

### 13. SALP sites and Development Briefs

13.1 The Council has three tools to assist with developing proposals for development with local communities:

**Concept Statements** – are prepared where necessary for larger sites to develop a high-level vision, setting out how relevant planning policies and objectives can deliver the best possible economic, social and environmental benefits. These are prepared by the Local Planning Authority.

**Masterplans** – (Policy DM3 of the Joint Development Management Policies document, 2015) will be required for proposals on allocated sites where a Concept Statement has been prepared (for many of the larger allocated sites), and *exceptionally* any complex sites which by virtue of size, location or proposed mix of uses is justified by the council to require this approach. These are prepared by developers.

**Development Briefs** – (Policy DM4 Joint Development Management Policies document, 2015) are required when a masterplan is not required, *exceptionally* for proposals which are justified by the council as being of a size; and / or in a location; and / or proposing a mix of uses; and / or of significant local interest such as to make this necessary.

13.2 The tables below sets out those SALP allocations which do/do not require a masterplan or development brief with a reasoned justification for the requirement/non-requirement.

**SALP Allocations which require a development brief or masterplan**

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
SA4(a) Focus of growth – Land west of Mildenhall	97	Mildenhall – adjacent to development boundary	Mixed-use (housing, local centre, employment, schools, leisure, public services)	Yes – see justification	Masterplan required	<p>A Masterplan is required for this very large site to provide a framework for coordinated and integrated delivery of the physical, environmental and social infrastructure required to be provided within this allocation.</p> <p>The Public Services Hub is required to address current demand for public services and has been brought forward through a planning application as a first phase of development within this site allocation (resolution to approve granted on 1 November 2017, subject to</p>

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						conditions and subject to the Secretary of State (upon consultation) confirming he does not intend to call in the planning application for his own determination.) The Hub is not required to be part of the Masterplan as it benefits from an adopted development brief (June 2016).
Site SA6(b) Land at Black Bear Lane and Rowley Drive junction	3.57	Newmarket	Mixed-use (TBC)	Yes – see justification	Development brief required	The site has a complex planning history, is in a Conservation Area and includes three individually Listed Buildings. Any scheme for development of the site must facilitate the restoration and appropriate reuse of the listed buildings and preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						conservation area. It should reflect the highly significant contribution Fitzroy Paddocks makes as a significant feature in the conservation area owing to its openness, historic character and importance to the horse racing industry. The significance of the scheme to the area and the potential for harm to heritage assets makes this an exceptional scheme for which a development brief would be required.
Site SA6(c) Land at Phillips Close and grassland south-west of Leaders	4.25	Newmarket	Housing	Yes – see justification	Development brief required	The site has two distinctive elements: Phillips Close to the south is an existing residential area which has been developed at a relatively low density.

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
Way/Sefton Way						Paragraph 10.19 of the Landscape and Heritage Study (CD:B8) states that to the north the 'L' shaped part of the site comprises a strip of grassland and a woodland tree belt with an associated access track from Hamilton Road. There are additional tree belts to other boundaries of the site which mark boundaries to adjacent residential areas and are of amenity value. Whilst they are in private ownership, they are partially available to the public in the afternoons as part of the network of gallops available to the public for recreation. The area was observed to be used for dog walking. Without careful

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						<p>design for their retention and future management development on this site has the potential to impact on these tree belts and the environmental benefits they provide.</p> <p>The allocation generated significant public interest through the SALP plan-making process in relation to how future development on the site would be achieved. A development brief is required to ensure the comprehensive and coordinated design of both parts of the site, the on-site constraints are taken into account and that appropriate</p>

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						and suitable points of access are achieved.
SA9(a) Land off Turnpike Road and Coopers Yard	9.07	Red Lodge	Housing	Yes – see justification	Development brief required	The site is within multiple ownership and is a mixture of brownfield and greenfield land comprising residential uses, a haulage depot, 1.5 ha mobile home park and a former commercial garage. Due to the multiple ownership, different land uses and need for a joined-up design and layout, a development brief is required.
SA10(a) Focus of growth – North Red Lodge	27.4	North Red Lodge	Mixed-use (housing, employment land, new primary school)	Yes – see justification	Masterplan required	This site is a significant mixed use urban extension to the north of Red Lodge (beyond the boundary of the original Red Lodge Masterplan) and a Masterplan is required to

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						provide a framework for coordinated and integrated delivery of the physical, environmental and social infrastructure required to be provided within this allocation, in particular strategic landscaping and open space to address the potential impact of the proposals on the countryside, to separate uses and to provide amenity space for the new residents.
SA12(a) Land south of Burwell Road and west of Queens View	15	Exning	Housing	Yes – see justification	Development brief required	The site is being promoted by the developer of an adjoining site that is the subject of an extant planning permission for 120 dwellings currently under construction. A Development Brief is required to ensure a joined up



SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						approach to this extension to the village and to address points sets out in Policy DM4 including access arrangements, open space and landscaping and a route for a cycle path within the site.
SA14(a) Land east of Beeches Road	7.8	West Row	Housing	<b>Yes - see justification and proposed main modification MM22</b>	Neither required	The site is in multiple ownership and two planning applications have a resolution to approve on the site (DC/14/2047/HYB for 41 dwellings (full application), up to 90 (outline) and 7 self-build; for part of the site. DC/17/0964/FUL for 6 dwellings - pending determination for part of the site). A remaining parcel to the north of the site is not

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
						<p>currently the subject of a planning application.</p> <p>To ensure a consistent approach in the SALP, and the application of Policy DM4 in the Joint Development Management Policies document, a main modification is sought to Policy SA14(a) to specify that a development brief be required for Land east of Beeches Road to ensure a well-planned, coordinated approach to development and delivery of physical and social infrastructure on this large site.</p>

**SALP Allocations which do not require a development brief or masterplan**

Site	Does the site meet the following criteria set out in Policy DM4: Development Briefs?				Development brief required? Masterplan required? Neither required?  (as set out in relevant SALP policy)	Justification
	Size (ha)	Location	Proposed mix of uses	Of significant local interest		
SA2(a) Land at Warren Close, Brandon	0.67	Brandon	Housing	No	Neither required	Small site is in single ownership with no known constraints to development. Site proposed for a single use.
SA2(b) Land off Gas House Drove	0.30	Brandon	Housing	No	Neither required	Small site in single ownership proposed for a single use. An application DC/16/1450/OUT for 10 dwellings is pending determination. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA3 Brandon Cemetery	1.59	Brandon	Cemetery	No	Neither required	Planning permission for cemetery granted 29 February 2016 (DC/15/1198/FUL). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

						development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA5(a) Land at 54 Kingsway	0.78	Mildenhall	Housing	No	Neither required	Small site in single ownership being proposed for a single use. The site has extant planning permission DC/16/1109/FUL for 6 dwellings on part of the site.
SA5(b) District Council Offices, College Heath Road	2.1	Mildenhall	Housing	No	Neither required	Site is in multiple public sector ownership being promoted for a single use. There are no known constraints to development. All owners/occupiers are signed up to relocating to the Mildenhall Hub site which was granted a resolution to approve on 1 November 2017.
SA6(a) Land at Brickfield Stud, Exning Road	2.90	Newmarket	Housing	No	Neither required	Site is in single ownership with no known constraints to development. Site proposed for a single use.
SA6(d) Former St Felix Middle School Site	4.50	Newmarket	Housing	No	Neither required	Site is in single ownership with no known constraints to development. Site proposed for a single use.
SA6(e) Land adjacent to Jim Joel Court	0.23	Newmarket	Housing	No	Neither required	This small site has extant planning permission for a single use (21 dwellings DC/16/0193/FUL). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA6(f) Land at 146a High Street	0.38	Newmarket	Housing	No	Neither required	This small site has extant planning permission for a single use (46 dwellings DC/15/0754/FUL). Case officer did not consider the

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

						application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA7(a) Matthews Nursery	1.86	Lakenheath	Mixed-use (housing and retail)	No	Neither required	The site has extant planning permission for 13 dwellings (Net gain 12 units) and A1 retail use. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA7(b) Land west of Eriswell Road	5.35	Lakenheath	Housing	No	Neither required	Planning application F/13/0394/OUT for 140 dwellings pending determination with resolution to approve. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA8(a) Rabbit Hill Covert, Station Road	3.45	North Lakenheath	Housing	No	Neither required	Planning application F/2013/0345/OUT for 81 dwellings pending determination, with resolution to approve. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA8(b) Land north of Station Road	22.4	North Lakenheath	Mixed-use (housing and primary school)	No	Neither required	Planning application DC/14/2096/HYB for 375 dwellings and a school, with resolution to approve. Sufficient information was submitted as part of the planning application that a development brief was not required.

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

SA8(c) Land off Briscoe Way	2.78	North Lakenheath	Housing	No	Neither required	Planning application DC/13/0660/FUL for 67 dwellings pending determination, with resolution to approve. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA8(d) Land north of Burrow Drive and Briscoe Way	9.16	North Lakenheath	Housing	No	Neither required	Site is in single ownership with no known constraints to development. Site proposed for a single use.
SA9(b) Land east of Red Lodge: north	5.5	Red Lodge	Housing	No	Neither required	Site is in single ownership with no known constraints to development. and is proposed for a single use. Site included in the original Red Lodge Masterplan (1995 Local Plan).
SA9(c) Land east of Red Lodge: south	14.97	Red Lodge	Housing	No	Neither required	Part of the site has permission for 374 units. Scheme is under construction. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4. Site included in the original Red Lodge Masterplan (1995 Local Plan).
SA9(d) Land west of Newmarket Road and north of Elms Road	4.15	Red Lodge	Housing	No	Neither required	The site has extant planning permission (125 dwellings DC/16/0596/OUT). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

						development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA11(a) Land adjacent to St Johns Street	2.30	Beck Row	Housing	No	Neither required	The site has extant permission for 60 dwellings. (DC/15/0922/OUT for 60 dwellings). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA11(b) Land adjacent to and south of the caravan park, Aspal Lane	4.10	Beck Row	Housing	No	Neither required	Planning permission DC/13/0123/OUT approved outline consent for 117 dwellings. Original application was approved prior to the adoption of the Development Management Policies document in 2015 and the requirement for a development brief. The site is in single ownership for a single use with no known constraints.
SA11(c) Land east of Aspal Lane	0.50	Beck Row	Housing	No	Neither required	This small site has extant permission (DC/15/0321/OUT for 5 dwellings), which has commenced on site. Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA11(d) Land adjacent to Beck Lodge Farm	0.60	Beck Row	Housing	No	Neither required	This small site has extant permission for 24 dwellings (Planning permission DC/14/1745/OUT). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a

SALP – Post-hearing issues for clarification

						development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA13(a) Land to the rear of The Kentford	2.30	Kentford	Housing	No	Neither required	The site has extant permission for 34 dwellings (planning permission DC/14/2203/OUT). Case officer did not consider the application triggered the need for a development brief under the requirements of Policy DM4.
SA13(b) Land at Meddler Stud	2.20	Kentford	Mixed-use (housing and racehorse training centre)	No	Neither required	Planning permission was allowed on appeal for DC/14/0585/OUT 63 dwellings (including 19 affordable,) on 05/05/2016.