director Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning, Employment, Economic Development and Regeneration, and agreed by Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council.

3. RELEVANT BACKGROUND INFORMATION/CHRONOLOGY OF KEY EVENTS:

3.1 For some time there has been an aspiration to regenerate the Shoreham Harbour Area, and this is an objective that Brighton & Hove City Council (BHCC), Adur District Council (ADC), and West Sussex County Council (WSCC), the three responsible authorities, have supported and continue to support. The objectives of regeneration are reflected in previous and emerging planning policy documents for the area, notably the BHCC saved local plan policies, and the emerging BHCC (and ADC) core strategies. At a national level, this has been recognised by the project receiving funding under growth point and eco town programmes.

- 3.2 The purpose of the Interim Planning Guidance (IPG) is to provide those interested in the regeneration of the Harbour with a), a summary of the existing planning policy framework for the Harbour, namely the relevant policies as contained in the BHCC Local Plan and emerging BHCC and ADC core strategies, and b), an overview of the future development priorities for the Shoreham Harbour regeneration area during the interim period (2011-2012).
- 3.3 The IPG does not establish new planning policy but, through setting out the background and context to the regeneration plans, aims to help encourage the type of development that is in keeping with the future vision for the Harbour, whilst planning policies are being prepared in the respective core strategies. The IPG has now been updated to reflect a number of factual changes. Consultation on these proposed changes took place between 13 June and 22 July 2011. Further amendments have been made to the IPG as a result of consultation. A schedule of the responses and how the IPG has been changed as a result is set out in appendix 2. In summary the responses covered:
- The need to include specific reference to the 'West Hove Lagoon Area' in reflection of how the community describes that part of the harbour.
 - The need for clearer differentiation between areas within Portslade and areas within Hove which are geographically distinct.
 - A comment that the project may have the effect of 'squeezing out' local businesses in favour of 'mixed use gentrification'. A recognition by the local community of the current role of the harbour as providing space for enterprises that do not easily sit alongside residential areas and that the project could reduce the opportunities for these types of businesses to flourish in the future, impacting on the local economy.
 - Southern Water commented that sufficient site capacity for future waste water treatment works (current site is in Adur) should be allocated for and protected.
 - The environmental impacts of temporary uses in the interim period.
 - The importance of positively highlighting the need to protect and enhance local nature designations, biodiversity, green infrastructure and access to the waterfront. The need for greater recognition of the potential impact of development on water quality and marine habitats.
 - The need to be clear about the planning weight of this document and its relationship with the Core Strategies and any future policy documents for the harbour.
- 3.4 The IPG does not constitute a formal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as part of the Local Development Framework but the policies it contains are material planning considerations in the determination of any planning application to which those policies apply.

4. CONSULTATION

- 4.1 The contents of this report have been discussed and agreed in advance with Adur District Council and West Sussex County Council.

5. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

- 5.1 The only direct financial implication for Brighton and Hove City Council relates to a small element of officer time. The consultation referred to was funded via Adur District Council.

Finance Officer Consulted: Karen Brookshaw

Date: 05/08/11

Legal Implications:

- 5.2 As stated in paragraph 3.4 of the report the Interim Planning Guidance does not have any formal status under the Local Development Framework. However, insofar as the Interim Planning Guidance contains saved Brighton & Hove Local Plan policies and planning policies as contained in Brighton and Hove City Council and Adur District Council's emerging core strategies those policies are themselves material planning considerations to be taken into account in the determination of relevant planning applications. No adverse human rights implications have been identified as arising from the report.

Lawyer Consulted: Bob Bruce

Date: 26/08/11

Equalities Implications:

- 5.3 None directly arising through the IPG.

Sustainability Implications:

- 5.4 The IPG aims to prevent piece-meal development in the short-term that would hinder the long term sustainable regeneration of the Shoreham Harbour area.

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 5.5 None identified.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 5.6 See below.

Corporate / Citywide Implications:

- 5.7 The intention of the IPG is to minimise the risk of inappropriate piecemeal development. Shoreham Harbour is a potentially significant employment area and strategic development site for the city. Careful management of development in this area is a city-wide priority.

6. EVALUATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S):

- 6.1 The alternative was not to produce Interim Planning Guidance in which case the potential for development to prejudice the long-term aims for the area would remain. Another option would be to produce a formal Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This option has been discounted due to the time and costs involved in preparing an SPD.

7. REASONS FOR REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 To provide informal planning guidance in the short-term for the wider Shoreham Harbour area pending the preparation of Core Strategies.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Shoreham Harbour : Interim Planning Guidance Update
2. Responses to Interim Planning Guidance Consultation Draft

Documents in Members' Rooms

None

Background Documents

1. Shoreham Harbour: Interim Planning Guidance Update