

PADSTOW TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices, Station House
Station Road
Padstow
Cornwall
PL28 8DA

Kathy Pemberton
Town Clerk
Email: enquiries@padstow-tc.gov.uk
Website: www.padstow-tc.gov.uk
Tel: 01841 532296



13 June 2019

TO: NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP

Councillors: F J Bealing, A P Flide, A Rickard, D N Vivian, Mrs T Walter and C Watson-Smyth

Also invited: R Buscombe (Cornwall Councillor) and Paul Weston (Community Consultant)

Dear All

You are invited to attend a meeting of the **Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group** on **Wednesday 19 June 2019** at **6.30 pm** to be held at **Station House, Station Road, Padstow**. Please note agenda below for discussion and consideration.

Yours faithfully

K E Pemberton
Kathy Pemberton
Town Clerk

A G E N D A

- 1.** Election of Chairman
- 2.** To receive apologies for absence
- 3.** Declarations of Interests
- 4.** Public Participation: To receive submissions from members of the public relating to items on the agenda, in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct and Standing Orders.
- 5.** Meeting Note (2 April 2019) (p 1-3)
- 6.** Terms of Reference: To receive the terms of reference and make any recommendations for amendment to Council (if necessary) (p 4-5)
- 7.** Local Green Spaces - Landowner Comments: To receive an update and discuss and decide on the way forward where necessary. (p 6)
- 8.** Cornwall Council Initial Comments: Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan (1st Consultation Version April 2019): To receive report and discuss and decide on the way forward. (p 7-10)
- 9.** Consultation: To receive report and discuss and decide on way forward. (p 11-12)
- 10.** Project Plan and Budget: To receive an update (p 13-15)
- 11.** Next Meeting: TBC

**Padstow Town Council
Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group**

Notes of meeting held on Tuesday 2 April 2019 at 6.30 pm at Padstow Town Council Offices, Station House, Station Road, Padstow

Present: Councillors A Rickard (Chairman), K Freeman, H M Saunders and C Watson-Smyth

In Attendance: Paul Weston (Community Consultant), Kathy Pemberton (Town Clerk), Tracey Trestain (Support Officer and note taker) and 4 members of the public

1. **Apologies:** Apologies were received for Councillors R Higman and D N Vivian.
2. **Declarations of Interest:** There were no declarations of interest.
3. **Public Participation:** One member of the public addressed the group and thanked the Town Clerk for providing him with a copy of the draft Plan. He considered it a very good draft and starting point. He understood that the 1st draft consultation document was a working document but wanted to give his thoughts i) PAD1 should include mention of the AONB; ii) PAD5 suggestion of land for Local Green Space consideration - burial ground at Trevone iii) Porthmission Close does have road layout for further expansion which could take place in that area, but understands that this has been a conflicted site.

The Chairman also acknowledged another member of the public who was present and thanked them for their email comments which were received.

4. **Meeting Notes (6 February 2019): RESOLVED** that the meeting notes were a true record of the meeting held on 6 February 2019
5. **Plan consideration and background papers**
 - i) **PAD 6 Settlement Boundaries:** The Chairman asked the Group if it was happy to support the Settlement Area Boundaries as proposed by the Growth Impact Task Group and detailed in the draft plan (Padstow boundary on Map 6, pg29 of draft plan and Trevone boundary on Map 7, pg30 of draft plan).

Action: Agreed to accept and include the Settlement Area maps (as pg29 & 30 of 1st consultation version of the Neighbourhood Plan) for consultation purposes.

ii) Housing Land Policy Options: The Chairman asked the Group if it was happy that a 'criteria-based approach' be taken with PAD 18 Treceus Industrial Estate. The Town Clerk added that the 'criteria-based' approach was approved by the Committee in July 2018 for the PAD7 and PAD11.

Action: Agreed to accept the use of 'criteria-based approach' for inclusion as PAD18 Treceus Industrial Estate in the Draft Plan for consultation purposes.

iii) PAD12 Second Homes: The Chairman referred the Group to the paper and asked if the members wanted to include a permanent residency policy in the draft plan for consultation purposes. The Town Clerk clarified that over 75% of respondents to the questionnaire had wanted something to be included.

Action: Agreed to accept the inclusion of the permanent residency policy (PAD12) for consultation purposes.

iv) PAD19 Padstow Town Centre: It was mentioned that MAP 10 (Pg46 of draft plan) was an option to test at consultation. It was likely this may change after further consultation but was a good starting point.

Action: Agreed to accept and include Map 10 as Padstow Town Centre for consultation purposes.

- 6. Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan:** The Chairman reminded members that the Plan was a 1st Version Consultation Plan. He would like to see members agree to this draft version to be sent to Cornwall Council. He considered that this Group could then meet to give consideration to the views of Cornwall Council and then go out to public consultation. After which he then felt it best to give consideration to the outcome from the consultation and update/amend the Plan as necessary.

He went on to say that comments to the draft Plan from both Task Group and Steering Group members have been received. He offered his thanks and commented that overall the comments had been positive. He considered that the next step was testing where we were and hearing back from Cornwall Council and our community, and then reviewing the Plan at that stage and amending as necessary. Copies of these emails were tabled at the meeting for information and future discussion.

One member wished a date be set to go through the document in detail, he had various comments to make. In his view he felt it was premature to give to Cornwall Council at this stage. It was a large document and he considered it required more finessing before sending to Cornwall Council. He also questioned if it was the right thing to do to send to Cornwall Council as he was aware they were under pressure with recent organisational changes within the planning department. Mr Weston commented that it was common practise to share early draft plans with Cornwall Council, to make sure they comply with the Cornwall Local Plan and other planning documents. He considered this worthwhile to avoid putting a document out for further consultation with the public which could raise expectation and then Cornwall Council come back to say that something could not be included. He thought Cornwall Council would be able to come back within 3-4 weeks, from this members can see what they advise and look to amend or revise policies as necessary. The consultant considered it was key to establish good communication with the local authority on an early version of the Plan.

Members gave this matter their due consideration, comment was made that this was a draft version and could be changed/amended later once comments had come back from Cornwall Council and the public.

Action: Agreed to accept the 1st consultation version of the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan as the version to be sent to Cornwall Council for their comment for consultation purposes. Councillor Saunders requested his name be recorded as voting against this decision.

- 7. Local Green Space Landowners:** The Town Clerk asked members if they knew any of the landowners who had not been identified in the agenda papers. Comment was made that Dennis Cove was owned by the Harris's and Polpennic Drive and Porthilly View were thought to be in the ownership of Cornwall Council.

The Town Clerk confirmed she would now be able to write to the landowners to advise that their land had been identified as a local green space and to seek their views.

Mention was made regarding Trevone burial site. Mr Weston advised that the burial site is unlikely to meet the criteria for green spaces.

- 8. Project Plan and Budget:** The Town Clerk updated that the plan had slipped. Regarding the budget Locality's funding had been received and the Town Council had budgeted £10,000 for 19/20.
- 9. Date of Next Meeting:** To be confirmed.

The meeting ended at 7.05pm

**PADSTOW TOWN COUNCIL
NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP**

Terms of Reference

Purpose and Aims

- The main purpose of the Steering Group is to oversee the preparation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan for the civil Parish of Padstow in order that it will then progress to the independent Examination and a successful community referendum and ultimately be adopted by Cornwall Council to become planning policy
- In compiling the plan, to ensure that there has been consideration of the needs of all residents and businesses now and in the future through appropriate consultation and involvement
- The Steering Group will be established for a time-limited period

Objectives

- Manage and coordinate the production of a Neighbourhood Development Plan consistent with government and CC guidelines and taking into account relevant local plans, such as the Parish Plan
- Provide progress reports from time to time to full Council and seek approval to any recommendations (if required)
- Co-ordinate engagement with all of the community, as and when necessary
- Develop a project plan to include detailed timescales for approval by full Council

Decision Making

- Unless the Council decides it wishes to have a matter referred to them the Steering Group has delegated authority from the Council to deliver its plan making functions up to consultation of the Draft Plan
- The Steering Group, if it so wishes, can refer a matter to the Town Council for consideration/decision
- The plan-making process remains the responsibility of the Town Council as the qualifying body. All publications, consultation and communication engagement exercises will be undertaken by or on behalf of the Town Council with appropriate recognition of the Parish Council's position given in all communications associated with the project.
- Submission version of the plan to be approved by Full Council prior to submission.

Working Groups

- The Steering Group may establish working groups, made up of volunteers from the community to aid them in any Neighbourhood Plan related work
- Chairman of the Steering Group, or failing him/her another member of the Steering Group, to Chair the Working Group, to ensure joined up working with the Steering Group.

Finance

- A budget has been approved by full Council in taking forward a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Group has authority to spend within the budget set, anything over this budget permission to be obtained by full Council.
- All grants and funding will be applied for and held by the Town Council who will ring-fence the funds for Neighbourhood Development work

Membership

- Drawn from Padstow Town Council members (6 appointed)
- Cornwall Councillor (Councillor R Buscombe)

Also:-

- Any member of the community, from time-to-time, in progressing specific areas within the Neighbourhood Development Plan can be called to attend

Meetings

- Meetings to be chaired by the Chairman, appointed by full Council
- Meetings to be held as necessary.
- Agendas to be circulated at least 3 clear days before the meeting but where possible more time will be given
- The Town Council will provide secretarial support for the Steering Group meetings. Minutes shall be made publically available on Padstow Town Council's website.
- Decisions made by the Steering Group should normally be by consensus at Steering Group meetings. Where a vote is required each Steering Group member as detailed above, will have one vote. Quorum to be 3, but must include at least one Padstow Town Councillor. A simple majority vote will be required to support any motion. The Chairman shall have one casting vote.
- All interests must be declared if being perceived as relevant to any recommendations put forward by the Steering Group, which will be recorded in minutes of the meetings. All members and any person on the Steering Group, from time to time, to follow the Code of Conduct adopted by Padstow Town Council.
- Any donations or assistance made by outside organisations and businesses to be declared and must not influence the plan
- The public can observe the meeting and speak at the Chairman's discretion
- All meetings to be held at Padstow Town Council offices. Dates of future meetings will be made publically available on the Padstow Town Council website.

Working Group

- A Working Group is to be formed, meeting when it feels necessary, to enable specific tasks and pieces of work to be taken forward, reporting back to the Steering Group any issues for consideration on specific aspects of the plan.
- Steering Group to agree Working Group membership which is to be drawn from the community and drawing on individuals' relevant expertise.
- The Terms of reference of the Working Group are to assist the Chairman in carrying out the work/projects determined by the Steering Group.
- Members of the Working Group are to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct.
- The Chairman, or failing him another member of the Steering Group, is to lead the Working Group, to ensure joined up working with the Steering Group.

Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Consultation with Owners of Proposed Local Green Space (Apr-May 2019)

| | Site | Owner(s) | Owner's Reaction | Reason (summarised) | Date |
|----|--|---|---|--|--------------------|
| 1 | Chapel Stile Field | Padstow Town Council | Supports Designation | Report considered and position agreed at Town Council meeting | TC Minute 23/04/19 |
| 2 | Dennis Cove Lake Area | C Harris-Brown | Does not object to Designation | Members made aware that the site may not meet the criteria of the NPPF | Email 15/05/19 |
| 3 | Land at Downstream Close | Live West | Supports Designation | Supports designation if it is acknowledged that the site is not public open space and public access may be restricted at times | Email 25/04/19 |
| 4 | Gateway site (junc. of B3276 & A389) | Prideaux-Brune Estate | Does not object to Designation | No plans to develop site | Email 30/04/19 |
| 5 | The Green, Porthmissen Beach | Padstow Town Council | Supports Designation | Unlikely that we would object to the gateway site, although we are looking into this a little further | TC Minute 23/04/19 |
| 6 | The Lawns Play and Recreation Area | Padstow Town Council | Supports Designation | Report considered and position agreed at Town Council meeting | TC Minute 23/04/19 |
| 7 | Lodenek Avenue Play Area | Cornwall Council | Does not object to Designation | Report considered and position agreed at Town Council meeting | Email 23/04/19 |
| 8 | Pellew Close Play Area (a) | Cornwall Council | Does not object to Designation | Believes that an additional policy to protect is not necessarily a bad thing. Ask it to be noted that the protection would not affect changes to management, such as removal of play equipment where alternative locations are better, or new landscape treatments. | Email 23/04/19 |
| 9 | Pellew Close Play Area (b) | Cornwall Council | Does not object to Designation | Believes that an additional policy to protect is not necessarily a bad thing.... | Email 23/04/19 |
| 10 | Allotments adj. Plantation | Prideaux-Brune Estate | Does not object to Designation | Believes that an additional policy to protect is not necessarily a bad thing.... | Email 30/04/19 |
| 11 | The Plantation | Padstow Town Council | Supports Designation | The estate has always and will continue to preserve this for the use and enjoyment of locals. | TC Minute 23/04/19 |
| 12 | Land at Polpennic Drive/Soldon Close | Trecerus Management No 1 Ltd | Still awaited, deadline to respond 14 June 19 | Report considered and position agreed at Town Council meeting | |
| 13 | Land corner of Porthilly View | Cornwall Council | Does not object to Designation | Believes that an additional policy to protect is not necessarily a bad thing. | Email 23/04/19 |
| 14 | Rope Walk Allotments | Padstow Town Council | Supports Designation | Report considered and position agreed at Town Council meeting | TC Minute 23/04/19 |
| 15 | Walled Garden, St Saviours (Oak Terrace Gardens) | Prideaux-Brune Estate | Objects to Designation | No intention to develop site for housing Interested in introducing a commercial element, also providing employment, to the site to help bring the garden back to life Have recently commissioned a Heritage Statement and Impact Assessment to advise on what could be done Designation would be counter-productive | Email 30/04/19 |
| 16 | Wheal Jubilee Parc | Wheal Jubilee Parc Millennium Green Trust | Supports Designation | It is positive to see that the Wheal Jubilee Parc has been recognised as a local green space and designated accordingly. I agree that it should be protected and agree with the proposed actions and suggested wordings. | Email 02/06/19 |

Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan – CC Review of Draft of 1st Consultation Version with Consultant's Suggestions for SG to Consider

Agenda Item 8

| Reference | NDP Officer Comments | Reason | Consultant's Suggestion |
|---|--|--|--|
| p.7 – AONB map | Could you add a key? | Clarity and ease of understanding | 1 A revised map (easier to interpret) with a key should be included |
| p.15 – 7.2 | Would be useful to include reference to the AONB Management Plan here ¹ | Additional evidence support I note it is referenced later in the NDP | 2 A specific reference to the AONB Management Plan could be included in para 7.2. |
| p.19 Policy PAD2 <i>Public rights of way should be protected from developments. Improvements to the existing network of public rights of way will be supported providing their value as wildlife corridors is protected and, if possible, enhanced.</i> | Suggested re-wording <i>Public rights of way must be protected from development, and where a planning proposal affects an existing PRoW appropriate mitigation must be agreed and approved as part of the planning approval process</i> | Adds some robustness to the policy. Mitigation would be likely to be a re-routing of a PRoW or accommodation of the route through a development site. This would be agreed by the Countryside Access team at CC who would be consulted automatically if a development affects a PRoW | 3 Please note Examiners tend not to like use of the word "must" and should be avoided. The suggested re-wording of the rest of the policy is acceptable if there is reference in the supporting text to recognising the value of public rights of way as wildlife corridors and protecting that and taking any opportunity to enhance it. |
| p.20 Policy PAD03 <i>Development proposals that enable farm diversification or for changes required for agriculture or land management practices, which respect or enhance the character and natural beauty of the AONB and other areas of countryside, will be supported, providing that proposals are complementary to, or compatible with, the existing agricultural use.</i> | Suggested re-wording <i>Farm diversification proposals will be supported which respect or enhance the character and natural beauty of the AONB</i> | Simplifies the policy wording and I don't think the final part of the sentence was required | 4 The suggested change/simplification would, potentially, enable diversification into a wider range of non-agricultural activities, if they are not prevented by other policies. This suggested re-wording is a matter for the SG to consider. |
| p.22 Policy PAD4 <i>Development proposals affecting locally identified heritage assets will only be supported where they retain and enhance the built character and heritage value of the asset and its setting and</i> | Suggested rewording <i>"Development proposals affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets will only be supported where they retain and reflect the built character and value of the heritage asset and its setting"</i> | Unclear as to what is considered 'locally identified heritage assets' – I understand that a list is being developed but I am unclear if it exists now? Simplified wording. | 5 The simpler policy wording is acceptable. However, if changed as suggested, it would indeed become "a bit of a repeat of Policy 24 CLP" unless and until a 'Schedule of Local Heritage Value' is established by the Town Council. |

¹ <http://www.cornwall-aonb.gov.uk/planning>

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <i>acknowledge the role the asset has played in the history of the area.</i> | | This is a bit of a repeat of Policy 24 CLP | | |
| p.23 add this to the list of actions for the community | | | 6 | If the draft policy is shown to be generally acceptable to the community during the 1 st consultation, the TC will need to make a commitment to establishing a local Schedule for the parish area that will lead to a call for "non-designated" heritage assets to be nominated. The suggested revised policy wording is acceptable. |
| p.23 <i>Proposals for new development on designated Local Green Spaces will only be supported where they:</i> i) are ancillary to the existing recreation or amenity use of the site; and ii) maintain or enhance the existing use and amenity value of the site; and iii) have no adverse impact on the landscape, habitats or biodiversity of the site or (where unavoidable) satisfactorily mitigate such impact. | Suggested re-working of last point iii) <i>have no adverse impact on the landscape, habitat or biodiversity of the site or provide a mitigation proposal which is agreed and approved through the planning approval process</i> | Adds more robustness | 7 | |
| p.28 3) <i>is infill and surrounded by existing development; and</i> | This definition of infill development does not reflect the CC guidance on what constitutes infill development, please see following guidance document ² Suggest rewording 3) <i>is considered to be infill development as set out in the Chief Planning Officers Advice Note – Infill and Rounding off</i> | Consistency with CC guidance. | 8 | The suggested revised policy wording is acceptable. It will require reference in the supporting text to the CC guidance on what constitutes infill development and explanation that, in accordance with the policy PAD6, it applies only to infill proposals within the settlement area boundaries. Nb. CC guidance on Infill states: "Infill is development that would fill a gap in an otherwise continuous frontage which will normally be a road frontage. The layout and density of the development should be in character with and similar to others in the continuous frontage. Development should not diminish a large gap that is considered important to the setting of the settlement. The large gaps between the urban edge of a settlement and other isolated dwellings are not appropriate locations for infill development. This applies to settlements of all sizes." |
| Policy PAD9 and PAD10 | Do you require this list 1-7 to be delivered for 1 housing proposal? It would be too onerous to ask small developments to deliver. Maybe you could distinguish what is required for | | 9 | Criteria 2 and 3 of PAD9 could be re-worded to apply only to major developments. The other criteria of PAD9 may be appropriate for any scale of development proposal outside Padstow's settlement area boundary. |

² <https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/30558877/cpoan-infill-rounding-off-4-12-17.pdf>

| | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|----|---|
| | smaller developments 1-10 dwellings and then larger developments 10+ houses? | | | PAD10 applies to "Development proposals for larger housing schemes.....". The supporting text could refer to 10 or more dwellings as being the appropriate threshold for the policy. (This is the usual planning definition of large development.) |
| Policy PAD12 Proposals for open market housing (excluding one for one replacement dwellings) will only be supported where first and future occupancy occupation is restricted by a legal agreement to ensure that each new dwelling is occupied only as a Principal Residence. A principal residence is defined as a dwelling occupied as the resident's sole or main residence, where the resident spends most of their time when not working away from home. Proposals for open market housing (excluding one for one replacement dwellings) without a requirement to ensure occupancy as a principal residence will not be supported. | Census data illustrating how the second homes issue has grown over a period of 10 years would be useful and what are the consequences of this growth in second home ownership on the town and wider community? Worth re-reading the guidance note below to check that the policy is sufficiently justified and to be aware of the possible unintended consequences of this policy. ³ | Further justification required. | 10 | Census data (including trends from 2001-2011) is now considerably 'in the past' and challengeable. It will be worth re-reading the guidance note to check whether there is any further evidence/justification that could be cited. Community response to the draft policy during the 1st consultation on the Plan could be critical. Unintended consequences were addressed in the recent SG briefing paper. |
| 9.24 The restriction to Principal Residence occupancy should be secured and retained in perpetuity through the imposition of an appropriate Planning Obligation created and enforceable under Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, or any subsequent successor legislation. Owners of homes with a Principal Residence condition should be required to keep proof that they are meeting the obligation or condition and be willing to provide this proof if/when Cornwall Council requests this information. Proof of principal residence includes, but is not limited to, being registered on the local electoral roll, at the local school or for local healthcare. | This isn't a policy, but the Principle Residence policy will be applied as a planning condition rather than in a Section 106 agreement in most instances. | Inaccurate information | 11 | Suggest revise reference in para. 9.24 to the Principle Residence policy being applied as a planning condition rather than in a Section 106 agreement in <u>most</u> instances. |

³ <https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/31070036/principal-residence-policies.pdf>

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>PAD 19 Padstow Town Centre <i>Residential use of accommodation on the upper floors of town centre businesses will be supported provided that such accommodation is not currently in employment use and that the residential use does not adversely affect the viability of any ground floor commercial use.</i></p> | <p>I understand that Padstow town centre is currently vibrant but there might be some benefits to introducing more accommodation within the town centre location and this part of the policy would restrict that opportunity. First floors could be associated with a shop but used simply as storage – conversion to living accommodation could assist with maintaining the viability of the business whilst also making better use of the space?</p> | <p>Limits the opportunity to introduce first floor living accommodation above ground floor business premises.</p> | <p>12</p> <p>SG should consider whether it wishes to revise the draft policy to be more permissive towards change of use of upper floorspaces to residential use rather than protect space that has the potential to remain in employment use.</p> |
| <p>p.49 Policy PAD21 <i>Major development should be phased in tandem with the timely provision of infrastructure to help support sustainable growth.</i></p> | <p>I understand the concerns of the community in terms of the provision of infrastructure and the NDP indicates that there is understanding that such provision falls outside of the NDP policies. I wonder whether these concerns could be better reflected as an action in a Community Action Plan? The action could be that the Town Council will lobby local decision makers to ensure that the infrastructure needs are assessed and considered in any future strategic infrastructure project proposals. The NDP survey responses can be used as evidence to support this lobbying. Also it is unlikely that a major development would be sufficiently large enough to provide the sort of infrastructure that Padstow residents are concerned about. For the above reasons I would suggest deleting this policy. Infrastructure projects can be identified in a list as an appendix but please be aware that if the Principle Residence policy is included in the final draft then this will reduce the CIL receipts as the Parish will likely drop a CIL zone. See above link on Principle Residence policy.</p> | | <p>13</p> <p>The draft policy is a 'comfort blanket' type policy that reflects what people so often say. As para. 12.6 states. It is a policy that can be found in varying forms in many NP's. It could be deleted, but it could remain. CC are not objecting to it on the grounds of non-conformity. The Town Council could choose to identify and list infrastructure projects in an Appendix, although this list may go out of date during the plan-period.</p> |

NDP STEERING GROUP: 19 JUNE 2019

AGENDA ITEM 9: CONSULTATION

1. Introduction

- 1.1 If approved, the updated version of the Project Plan proposes that informal consultation on the 1st Version of the Plan take place in July/August. Members are asked to give consideration to both the promotion of this consultation and the form it should take.
- 1.2 The Group's thoughts on how to progress with the consultation are now sought. In particular, promotion of the consultation and the method or methods preferred.

2. Promotion

- 2.1 When promoting previous consultation events the Steering Group have utilised social media, the Town Council website, the NDP database and posters which have been distributed around the parish and to local groups. These methods can be undertaken at little cost.
- 2.2 When promoting the 2015 questionnaire in addition to the methods in 2.1, the questionnaire was sent via Royal Mail's Door To Door service. This method is for unaddressed mail and provides blanket coverage to all postcodes within the PL28 8 sector. This service requires a minimum spend of £600 inc vat for which the service will deliver a maximum of 8,000 items. As PL28 8 is comprised of only 3,245 residences Royal Mail will allow a secondary drop within 13 weeks of the first. This second drop can be for a different mail item. With this method the items will need to be couriered to Swindon 1 week prior to the date of distribution, the cost of which would be dependent on the weight. If the promotional literature was outsourced this would also incur additional fees for design and/or printing. The lead-in time for this service is a minimum of 3 weeks and delivery takes up to 2 weeks to complete.
- 2.3 More recently, the 2018 questionnaire was promoted through an addressed mail method using Royal Mail's Business Mail Advanced service at a cost of £1281.05 plus printing. Postage costs increased in March 2019, therefore new costs would need to be obtained for this method. This option ensures that items are delivered only to parish residences.
- 2.4 Additional methods were used during the promotion of the 2018 questionnaire which included sharing information with second home owners via local estate agents and displaying a promotional banner in a prominent location. The cost of a double sided banner is £55 plus VAT, plus an additional fee for artwork.

3. Consultation Methods

- 3.1 There are a number of ways the consultation could be facilitated. It could be made available online for comment. Comments could be submitted via email or respondents could publish their comments alongside the document for public view. Suggested length of time for this consultation by Mr Weston is one month.
- 3.2 A method used by the Hayle NDP Steering Group was to put the policies into a questionnaire asking residents to "agree", "disagree" or a "agree with comment". The Support Officer has spoken with the Hayle NDP Chairman who advised that the questionnaire took respondents around 40 minutes to complete and overall the group were pleased with the number of responses received. It would be worth noting that the current annual SurveyMonkey subscription expires on the 6 August 2019 and another year's subscription would cost £408.
- 3.3 Other groups have adopted drop-in methods using green dots, red dots and post-it notes to comment, as the group will recall using themselves during earlier consultation stages. An event like this could be set up to run continuously for one month in the Council Chamber during office opening hours. Copies of the full plan can be made available for reading and A1 sheets of paper detailing the individual policies and policy rational can be laid out around the room. In addition, Trevone Village Shop could be approached to make available a month long display, advising residents how to participate in the consultation. They could also be asked to hold copies of the plan.

4. Recommendations

- 4.1 As this is an informal consultation inviting comments to test the plan to date and assist in developing a refined version, perhaps a combined approach is the most fitting. A drop-in during office hours as outlined in 3.3 could run alongside an online questionnaire. In terms of promotion and to raise awareness, it's felt that the addressed mail method could perhaps be reserved for more formal consultation and the Door to Door service more fitting at this stage. Any promotional material could be designed in house to save costs but printed externally. The Group's views are welcomed.
- 4.2 The NDP available budget is £15,000. Based on 4.1 the cost for the informal consultation would be approximately £1,165. This is inclusive of A1 sheets, A5 double sided flyers, Door to Door service, and a courier. However, if the consultation and results analysis goes beyond the 6 August the SurveyMonkey subscription would need to be renewed at an additional cost of £408.

Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan Project Plan

| Padstow Project Plan Overview | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|---|----|---|---|---|---|------|---|---|----|---|----|----|---|----|---|---|
| | 2017 | | | | | | | 2018 | | | | | | | 2019 | | | | | | | 2020 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F |
| Start-up pre-July 2017 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Identify Issues | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vision & Objectives | | | | | | | | C2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Generate Options | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | C3 | | C3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Prepare Draft Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | C4 | | C4 | | | | | |
| Consultation & Submission | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | C5 | | C5 | | |
| Independent Examination | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Referendum & Adoption | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Consultation Points:

C2 - consult on vision & objectives

C3 – policy options consultation

C4 – informal consultation on 1st Version of Plan

C5 – (Reg. 14) consultation on Pre-submission of Plan

C6 – Referendum – 2020 (NB. This is the responsibility of the local planning authority)

Agenda Item 10

Survey & Analysis

| Stage 2 Identifying the Issues: | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--|------|------|------|------|------|---|--|
| No. | Process | Method | Ju17 | Au17 | Se17 | Oc17 | No17 | | |
| 2.1 | Strategic context | research/review strategy documents | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | | liaise with LPA | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | | prepare report | ✓ | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Community context | research/review local situation/strategies | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| | | prepare report | | | ✓ | | | | |
| | | design community consultation | | | | ✓ | | | |
| | | approve community consultation | | | | ✓ | | | |
| | | consult local bodies/organisations | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | Development potential | analyse consultation & prepare report | | | | | | ✓ | |
| | | planning history & current land uses | | ✓ | | | | | |
| | | assess development potential | | | ✓ | | | | |
| 2.4 | Future demands | trends & forecasts | | ✓ | | | | | |
| 2.5 | Stakeholder views | specialist studies (if necessary) | | | | | | | |
| | | Identify and consult landowners | | | | ✓ | | | |
| | | consult statutory bodies and agencies | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| 2.6 | NP Issues | analyse surveys & consultations | | | | | | ✓ | |
| | | prepare issues & opportunities report | | | | | | ✓ | |
| 2.7 | Scope & content | prepare & recommend scope & content | | | | | | ✓ | |
| | | agree NP purpose & focus | | | | | | ✓ | |

| Stage 3 Vision & Objectives: | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|
| No. | Process | Method | De17 | Ja18 | Fe18 | Ma18 | | | |
| 3.1 | Draft Aims | prepare workshop method | ✓ | | | | | | |
| | | agree draft vision & aims | | ✓ | | | | | |
| 3.2 | Draft objectives | interpret vision & prepare draft objectives | | ✓ | | | | | |
| | | agree draft NP aims & objectives | | ✓ | | | | | |
| | | publicise draft vision, aims & objectives | | ✓ | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Consult | consult on vision & objectives | | | ✓ | | | | |
| | | analyse and report on consultation | | | ✓ | | | | |
| 3.4 | NP vision & objectives | prepare vision & objectives report | | | ✓ | | | | |
| | | approve vision & objectives | | | | ✓ | | | |

Plan Making

| Stage 4 Generate Options: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| No. | Process | Method | 2018 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Ap | Ma | Ju | Ju | Au | Se | Oc | No | De | Ja | Fe | Ma |
| 4.1 | Options | generate development options | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Impacts | consider who/what will be affected | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Options Appraisal | options appraisal | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | C3 | ✓ | | | | |
| Stage 5 Plan Making: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Policies | draft NP Policy statements | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 5.2 | Proposals | prepare 1 st Draft of NP | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| 5.3 | Compliance | check compliances | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.4 | Informal Consultation | Consult with local stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.5 | Plan Amendments | After community consultation | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.6 | Sustainability | SEA/HRA (as appropriate) | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Plan Submission

| Stage 6 Consultation & Submission: | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| No. | Process | Method | Oc19 | No19 | De19 | Ja20 | Fe20 | Ma20 |
| 6.1 | Consultation document | approve Pre-Submission Version of Plan | | | | | | |
| 6.2 | Statutory consultees | consult formally (Reg.14) | | C5 | C5 | | | |
| 6.3 | Community | apply consultation strategy | | C5 | C5 | | | |
| 6.4 | Stakeholders | consult formally | | C5 | C5 | | | |
| 6.5 | Consultation | prepare Consultation Statement | | | | | | |
| 6.6 | Amendments | consider comments & amend if necessary | | | | | | |
| 6.7 | Submission documents | Basic Condition Statement | | | | | | |
| | | approve submission documents | | | | | | |
| 6.8 | Submission | submit required documents | | | | | | |