

Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan
Analysis of Response to Informal Community Consultation on 1st Version of NP

Number of Respondents: 53

After responses were sorted and segmented:

| Comments on Aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan | | No. |
|--|-------------------------------------|------------|
| General Comment on Neighbourhood Plan | | 24 |
| Foreword | | 1 |
| Sec. 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| Sec. 2 | Padstow Today | 11 |
| Sec. 3 | The Strategic Context | 11 |
| Sec. 4 | Purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan | 2 |
| Sec. 5 | The Structure of Our Plan | 1 |
| Sec. 6 | Vision, Aims and Objectives | 0 |
| Sec. 7 | Natural Environment | 6 |
| PAD1 | Protecting the Natural Environment | 6 |
| PAD2 | Public Rights of Way | 7 |
| PAD3 | Farm Diversification | 1 |
| Sec. 8 | Built Environment and Heritage | 3 |
| PAD4 | Heritage Assets | 1 |
| PAD5 | Local Green Space | 8 |
| PAD6 | Settlement Area Boundaries (SAB) | 8 |
| PAD7 | Development Adjoining Padstow's SAB | 15 |
| PAD8 | Sustainable Design | 5 |
| Sec. 9 | Housing | 7 |
| PAD9 | Housing Development | 6 |
| PAD10 | Housing Needs and Mix | 7 |
| PAD11 | Rural Exception Site Development | 17 |
| PAD12 | Second Homes | 24 |
| Sec. 10 | Transport, Traffic and Parking | 4 |
| PAD13 | Local Travel and Safety | 4 |
| PAD14 | Electric Vehicle Charging | 3 |
| PAD15 | Public Car Parking Areas | 8 |
| PAD16 | Off-road Parking | 4 |
| Sec. 11 | Local Economy and Tourism | 2 |
| PAD17 | Business Development | 1 |
| PAD18 | Treccerus Industrial Estate | 6 |
| PAD19 | Padstow Town Centre | 3 |
| PAD20 | Tourism Development | 3 |
| Sec. 12 | Community Wellbeing | 7 |
| PAD21 | Community Infrastructure | 5 |
| PAD22 | Community-based Initiatives | 2 |
| PAD23 | Community Facilities | 0 |
| PAD24 | Recreation and Sports Facilities | 2 |
| PAD25 | Facilities for Young People | 4 |
| Sec. 13 | Monitoring the Plan | 1 |
| Sec. 14 | Glossary | 0 |
| | | 231 |

Features of the Consultation Response:

- Most respondents commented on more than one aspect of the Plan
- The following policies did not receive any opposition, only support or positive criticism: PAD3, PAD4, PAD5, PAD6, PAD10, PAD13, PAD14, PAD17, PAD20, PAD21, PAD22, PAD24
- The following policies received more comments in support of them than the sum of the critical comments about them: PAD1, PAD10, PAD12, PAD13, PAD14, PAD15, PAD20, PAD21
- The following policies did not attract any comments relevant to the policy: PAD19, PAD23
- The policy attracting most unconditional support was PAD12
- The policy attracting most opposition or negative comment was PAD11
- Policies PAD5, PAD6 and PAD7 received the most calls and suggestions for amendment

| Policy No. | Policy-related Comments | Support | Positive but could improve with changes | Oppose or significance concerns about the policy |
|------------|-------------------------|---------|---|--|
| PAD1 | 4 | | 5 | 1 |
| PAD2 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| PAD3 | 1 | | 1 | |
| PAD4 | 1 | | 1 | |
| PAD5 | 7 | 1 | 6 | |
| PAD6 | 8 | 2 | 6 | |
| PAD7 | 15 | | 8 | 7 |
| PAD8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| PAD9 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| PAD10 | 7 | 4 | 3 | |
| PAD11 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| PAD12 | 22 | 16 | 2 | 6 |
| PAD13 | 2 | 2 | | |
| PAD14 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| PAD15 | 3 | | | 3 |
| PAD16 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| PAD17 | 1 | | 1 | |
| PAD18 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| PAD19 | 0 | | | |
| PAD20 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| PAD21 | 5 | 3 | 2 | |
| PAD22 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| PAD23 | 0 | | | |
| PAD24 | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| PAD25 | 3 | | 1 | 2 |

The number of persons criticising or opposing specific policies, or other aspects of the Plan is, in all cases, relatively small (given the size of the population of the area). Caution should therefore guide your consideration of any changes.

Rarely is it justified to change a policy significantly as a result of the views expressed by only one person or business.

Remember too, people are more likely to comment if they oppose something than if they support it.

Headlines from Consultation Response:

| No. | Policy Title: | Main Community Reaction (based on the number received and thrust of written responses) |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| PAD01 | Protecting the Natural Environment | Highlight the special character of AONB |
| PAD02 | Public Rights of Way | Extend the policy to include other footpaths |
| PAD03 | Farm Diversification | No problems with purpose of policy |
| PAD04 | Heritage Assets | No problems with policy |
| PAD05 | Local Green Space | Consider adding a further site to the list |
| PAD06 | Settlement Area Boundaries (SAB) | Approach is supported, but the boundaries need adjusting |
| PAD07 | Development Adjoining Padstow's SAB | Concern that policy may threaten AONB area |
| PAD08 | Sustainable Design | Suggestions as to how it might be extended |
| PAD09 | Housing Development | Needs adjusting to ensure past mistakes are avoided |
| PAD10 | Housing Needs and Mix | Recognise there are different types of local housing need |
| PAD11 | Rural Exception Site Development | May lead to housing development in the wrong place |
| PAD12 | Second Homes | Much support, but some concerns about its consequences |
| PAD13 | Local Travel and Safety | Good intentions, but how will it be implemented? |
| PAD14 | Electric Vehicle Charging | Extend the policy to new buildings |
| PAD15 | Public Car Parking Areas | Consider unwanted consequences of more car parks |
| PAD16 | Off-road Parking | Avoid loss of existing off-road parking spaces |
| PAD17 | Business Development | No problems with policy |
| PAD18 | Treccerus Industrial Estate | Industrial Estate needs improvements |
| PAD19 | Padstow Town Centre | No problems with policy or designated area |
| PAD20 | Tourism Development | Support for policy position on tourism |
| PAD21 | Community Infrastructure | Community infrastructure needs improvements |
| PAD22 | Community-based Initiatives | No problems with policy intention |
| PAD23 | Community Facilities | No problems with policy |
| PAD24 | Recreation and Sports Facilities | Community views on what is needed will be important |
| PAD25 | Facilities for Young People | Confusion about purpose of policy |

PPNP/PW/Oct19

Padstow Neighbourhood Plan
1st Consultation Version Response by Plan and Policy Order

| No. | Address | Comment | Consultant's Suggestion |
|----------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| General | | | |
| G1 | Netherton Road | I am pleased to see a comprehensive range of policies for the Padstow and Trevone area. The policies seem to highlight the major issues which concern the local community such as second homes, parking and the like. | Note expression of support. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G2 | Treverbyn Road | All draft policies reflect local desire to maintain the community and local area for maximum benefit. | Note positive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G3 | Rainyfields | The draft policies I feel are very good. Very good in all aspects. The layout and display are first class. Well done Padstow Town Council. | Note expression of support. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G4 | Padstow | Compromise breeds corruption - and what a shocking compromise this much acclaimed plan presents! It is something of an absolute disgrace and it would be a very certain disingenuous lie, to refer to it as being 'ours' as a community, as sure as it would be, to claim this has ever been a process of consultation. Just to properly assess our Local Green Space (Policy No. PAD5) - is this plan clutching at straws? | Note criticism. |
| G5 | Padstow | As for Housing ...the powers that be will not do anything to curb the blight of second homes.... This is no fair or reasonable consultation any more than it may be called a plan. | Note scepticism. |
| G6 | Dobbins Close | I thought the maps were informative BUT did not reproduce very well and the words could not be read when the maps were enlarged on my laptop. | Consider improving quality of mapping in Pre-Submission Version of NP |
| G7 | Beach Road | Generally, I think the plan reads well and strikes a good balance between meeting the needs of the community and protecting the environment. | Note positive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G8 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | The 1st draft consultation Plan is a positive document supportive toward proposed further expansion of the town's housing provision, providing it secures sustainable homes that meet local needs especially around affordable housing. We would support that. Tenure, mix and good design represent important objectives of the Plan. Parking is also important, as the Plan recognises that unless there is adequate parking within housing schemes there could be an impact upon the surrounding area. Sustainable housing development is a strong ambition, including moving away from fossil fuel heating systems, adding Electric car charging points to homes and supporting renewable energies, subject to conditions. The Plan acknowledges that the housing targets in the adopted local plan are minimum rather than maximum. This is a stance taken across other parishes and towns in the county. Tourism is recognised as a key economic activity, but residents consulted considered that further significant expansion of the tourist industry was not what Padstow required, preferring to see alternative forms of employment opportunities created. Treceus Industrial estate was the general location where the community felt further expansion would be appropriate, initially overhauling existing facilities. New commercial buildings should not include warehousing or other businesses that generated few employments jobs. Improving Community facilities and services is also an aim of the Plan and concerns about the infrastructure capability within the parish. | Note expression of support and positive interpretation of the policy approach taken. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G9 | Dobbin Lane | Tone and scope of the report is good. | Note positive comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G10 | Dobbin Lane | Maps would be much more useful if they included scales. | Consider improving quality of mapping in Pre-Submission Version of NP and using a bar scale for each map. |
| G11 | Parkenhead Lane | Having read through the draft document, I find there are many ambiguities, sometimes misinterpretation and draft policies that could be misleading and therefore, possibly, contentious. | Note general criticism and consider specific concerns under the various policy headings. |
| G12 | Trevone | Once approved, the Plan will be used by Cornwall Council and be referred to at any planning enquiry affecting the Parish. It therefore needs to be a tightly written document, concentrating only on planning issues, and written so that there is no conflict of information or policy within the Plan and with the Cornwall Plan. This is not the case at present. | Note criticism and take it into account when re-drafting. |
| G13 | Trevone | The whole document should be written using the impersonal pronoun throughout. It will become a formal planning document, part of the Local Cornwall Plan. Once approved, to whom does the 'we' and 'our' refer to: Cornwall Council, Padstow Town Council, the electorate, the council tax payers etc.? In addition, there will be conflict with the remaining 'we', also undefined, in the Cornwall Plan, which can only add to the confusion. | Consider whether the Plan should adopt the impersonal pronoun throughout. The NP is a statement of agreed planning positions and policies adopted by the Town Council on behalf of all parishioners. The use of 'we' is a common convention for NP's and ensures the Plan is recognised as the wishes of the people of the area. |
| G14 | Trevone | 'Plan', 'Neighbourhood Plan' and 'Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan' are used interchangeably to describe the document. I would suggest that the document is defined as 'the Plan' throughout. | Ensure that references to the NP are consistent in their application throughout the document. |
| G15 | Trevone | To the extent that they are needed, pages 38 onwards, including policies PAD 13 to PAD 25 inclusive, relate in practice only to Padstow and should be in a separate section. It must be made very clear that these policies do not apply to the land within the Parish which is within the AONB. Policies PAD 7, PAD 9 and PAD 10 should also be included in this section. | Consider whether there is any merit in separating out the Padstow only policies. It should be noted that several of the draft policies mentioned by the respondent apply across the whole parish. |
| G16 | Trevone | Very detailed comments are marked up on the relevant page and included as schedule 3 to this document. Items omitted | Refer to marked-up schedule 3, as necessary, when re-drafting the NP. |
| G17 | Un-specified | Overall, I think it is a sound set of policies and positively prepared | Note positive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G18 | Trevone | ... there are many instances where subjective language is used: for example (and there are many more) 'thanks to', 'good use', 'of concern', 'require', 'inevitable', 'ironic'. It may be the case that the judgements associated with the use of these descriptors reflect the beliefs held by the limited number of those writing the Plan; whatever the explanation I think such language is unhelpful and quite possibly contrary to the views of many Parishioners. None seems to me to be a necessary part of the Plan. I would suggest that such judgemental wording be removed so as to make the Plan a more factual document. | Consider whether the use of language in parts of the NP to describe or explain the planning issues and opportunities or justify the policies is inappropriate and should be amended. |
| G19 | Trevone | The Plan frequently uses the term 'we' but it is unclear who exactly is making the subsequent statements; some clarification of both authorship of the Plan and | The use of 'we' is a common convention for NP's and ensures the Plan is recognised as the wishes and |

| | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| | | Councillors views on it would assist in understanding its provenance. | aspirations of the people of the area. Consider whether it needs clarifying in the Foreword or Introduction. |
| G20 | Trevone | The Padstow Parish Maps (1, 2, 3) do not display the full parish. If the entire Parish is not to be shown, then I suggest some statement to that effect would be appropriate. | Consider improving quality of mapping in Pre-Submission Version of NP. |
| G21 | St Petrocs Meadow | To my eyes it appears professionally with the usual caveats. What of the acquisitive builders and landowners involved? | Note positive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G22 | St Petrocs Meadow | The Plan would seem to be about building, expansion and selling the benefits of tourism. | A NP is about promotion sustainable development. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G23 | Church Street | I was impressed by the quality of the "Consultation Version 1". I am pleased that the TC has persisted in bringing it to this point. | Note positive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| G24 | Trevone Road | The wording of the plan and some of its aspirations seem at odds with a professionally constructed and worded plan. One is left with the view that conclusions may have been arrived at and then the Plan constructed to arrive at those conclusions. | Note criticism and take it into account when re-drafting. |
| Foreword | | | |
| F1 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | There is reference to the evidence base which can be viewed by the website link. Through inspection there will be detailed scrutiny of the evidence base for the following policies. | Note comment and ensure that the evidence base is sufficient to justify the policy positions. |
| Introduction | | | |
| I1 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | Para. 2.6 There is an erroneous reference to Treceus Farm phase 3 and Homes England 'intervention.' That was not the case. | Check the accuracy of the statements in para. 2.6 |
| Padstow Today | | | |
| PT1 | Beach Road | The challenges are also well understood and set out in Chapter 2 with focus rightly on the provision of affordable homes, preserving and protecting jobs, the capacity of health facilities, community buildings, inadequate public open space and recreational areas and as described as the 'matter of most concern to the community' is inadequate road network and traffic congestion. In trying to balance these often competing and conflicting objectives and in the relationship between policy PAD1, PAD7, PAD8, PAD9 and PAD11 I believe there is significant error which could lead to both unsustainable developments being encouraged and, to compound this, unnecessary adverse impacts on the AONB. This would be at odds with para. 8.30 of the plan which states 'we expect the principles of sustainability to pervade all facets at development'. As drafter therefore, I think the plan does not meet the necessary tests required for a Neighbourhood Plan to be 'made'. Having said that with some simple amendments to address these points I would wholeheartedly support the plan. | Note positive comment about the description of Padstow Today. Consider specific concerns under the various policy headings. |
| PT2 | Dobbin Lane | No figures given for the present size of Padstow or Trevone - population, number of residential and business properties. More specific information on numbers of second homes and the loss of local facilities, Banking, Post offices and Care homes. There have been significant changes over the 30 years that I have been a permanent resident of Trevone and | Consider whether the scene-setting of this section would benefit from the insertion of specific numbers (perhaps in a tabular form), if up-to-date figures are available. |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------------|---|---|
| | | the rate of change is now increasing at an alarming rate. Many simple properties are being knocked down or rebuilt as second homes for wealthy people and are too expensive for locals. | |
| PT3 | Dobbin Lane | This year's building developments have caused significant traffic problems with the roads being choked with contractors' vehicles. | Note comment about recent problems. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PT4 | Parkenhead Lane | Having read the whole Community Consultation Document, I feel the Council has made a good effort at summing up our local needs. | Note positive comment about the description of Padstow Today. |
| PT5 | Parkenhead Lane | Para. 2.3 I'm pleased to see that the report acknowledges the significance of the AONB to the draft policies within the plan and refers to the 'two distinct areas of Padstow and Trevone' within both the ANOB Management Plan and Cornwall Council Landscape Character Study. Re-enforced in paragraph 7.2 and 7.3. Paragraph 8.1 again identifies the substantial difference between the major two settlements, referring to Padstow as a Historic Port and Trevone as a Seaside Village. The significance of the AONB, and that the whole settlement of Trevone is within the AONB, relates to the target figures outlined in paragraph 8.25, 9.6 and 9.26 for new housing, including affordable housing. Cornwall Council's housing statement guidelines allow for reduced targets in the case of parishes which are partly within the AONB in parishes where settlements are within the ANOB the baseline for the housing target will be set at zero. Furthermore it is also recognised that as part of the supporting evidence base for the CLP the Examiner directed that Cornwall Council were required to show that the whole of the housing target for the county could be provided for without relying on any house construction within the AONB. | Note positive comment about the description of Padstow Today and the recognition of the significance of the AONB. Consider whether it is appropriate to make reference here, or elsewhere in the NP, to Cornwall Council's housing statement guidelines on housing targets as they relate to the AONB area. |
| PT6 | Trevone | It should be stated explicitly that everything up to the PAD 1 policy on page 15 does not form part of the legal NDP for planning purposes. To emphasise this, the heading before policy PAD 1 should start on a new page and I see no point in repeating this heading throughout the document. | Consider whether it is necessary to make statement regarding status of the introductory sections. |
| PT7 | Trevone | The word 'community', in the singular is used many times throughout the document. What is this single community? Is Padstow Town really only one community; are Crugmeer, Treator, Trenio and Trevone really the same community as Padstow? Re paragraph 2.2, can two separate settlements be one community? 'Communities', in the plural, should be used throughout the document. | Consider, when re-drafting, whether it is appropriate in all instances within the NP to describe the parishioners of the area as a single community or whether the NP needs, on occasions, to reflect the fact that there are separate settlements areas and communities. |
| PT8 | Trevone | In several places, the document fails to differentiate between land (including dwellings thereon) which is within and without the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB'). Because of its very nature, any and all policies written for land within the AONB cannot also be applicable to land without and visa-versa. A proper differentiation needs to be made throughout the document. | Consider when re-drafting the NP whether it is appropriate for some policies to differentiate between land within and without the AONB. |
| PT9 | Trevone | Para. 2.8, I agree that there should be more recreation areas, but to say that 'The area is under-provided with public open spaces' is incorrect'. What about the walks, cliffs and beaches around Padstow, which a 'townie' | Consider whether the description in para. 2.8 is incorrect. |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|---|
| | | from elsewhere would love to be near? How is this paragraph compatible with paragraph 12.1 on page 47? | |
| PT10 | Un-specified | I notice reference to the word 'community' in the singular, in Para 3.8, 3.9, 4.3, 4.6 and 4.8. However, in Para 2.3 it refers to two distinct areas of Padstow and Trevone, and elsewhere in the report a significant difference is noted between the two major settlements. I therefore would question the use of 'community' in the singular as this could be misleading. | Consider, when re-drafting, whether it is appropriate in all instances within the NP to describe the parishioners of the area as a single community or whether the NP needs, on occasions, to reflect the fact that there are separate settlements areas and communities. |
| PT11 | Un-specified | The seaside village of Trevone lies entirely within the AONB, whereas the town of Padstow lies partially so. This is of significance when considered against Cornwall Council's housing guidelines, which allow for reduced housing targets for parishes which lie partly with the AONB, and a zero target for parishes where the settlement is entirely within, such as Trevone. Within the supporting evidence for the CLP, Cornwall Council was required to demonstrate that the entire housing target for the county could be provided for without relying on any housing being built within the AONB. The policy PAD1 is in danger of weakening the overriding importance of the AONB status of Trevone. Further, PAD 6 and PAD 7 refer to special circumstances for development of homes in the open countryside, but given that Trevone lies entirely within the AONB, Cornwall Council have no target for such settlements and there needs to be a separate policy for Trevone to acknowledge this zero target | Consider specific concerns regarding the AONB status of Trevone under the various policy headings. |
| The Strategic Context | | | |
| SC1 | Beach Road | There is however one important aspect which I believe, if not corrected, could lead to unsustainable development and harm to the AONB. The AONB of course reflects the exceptionally high quality of the landscape and environment of about 2/3s of the parish area. It is also the main reason why the area is so attractive to visitors, resulting in the obvious pressures that this creates but also the huge benefits socially and economically. As mentioned in para 2.3 of the plan "the countryside remains one of the parish's greatest assets that can be enjoyed but must be protected". This balance is I believe correctly and eloquently expressed in the Town Council's Position Statement as summarised in para 3.8 but not so reflected in the draft plan.... | Note positive comment regarding the Town Council's Position Statement. Consider specific concerns regarding the AONB under the various policy headings. |
| SC2 | Egerton Road | I support the Padstow Town Council policy statement. | Note expression of support for the Town Council's Position Statement. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| SC3 | Trevone | Para. 3.8 should refer to communities. Padstow and Trevone communities are so different, as indeed is Traitor. I would say that Padstow itself has more than one community. The same applies to the first bullet point in 3.9, 4.3, 4.6 and 4.8. The second reference to community in 4.8 could read 'to achieve the communities' consensus. Please amend so as not to end a sentence with a preposition! | Consider, when re-drafting, whether it is appropriate in all instances within the NP to describe the parishioners of the area as a single community or whether the NP needs, on occasions, to reflect the fact that there are separate settlements areas and communities. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| SC4 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | There is reference to the local plan strategic policies that if an NDP has not been adopted within two years of the local plan November 2016 the council will undertake the necessary site allocations documents to support the delivery of the target set out in the local plan. Are you sure that this relates to Padstow? | Check the LPA's position with this regard. |
| SC5 | Parkenhead Lane | Transport Paragraph 3.8 - PTC Policies, acknowledges that "travelling within the area must become less stressful and safer." This is particularly relevant when considering the difficulties for residence in Trevone accessing social infrastructure in Padstow (Doctor, School, supermarket etc) where the rural road B3276 has no pavements for pedestrians, and the only partial footpath from Trevone into Padstow is not accessible to many and uses some single track road. Because of the lack of transport, Trevone is unsuitable for affordable housing. | Note implied support for the TC's priorities. Consider whether to add any further details of the hazardous footpath situation in Section 2. |
| SC6 | Trevone | Much of the document refers to matters which are either not the subject of planning control or are repetitive of national or Cornwall Council policies. The document, as a consequence, is far too long and thus not nearly so user friendly as it should be. All these sections should be deleted from the Neighbourhood Development Plan ('NDP'). | Consider whether to delete the sections of the NP, which set the context for the policies, in the interests of making it more user-friendly. |
| SC7 | Trevone | In paragraph 3.2, the statement about development is incorrect unless it refers also to paragraph 11 b) i of the NPPF. | NPPF para. 11 does begin with "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development." |
| SC8 | Trevone | Paragraph 3.9 is very derogatory to second homeowners and visitors, who provide the livelihood of many residents. I expect that many do not agree with it. This is an assertion, and I (as part of the 'we'?) object to being included with it. | Consider whether para.3.9 should be re-worded. |
| SC9 | Trevone | No reference is made throughout the document to North Cornwall DC's retained policy ENV 1. This is pertinent for the continued protection of the AONB. | Consider whether it is necessary to refer to North Cornwall DC's retained policy ENV 1 in support of any particular policy in the NP. |
| SC10 | St Petrocs Meadow | I quite accept that we must plan very carefully for the future and have the strength and will to say no when there is sufficient doubt or concern. Stealth will not go down well in Padstow | Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| SC11 | Trevone Road | Para. 3.9. The wording is at best unfortunate. If used in a plan elsewhere in the country it may be considered outrageous as population movements into an area may not only from other parts of the country. As the young from Padstow, and Cornwall in general, should rightly be given every opportunity to develop their careers and lives here or elsewhere, so newcomers to the Padstow Parish should be considered exactly the same as those that were born and have grown up here. They would not be here if it was not for those from the Padstow Parish being happy to sell their land and properties to them. | Consider whether para.3.9 should be re-worded. |
| Purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan | | | |
| PP1 | Netherton Road | Change is not easy. It would be valuable to get youth perspective. Is this consultation allowing young people the opportunity to express views? They are the ones who will live with the outcome or more out of area. | Consider whether more should and can be done to engage with young people in the latter stages of plan making. |
| PP2 | Trevone | Para. 4.3: In relation to Trevone and its environs, I am not aware of any measures to support the assertion that 'we have consulted widely ...' I would therefore contend | Note views of respondent. Ensure that consultation on the Pre-submission version of the NP is carried out in |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | that the current statement is misleading unless some convincing evidence to the contrary is provided. | accordance with Regulation 14. |
| The Structure of Our Plan | | | |
| SP1 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | It is clear that the Plan is sensitive around existing policies only wishing to introduce new where they strengthen outcomes. This is a good approach. | Note positive comment about the approach being taken. |
| Vision, Aims and Objectives | | | |
| | | | No comments received – so no change is necessitated by the consultation |
| Natural Environment– Topic Overview | | | |
| NE1 | Dobbins Lane | Very pleased to read in Para 7.3: 'Safeguarding and reinforcing the distinctive character of the countryside are important aims that the Neighbourhood Plan shares with the AONB Management Plan.' | Note expression of support. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| NE2 | Dobbins Lane | Para. 7.5 highlights the importance of agriculture. How can the Plan incentivise organic farming as the most tried and tested method of sustainable farming with maximum soil protection and habitat preservation for wildlife of all sorts? | Note concern about farming practices. Incentivising organic farming is not a NP matter. |
| NE3 | Trevone | Section 7 makes no reference to the MCZ, which is, in my view, a significant feature of the local environment and of particular relevance to those both wishing to conserve and enhance the seascape and Parishioners whose livelihood depends on the local marine area. | The foreshore, between high and low water lines is part of the MCZ. The high-water line has been regarded as the neighbourhood area boundary. If the low water line is indeed the Parish and the neighbourhood area, then a reference to the foreshore being in the area could be included. If the PC is uncertain if the foreshore is within the designated neighbourhood area, it should seek the advice of the local planning authority. |
| NE4 | Grenville Road | We are lucky enough to live in an environment that is more naturally beautiful and less toxic than the UK average; certainly, it's one of the reasons thousands of people choose to holiday here. It is up to all of us to protect this and the Council has an important stewardship responsibility to ensure our children and future generations can hold hope for the same benefits. It would be good for the Council to declare a climate emergency and put in place a definitive strategy and plan to deal with this and execute that plan. We should aim for Padstow to be at least carbon neutral, but ideally carbon positive. 1. Obj.14B Encourage recycling and renewable energy use: We should actively promote solar, wind, heat and tidal energy, and greywater harvesting, in both existing and future housing and business developments. The Council should create a formal scheme for local residents and business to participate in buying these services. There is a distinct lack of public recycling facilities in the centre of the town. All of the single use plastic bottles, chip boxes, pasty wrappers etc. that individuals use are currently being thrown in the general waste bins. We should provide the type of public recycling bins that other places already have. 2. Obj.6B Encourage sustainable housing design and development: I absolutely agree with this. We know | Note comments. Declaring a climate emergency and adopting a 'community strategy' is a proposal that should be referred the Town Council for further consideration. Consider, in the context of national and local strategies whether the Pre-submission version of the NP is suitably climate and environment sensitive. A SEA or SA may be necessary or appropriate. |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>Cornwall Council has a target for more homes. If some of these are in Padstow, we should demand they are of the best sustainable design and development.</p> <p>3. Obj.1B Protect and enhance biodiversity; Obj.3B Protect and enhance local green spaces and green infrastructure; Obj.6B Encourage sustainable housing design and development: All of these objectives should drive a clear policy on the current public green spaces. I suggest the need to plant lots of trees to drive carbon sequestration (and help Cornwall Council with the “Cornwall Forest”) and the need to plant areas of wildflowers to improve biodiversity and the preservation of pollinating insects which we heavily rely on for our food chain (plus it should reduce the cost of mowing grass verges etc.). One area could be the “Gateway Site” grassed space at the A389/B3276 junction which would look amazing to people driving into Padstow.</p> <p>I would also encourage a policy for minimising the effect of light pollution. The new builds on the Treceus Farm development emit a lot of light at night-time. One of the benefits of living in Padstow is the dark skies, and the importance of that for wildlife too, so any further development should be with low impact lighting.</p> <p>4. Obj.9B Facilitate electric vehicle charging facilities: I agree with this, I know there are chargers at the Treceus estate garage, provision should also be made available in public car parks, and incentives for residents to install these too.</p> <p>5. Obj.9C Support public and community transport initiatives. It would be helpful to improve the frequency of public transport to Wadebridge. I encourage the Council to support the move to electric buses as soon as possible, both the public bus fleet and the Padstow park & ride. The charging infrastructure in bus stops and depots is already in the UK, I know Cornwall Council are actively looking at this.</p> | |
| NE5 | Cornwall Wildlife Trust | <p>Good to see reference and policies specifically referring to Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the inclusion of data/figures about habitat designations for the Parish. It would also be useful to include reference to the Biodiversity Guide and inclusion of wildlife specific development measures, in line with the Biodiversity Guide e.g. one bat or bird box for each new build dwelling.</p> | <p>Note support from CWT. Consider including reference to the Biodiversity Guide and wildlife specific development measures if it is decided to include such in other policies.</p> |
| NE6 | Cornwall Wildlife Trust | <p>There is no reference in the NDP to Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Environmental Growth Strategy which stresses the need for us to do much more for nature and wildlife than simply minimise losses, we should be providing more opportunities for wildlife and habitats to thrive. We would encourage a reference to be included, with specific reference to Target Outcome 9.</p> | <p>Consider including reference to how the NP accords with the Environmental Growth Strategy</p> |
| PAD1 Protecting the Natural Environment | | | |
| PAD1/1 | Beach Road | <p>The wording of policy PAD1 does not go as far as the wording in para 1.72 of the NPPF (as quoted at para 7.9 of the draft plan). Given that so much of the parish is covered by AONB, Policy PAD1 should expressly refer to the AONB and the highest level of protection required in the same or more stringent terms than the NPPF. PAD1 also does not reflect the text at para 7.12 which says that proposals will only be supported ‘if it is shown that there will be no adverse effect on areas and habitats recognised by Cornwall Wildlife Trust as having ecological geological values’.</p> | <p>The draft policy applies to the whole parish area. Consider whether policy PAD1 needs to make specific reference to the AONB.</p> |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | There should be no harmful effect on the AONB (as stated in relation to PAD3 at para 7.20) | |
| PAD1/2 | Trevone | In order to ensure this policy, it is essential that AONB is protected. | The draft policy applies to the whole parish area Consider whether policy PAD1 needs to make specific reference to the AONB. |
| PAD1/3 | Un-specified | There should be scope for “reasonable mitigation” to overcome issues, I would suggest it is added to the policy. | Consider whether the policy should include the caveat that would tolerate development that provides reasonable mitigation. |
| PAD1/4 | Trevone | PAD1 would seem to apply to whole Parish. However, as noted in associated paragraphs, much of the Parish is part of Cornwall’s AONB. It is suggested that the sentiment in the last sentence in 7.11 be included in PAD1 so as to make it clear that PAD1 is not intending to dilute the importance of the plans and policies already adopted in respect of the AONB. | Consider whether policy PAD1 needs to make specific reference to the AONB. |
| PAD1/5 | Cornwall Wildlife Trust | We support the reference to the preparation of “Sites of Interest” for the Parish. This information is available via the Wildlife Resource Map supplied from the Environmental Records Centre for Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly. | Note support from CWT. Consider including reference to this in the supporting text. |
| PAD1/6 | Cornwall Wildlife Trust | It would be useful to add some supporting text for local non-statutory designated sites in line with the Biodiversity Guide. E.g.: <i>non-statutory sites include County Wildlife Sites (CWS), County Geology Sites (CGS), Roadside Verge Audit Biological Sites and Ancient Woodlands: These are of at least county importance for wildlife/geology in Cornwall and are all recognised and given weight through the planning process. Developments which would have an adverse impact on County Wildlife Sites will not be supported by Cornwall Council there are no suitable alternative sites, impacts are unavoidable and there is full provision for habitat re-creation and management.</i> | Consider extending supporting text in accordance with suggestion from CWT. |
| | Trevone | Policy PAD 1 and the related narrative is ill-thought through and weakens the protected nature of the AONB. The policy and narrative fail to differentiate between land within and without the AONB. The policy itself makes no reference to the AONB. Paragraphs 7.12 and 7.14 can only weaken the AONB. Given the NPPF paragraph 172 and the Cornwall Plan's policy 23, what does this policy add in planning terms: absolutely nothing. Therefore, there is absolutely no need for this policy, which together with the narrative should be deleted. | Respondent feels that a policy to protect all the natural environment of the Parish area diminishes the special status of the AONB area. Consider whether a policy that recognises the value of all the Parish’s natural environment is appropriate and needed. |
| PAD2 Public Rights of Way | | | |
| PAD2/1 | Un-specified | The footpath adjacent to the green space which is owned by Cornwall Council needs to be re-classified as a public right of way and needs protection clause to stop any further development in our beautiful town of Padstow. The footpath to be added to map 5 and clearly marked. | Designating a public right of way is beyond the scope of the NP. The map is intended to show all PROWs in the parish area. No change necessary as a result of this comment. This matter should be referred to the Town Council. |
| PAD2/2 | Egerton Road | The footpath between Egerton and Treverbyn Road adjacent to 32 Treverbyn Road, which is owned by Cornwall Council to become a designated public right of way. Firstly, on grounds of health and safety as the path provides a safe protected traffic free area to safely cross | Designating a public right of way is beyond the scope of the NP. The map is intended to show all PROWs in the parish area. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--|
| | | the busy road junction. Secondly the footpath has been in existence since the area was developed over 60 years ago and has been and still is in regular daily use. As such it should qualify as a designated public right of way. The footpath should be clearly marked with red dots on the map 5 as a protected right of way. | No change necessary as a result of this comment. This matter should be referred to the Town Council. |
| PAD2/3 | Un-specified | I would like to see the footpath between the triangle and No 32 Treverbyn Road at the junction of Egerton road and Treverbyn road made into a public right of way due to a health and safety risk and needs to be re-classified as a public right of way and added to Map 5 and clearly marked with red dots. The footpath has been there all my life (70 years) and is walked daily. | Designating a public right of way is beyond the scope of the NP. The map is intended to show all PROWs in the parish area. No change necessary as a result of this comment. This matter should be referred to the Town Council. |
| PAD2/4 | Treverbyn Road | Footpath between Egerton and Treverbyn Road, application to stop this up was we believe turned down by PTC with a view to preserving the footpath in future. We were under the impression that if PTC refused it Cornwall Council would not go further but we have had no reassurance of this. Excellent idea to maintain rights of way and footpaths. | Note expression of support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD2/5 | Dobbins Lane | 7.16 says: Strategic Policy 16 of the Local Plan wants us to provide or enhance active travel networks that support and encourage walking, riding and cycling. ' and I question whether facilitating cycling or riding on public footpaths is good use of public funds, especially given habitat impact (if this is implied in the Plan.) On the other hand, finding ways to make cycling and riding safer on the road network is valuable, perhaps by further limiting road speed limits, improving public transport, and thus discouraging car use. I am concerned to read 7.16 that there is the possibility of causing harm to local ecology, albeit least 'any changes should be done in a way that cause least harm to local ecology'. I am convinced our job is to preserve local ecology. | Note concerns expressed. The policy seeks to protect existing rights of way from development. Consider whether the statement in 7.16 " <i>policy PAD2 is generally supportive of improvements and enhancements to the rights of way network</i> " needs further explanation. |
| PAD2/6 | Homer Park Road | Map 5 shows I think two paths that are no longer sign-posted: A section to St Cadoc Farm – this section is not shown on map 9, the Trevone map A section from Padstow farm shop towards Padstow which once cut off a section of the minor road to Prideaux Place. | Ensure the map of Prows, if included in the Pre-submission version of the NP is accurate. Refer comment to the Town Council. |
| PAD2/7 | Trevone | What is the purpose of policy PAD2? Public rights of way are protected by national legislation which Cornwall Council is required to implement. It is Cornwall Council who have to approve and make any diversion orders. These will be required should there be any development proposals approved which affect public rights of way. Paragraph 7.15 is irrelevant to the policy and paragraph 7.16 is a paraphrase of the Cornwall Council policy. The policy should be deleted. | Consider whether it is necessary to include a PROW policy in the NP. |
| PAD3 Farm Diversification | | | |
| PAD3/1 | Trevone | Policy PAD 3 is unexceptional. However, paragraph 7.18 should be amended so that there is differentiation between 'countryside' within and without the AONB. In paragraph 7.20, delete '...there is no harmful effect on the AONB.' and substitute '...and which respects or enhances the character and natural beauty of the AONB.' to reflect the wording of the policy. | Consider whether it is to differentiate in the policy between land within and without the AONB. |
| Built Environment and Heritage – Topic Overview | | | |
| BE1 | Duke Street | I haven't spotted anything relating to protecting or promoting the quality of the environment within our | Note concern. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | <p>built-up areas, particularly in the centre of Padstow. The plan mentions the benefits of a thriving restaurant trade, but doesn't cover the drawbacks: sound pollution, air pollution and waste disposal.</p> <p>The centre of the old town still has residential accommodation within it and bordering it, and the environmental nuisance of restaurant extractors, refrigerator compressors and take-away litter is not mentioned, despite the impact it has on residents and other businesses. The latest craze for wood fired ovens is particularly unfortunate, often creating a rancid/burnt oil smell around the streets and harbour, with the drone of extractor fans ever present.</p> <p>There surely ought to be some sort of planning guideline to cover this. While the visual aspects of the town are, quite rightly, carefully protected, it would seem that anyone can install this sort of equipment without prior consultation. If something is ugly one can look away, but noise and air pollution is harder to ignore.</p> | <p>Addressing pollution from existing businesses is beyond the scope of the NP. Consider whether the NP should and can do more in a policy context to address the potential impact of pollution from new development.</p> |
| BE2 | Un-specified | Town Council should undertake better gardening of areas within the Town boundary (e. the main A389 opposite the Park & Ride was very badly maintained this year. | Refer comment to the Town Council. |
| BE3 | Dobbins Close | It is a shame the report does not mention the really old aspects of the area. I have seen Time Team on TV excavate bronze age (and earlier) settlements at harbour cove showing the area had visitor and trading contacts with faraway places – such as the Mediterranean – and it is disappointing that one clause if not given over to your ancient links. Parkenhead in Trevone has the site of an Iron Age round house. | <p>Note comment.</p> <p>The content of the NP should be determined by the policies and what is required to justify them and explain their scope and purpose.</p> |
| PAD4 Heritage Assets | | | |
| PAD4/1 | Trevone | If there is a need to protect local heritage assets, particularly on the 'Padstow schedule of local heritage value', why is this not explicitly referenced in policy PAD 4. | The schedule of local heritage value' does not exist yet. Once it does it could be referred to in the policy. The contents of such a schedule are covered in the draft policy by the term “non-designated heritage assets”. |
| PAD5 Local Green Space | | | |
| PAD5/1 | Un-specified | On the map 8 I would like to see the grass triangle at the junction of Treverbyn and Egerton Road designated a 'local green space' or a 'no development area'. | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/2 | Grenville Road | The comment I would like to make concerning the piece of land which is a triangle of Treverbyn Road and Egerton. Could it become a green area? As a local person who use to take cows down there to graze before the houses were built. It would be good to keep the triangle as it is. | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/3 | Un-specified | I wish to comment on a small piece of land in the Treverbyn Road and Egerton road area. May this be a designated area? | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/4 | Un-specified | The grass triangle situated at the junction of Egerton and Treverbyn Road should be protected green space for all to use. It has been there in my lifetime for 60+ years. This green space should be designated as a non-development area. | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/5 | Egerton Road | The grass triangle at the junction of Egerton and Treverbyn Road adjacent to the above footpath should | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|
| | | be protected green space for all to enjoy. It adds to the pleasant open landscape of the otherwise built up area and is a characterful part of Old Padstow, having been in existence for over 60 years. | criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/6 | Treverbyn Road | Island between Egerton and Treverbyn Road is surely a green space which enhances the area and allows for visibility at junction of two roads. | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/7 | Treverbyn Road | I would like the green area on the junction between Treverbyn and Egerton Road to remain so and to be designated as a local green space for the enjoyment of Padstonians and visitors alike. It is a site used by the Obbyoss on May Day and also as a landing spot for the Cornwall Air Ambulance. Important for the elderly living in this area. | Consider whether the site nominated meets the NPPF's criteria to be designated as a LGS. If it does, then consider including it in the policy list. |
| PAD5/8 | Treverbyn Road | Do not get rid of green space as Padstow is now getting over-developed and also second homeowners wanting to extend properties that they buy without any consideration for other people. | Note expression of general support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD6 Settlement Area Boundaries | | | |
| PAD6/1 | Dobbins Lane | Para. 8.18 makes sense: In general, in accordance with policy PAD6, there is a presumption in favour of development within the settlement area boundaries. However, 'strict regulation' is not adequate for countryside area development - surely it should simply not happen at this stage, when most needed housing (all but 53) is already planned for, per para 9.6 | Note expression of support for the policy. Consider addressing concerns about the countryside in the context of other policies. |
| PAD6/2 | Dobbins Lane | Para. 8.21 Local Plan policy 7 states that "the development of new homes in the open countryside will only be permitted where there are special circumstances" and then shortly thereafter, we read that 'The lack of sufficient development land within the confines of the settlement areas to meet strategic targets or local housing needs is a special circumstance'. This seems like a rather large exception to what is a good policy and will potentially invalidate the good policy. | Note concern about the limited scope for development within the settlement area. As the criteria used to define the settlement area are quite strict, consider how to address that concern in the context of other policies. |
| PAD6/3 | Beach Road | This policy is clear and provides unequivocal direction for location of development within settlement area boundaries. | Note expression of support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD6/4 | Trevone | Pad6 does not make any specific reference to the AONB which local Trevone residents and visitors alike treasure. I think it should be mentioned and perhaps there should be a separate policy for Trevone to protect the AONB but also ensure appropriate development in that area that will not affect the AONB. | The policy is specifically about development within the strictly defined settlement area boundaries. Consider addressing concerns about the AONB in the context of other policies. |
| PAD6/5 | Trevone | I am pleased that it is accepted that there should be settlement boundaries for Padstow and the village of Trevone/Windmill ('Trevone'). However, PAD 6 makes no differentiation between Padstow and Trevone. Padstow is without the AONB but contains a conservation area and Trevone is within the AONB. Surely separate policies are needed for these two settlements. In particular, paragraphs 8.18 and 8.19 are incorrect/inappropriate for Trevone. | Note support for policy approach. Consider whether the policy needs to differentiate between Padstow and Trevone or whether the supporting text needs to distinguish between them. |
| PAD6/6 | Trevone | For Trevone, it is hard to understand, and no reason given, why the settlement boundary is not the same as the NCDC development boundary. In particular, it is necessary to keep the rural exception site outside the settlement boundary so that 'Rural exception policies' continue to apply to that site. This is illustrated in schedule 2. | Review the boundaries of the settlement areas in the light of comments received and changing planning status. |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--|
| PAD6/7 | Un-specified | <p>I would like to draw your attention to the anomaly that has occurred with the drawing of the new Trevone and Windmill Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>A certificate of lawfulness was granted on the Black Shed and a large portion of the adjacent land which is connected to Upper Dobbin Lane. The red line curtilage of this was drawn in a completely arbitrary way not recognising any of the 'on the ground' boundary's, there is no boundary along this arbitrary, non-marked line and that leaves a few meters of land in the grand plan completely disconnected from any agricultural land but completely connected to the residential land of Upper Dobbin Lane, this few meters of land have not been included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>May I suggest that for this few meters of land to 'make sense' it should be included within the Trevone and Windmill Settlement Boundary line, acknowledging the 'on the ground' well established old Cornish Stone Hedges and earth boundaries which surround it on all sides other than the absence of boundary which connects it to Upper Dobbin Lane.</p> <p>This would conform with 'Round Off' as precedent, stated in the guidance given by the Secretary of State and the National Policies set by Government, followed by Cornwall County Council and Local Council.</p> | Review the boundaries of the settlement areas in the light of comments received and changing planning status. |
| PAD6/8 | Trevone Road | It is also noted that the map indicating the Padstow settlement area seems not to include the housing and commercial development discussed at full council on June 25th that already has planning permission. | Review the boundaries of the settlement areas in the light of comments received and changing planning status. |
| PAD7 Development Adjoining Padstow's Settlement Area Boundary | | | |
| PAD7/1 | Beach Road | <p>The problem arises as a result of confusion enshrined within these three policies and a failure, in my view, to distinguish between development in the countryside outside of the settlement area boundaries (as referred to at 8.18) and development within the AONB within the countryside.</p> <p>Sequentially if only from a landscape and environmental perspective, development should first be supported in those parts of the countryside unconstrained by other policy designations, Only when no suitable location within the countryside can be identified should locations within the AONB be even considered.</p> <p>This sequential approach is reflected in the Local Plan as mentioned at para 8.21 in the context of placement dwellings where 'the guidance recognises that greater scrutiny replacement dwellings proposals will be required within the AONB'. There seems no reason why the Neighbourhood Plan should not similarly reflect this hierarchy.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan has opted for a criteria-based approach to allow for development proposals outside of the settlement boundaries.</p> <p>Of course, this is acceptable in principle but once again the sequential test should be introduced to these criteria.</p> <p>IN practice this would and should reflect the historical and in all realistic terms the likely future direction of growth of Padstow in a westerly direction onto land outside of the AONB.</p> <p>The key problem with the interrelationship between these development policies arises due to what I believe to be the lack of any analysis considering the suitability and sustainability of differing locations for any new</p> | The respondent expresses concern about how the policy may be interpreted and whether the AONB can be sufficiently protected. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |

| | | | |
|--------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>housing developments within the parish, even before any environmental constraints are overlain.</p> <p>In practice there are only 2 settlements being Padstow and Trevone and whilst a distinction has been made in the sense that PAD7 only relates to development adjoining Padstow's settlement boundary, in practice given the proviso to the rural exception site development policy at PAD11 that a proportion of market housing may be allowed, there is little distinction.</p> <p>Trevone as identified in the Plan has very limited services and facilities, little employment whilst at the same time having the highest level of environmental protection. Bus services to Padstow and Wadebridge are poor and in all likelihood residents of market and affordable housing will work outside of Trevone, send their children to school outside of Trevone and use the services and facilities outside of Trevone.</p> <p>It is therefore hard to think of the less sustainable location to promote additional development than outside the settlement boundary at Trevone. Policies therefore should be to focus all development at and adjoining Padstow and to the least constrained areas.</p> | |
| PAD7/2 | Un-specified | <p>In my opinion, the policy should apply equally to the settlement of Trevone as it does to Padstow. Whilst Trevone is in the AONB, that designation will be given due weight in the balance of considerations and should not therefore preclude development altogether without weighing up the potential benefits. It is unlikely that any more land will come forward in Trevone as an exception site in the Plan Period given the difference in land values between sites that are affordable led and those that are open market led but policy compliant with the amount of affordable housing, therefore by not applying PAD7 to Trevone as well it is denying the village the opportunity to support more community housing and the added benefits that this brings in terms of spend in the local shops and public house. PAD7 already has a clause that ensures any proposed development must not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of the environment and the special landscape character of the AONB, therefore I feel that the Policy should apply equally to Trevone as it does in Padstow and any prospective housing sites should be assessed on its merits and constraints.</p> | <p>Respondent suggests that the policy should apply to land on the edge of the settlement area of Trevone as well as Padstow. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received.</p> |
| PAD7/3 | Parkenhead Lane | <p>As stated in para. 8.29 I too am not in favour of any further building on countryside land around Trevone outside the existing settlement area boundary. It is a small rural community and needs to remain so. Locals in Padstow and Trevone, and holiday makers enjoy this area for the way it is now and it does not need to grow and bigger. Nor does Padstow which is bursting at the seams in high season!</p> <p>So I am concerned that there appears to be a "Get Out Clause" in Policy No PAD 8 which would allow future development at the discretion of the council.</p> | <p>Respondent is concerned that the policy may be too permissive and lead to undesirable development proposals coming forward. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received.</p> |
| PAD7/4 | Parkenhead Lane | <p>This seems to suggest, paragraph 8.26, that there may be no need for additional land in Padstow; however, paragraph 8.24 would allow for some incremental growth outside the settlement boundary; And that, paragraph 8.29 "land adjoining...Trevone is regarded as 'countryside', being within the ANOB, development proposals will be resisted unless they comply with policies etc..."</p> | <p>Respondent suggests a site allocation approach may be preferable way of safeguarding the countryside. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries</p> |

| | | | |
|---------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | Therefore, perhaps a preferred development site for Padstow should be investigated and identified. | should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/5 | Parkenhead Lane | PAD6 and PAD 7 refer to 'special circumstances', but as Trevone is wholly within the ANOB, and CC have zero targets for such settlements, these should be rewritten, and Trevone excluded. | Trevone is excluded from policy PAD7. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/6 | Parkenhead Lane | Para. 8.21 refers to CLP P7 highlighting "the development of new homes in the open countryside will only be permitted where there are special circumstances"; and in paragraph 8.22 that "the lack of sufficient development land within the confines of the settlement areas..... is a 'special circumstance' and is addressed by PAD7 and PAD11. But these policies should not override the policies relating to the AONB | Consider implications of development on the AONB in the context of policies PAD7 and PAD11. |
| PAD7/7 | Trevone | Policy PAD 7 relates to Padstow only and should be in the separate Padstow section. Wherever the policy finally lands up in the document, paragraph 8.29 does not relate to Padstow and should be deleted. | Respondent wants policy PAD7 to be part of a Padstow only section of the NP to ensure that Trevone is excluded. Respondent also objects to para. 8.29. Nb. All supporting text will need to be reviewed in the context of agreed changes to policies. |
| PAD7/8 | Trevone | 8.26 "If house building rates do not slow down and continue as in recent years, the twenty-year target could be achieved by 2021." This surely is not a desirable result – it suggests that completions and permissions are being issued too readily and a more measured pace spread over the next eleven years to 2030 is better for the community and its infrastructure. | Respondent wants the NP to affect some control over the pace of new development. |
| PAD7/9 | Trevone | Para. 8.29 The exact meaning of the text is not clear (what does "... that are tolerant of specific and fully justified types of development" mean? Presumably this is saying the Council will override the countryside/AONB development restrictions if the proposed plan is for social housing. If so then we have the following views concerning social housing running roughshod over our AONB: | Note concerns. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/10 | Trevone | 8.2Sue7 regarding the Community Survey 2018 "... It was plain from the Survey's response that most people would prefer that the growth in housing numbers, over the next 10-15 years is modest. There is a discernible concern however, particularly from Padstow residents, that such a limited target will not achieve the number of affordable homes that are needed ..." Assuming that Trevone residents were of the opposite view to the Padstow residents it would not seem fair or right to burden Trevone's AONB with further development outside its settlement area with additional homes for Padstow residents however worthy their cause for affordable housing as this practice would ultimately destroy Trevone's uniqueness and special character and have an adverse effect on quality of life and tourist numbers. We are not suggesting there is not a case for more affordable homes for Padstow residents but that these should be accommodated within the Padstow boundary; Trevone by its style and character is | Trevone is excluded from policy PAD7. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |

| | | | |
|---------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | not a suitable village for further expansion of affordable homes. | |
| PAD7/11 | Un-specified | This should not be limited to “residential or mixed-use” which gives the impression that any development must include an element of residential. There could be suitable solely commercial, tourism, retail or leisure proposals that would benefit the Town socially and economically. | Note comment. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/12 | Un-specified | the policy should apply equally to the settlement of Trevone as it does to Padstow. Whilst Trevone is in the AONB, that designation will be taken into consideration in any event and should not therefore preclude development without having due regard to the overriding existing statutory framework. As a home and land owner in Trevone, I would be unlikely to put any land forward as an exception site in the Plan Period given the difference in land values between sites that are affordable led and those that are open market led but policy compliant with the amount of affordable housing. By not applying PAD7 to Trevone as well it is denying the village the opportunity to support more community led housing and the added benefits that this brings to the whole community. PAD7 already has provision to ensure that any proposed development must not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of the environment and the special landscape character of the AONB. On that basis the Plan should apply equally to Trevone as it does in Padstow and any prospective housing sites should be assessed on their respective merits. | Respondent suggests that the policy should apply to land on the edge of the settlement area of Trevone as well as Padstow. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/13 | St Petrocs Meadow | Strongly object to any development in the out-of-settlement area in the vicinity due north of PL28 8HB. Have they surveyed these outer fields for former mine workings? We were told by a former P-B land agent that this parcel of land would never be built on. | Note specific objective to land due north of St Petrocs Meadow and doubts about its developability. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |
| PAD7/14 | Treverbyn Road | Padstow must not be allowed to have its boundary joining up with Trevone, Treator of Windmill. | Note concern about coalescence of settlements. |
| PAD7/15 | Trevone Road | Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) – If this status is to mean anything then the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan should clearly state that it will not support any further development on such land – for whatever reason. If that is not the view of the council, then it should have the confidence to say so and the reasons why and draft the plan accordingly. Appreciating that existing developments, even if constructed in what was open AONB – i.e. Porthmissen Close, Trevone has to be marked as within the Trevone existing development. However, it lies bordered on two sides by open fields that are totally within the AONB. The plan allows considerable ‘wriggle room’ for future developments to be allowed on AONB. The layout of Porthmissen Close allowing road extensions in two places. If the intention is, as would seem to be the case, for any future development plans to be viewed favourably then the council should declare it in the plan. | The respondent wants the policy to specifically protect the AONB. Policy approach to development outside the settlement area boundaries should be reviewed in the light of comments received. |

| PAD8 Sustainable Design | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PAD8/1 | Dobbins Lane | 'Sustainable' and 'sustainable development' are terms used repeatedly and I have found a definition in the plan relating to building approaches, which I applaud (8.31) and wondered to what extent the term includes building for future generations so that families can stay here even when they are less able, and can be supported by their relations/carers in their own residences | Note support for the policy approach. Building to meet local needs is addressed by policy PAD10. Consider whether this and other housing policies adequately cover the priorities identified by the respondent. |
| PAD8/2 | Dobbins Lane | 8.31 about sustainability makes excellent sense. I wonder whether it is worth including specific reference to developments that make it easier for elderly people to stay resident in the Parish - extra bedrooms for relatives/other carers, disabled bathroom facilities on the ground floor etc. - and for their offspring to live with them when appropriate. | Note support for the policy approach. Consider whether the policy should include reference to lifetime housing standards. |
| PAD8/3 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | Design standards are an important requirement in new developments according to the Plan and working within the changing policy requirements of the Local Plan. Cornwall Council has declared a Climate emergency and this declaration requires the Council to prepare a report outlining how it can sufficiently reduce carbon emissions through energy and other Council Strategies, plans and contracts to ensure Cornwall works towards carbon neutrality by 2030. | Note supportive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD8/4 | Trevone | Policy PAD 8 is very anodyne. I am not at all certain that this adds to national and Cornwall policies. If it does not, it should be deleted. | Note comment. Consider, in the light of other comments, whether the policy should go further. |
| PAD8/5 | Cornwall Wildlife Trust | The recently published St Agnes NDP is a good example of how neighbourhood plans can promote environmentally friendly developments. An extract from the plan's guidance is provided. It would be beneficial to replicate some of these measures to join up the policies and recommendations being supported across Cornwall. | Note suggestion. Consider whether policy should be extended to cover wildlife enhancing measures. |
| Housing – Topic Overview | | | |
| HO1 | Un-specified | More work to be done by the Council and the Housing Associations to maintain the outside of properties to improve their appearance (e.g. Percy Mews) | Refer comment to the Town Council. |
| HO2 | Netherton Road | Having completed the Development Plan the pace and priorities of implementation will be important. I would like to see priority given to such policies and issue as PAD9, PAD10, and PAD11 to encourage affordable houses for local residents and people with key employment to support the local community. | Refer comment to the Town Council to consider as part of any implementation strategy resultant from the NP. |
| HO3 | Dobbins Lane | Para 9.6 asserts that ' We recognise that a continuous house-building programme that includes a high proportion of the right types and tenures of dwelling is in the interest of local households.' I question this and would like to understand why housebuilding would not be complete at some stage? Or is this because of the employment afforded? The rationale is not clear to me and undermines the sensible limits otherwise implied in the Plan. | Note doubts about the need to facilitate a long-term building programme. |
| HO4 | Parkenhead Lane | Housing figures, including affordable housing requirements, must be based on the current housing numbers attributed to PTC by CC | Ensure latest 'target' figures are include in the Pre-submission version of the NP. |
| HO5 | Trevone | With regard to housing numbers required to be built within the area of Padstow Town Council ('the Parish'), the figure allocated to the Parish relates only to land not in the AONB. There is no allocation for land within the | Consider whether it is necessary to make reference to the LPA's guidance that the strategic housing target |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | AONB (see schedule 1 attached; an e-mail from Cornwall Council). In addition, I understand that, at the examination in public of the Cornwall Plan, the Examiner required that Cornwall Council should show that the whole of its housing target could be provided without relying on any housing being constructed in the AONB. Para. 9.6, or indeed a separate one should state that Cornwall Council were required at the examination in public to show that the housing numbers required to be built by the council could be built on land totally outside the AONB. In addition, it should be stated that the housing numbers for the Parish presume that none are built in the AONB. | should be met on land outside the AONB. |
| HO6 | Trevone | The housing figures in this paragraph do not agree with those in paragraph 8.25. They should be conformed with each other, using the latest available figures, which should be as at 31 March 2019. | Ensure latest 'target' figures are include in the Pre-submission version of the NP. |
| HO7 | Trevone | Consideration should be given to having a policy which protects the stock of small residential properties, particularly bungalows. Several such properties have been pulled down and larger ones built. By retaining small bungalows, it would give the more elderly residents the opportunity to 'trade down' their property. | Consider whether there is merit and sufficient community support to include a policy that limits dwelling replacement and/or garden development. |
| PAD9 Housing Development | | | |
| PAD9/1 | Treverbyn Road | In favour, but can this be achieved? | Note support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD9/2 | Dobbins Lane | Para 9.9 references attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live - to be distinctively Padstonian/Trevonian seems sensible; however, one or two 'distinctive' recent builds are merely extraordinary and rather out of keeping with their surrounds - the three distinctively enormous houses newly built opposite Trevone Farm shop, and the distinctively almost entirely wooden one on Dobbin Road seem out of keeping to me. | Note comment. Consider whether the policy will apply adequate control to prevent inappropriate design and development taking place. |
| PAD9/3 | Trevone | Policy PAD 9 is only suitable for a proper town and therefore relates to Padstow only and should be included in the Padstow section. No development is expected in Trevone. It should be noted that the Porthmissen development, with its urban pavements and car parking spaces layout, is out of character with Trevone in general. | Note comment. Consider whether there are good reasons why the policy should not apply to future housing development in the Trevone area. |
| PAD9/4 | Beach Road | Furthermore, there seems to be some confusion, or at least risk of confusion between Policy PAD9 which is generally supportive of development proposals, but which does not include the safeguards within PAD1 or indeed PAD11 (noting my comments on PAD11) Given the scale of the outstanding housing requirement /obligation (para 9.6) to meet 53 dwellings (and noting this figure is only a snapshot in time so will increase over the plan period) I feel that it would lead to greater certainty and greater levels of community understanding now and in the future if sufficient land was identified to the west of Padstow to meet this need now. This would avoid an unseemly rush by landowners and developers to take advantage of what otherwise are supportive policies for development on both the edge of Padstow and Trevone. This would lead to, in my view, exacerbation of the problems identified in the plan, unsustainable development and harm to the environment, all contrary to the local plan and to the NPPF. | Note suggestion that specific sites should be allocated for future housing development. Consider whether the current policy approach remains valid and the preferred approach following this consultation with the community. |
| PAD9/5 | Un-specified | There is relatively good permeability between different parts of the town at present, but the recent Treceus | Note criticism of recent development. |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | farm estate does not build on this, so people jump over walls and cut through fences and cross fields etc. This is poor planning that should not be repeated and should be remediated where possible through future phases. I would recommend the following change to PAD9: <i>3) provision of safe and secure pedestrian access within the development, and maximise opportunities for links to other parts of Padstow, such as neighbouring residential areas and Treceus Industrial Estate, to enhance pedestrian safety, accessibility and permeability of the whole town; this must meet the most up-to-date standards for such provision set by the County Highways Authority.</i> | Consider whether the policy would benefit from an additional criterion similar to that suggested by the respondent. |
| PAD9/6 | Trevone | PAD9 seems to be silent on the desirability of access to public transport. The same is true of PAD11. Furthermore, neither policy mentions the need to have ready access to medical facilities, which seem to me to be important (without having to drive there, take a taxi or walk for a few miles!), and schools. I suggest that these policies, if retained, be amended to reflect the requirement to address the desirability of these other infrastructure matters. | Note concerns about the adequacy of infrastructure. Consider whether they are adequately addressed by other policies in the NP. |
| PAD10 Housing Needs and Mix | | | |
| PAD10/1 | Netherton Road | Important to recognise “affordable homes” mean that access is open to all. Single, young families, retired, those needing medical support ..etc. Not just 3-bedroom luxury homes. We all, as a community, need to plan for the future, and more. | Consider whether the supporting text adequately covers the point made. |
| PAD10/2 | Dobbins Lane | Glad to see in paras 9.10 - 9.14 an understanding of actual local needs for smaller, rented and lifetime housing | Note supportive comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD10/3 | Un-specified | As an aside, it is also worth noting that Padstow Primary School is now at 75% capacity (Metropole Hotel Statutory Consultee Response) and classes are now being amalgamated with the associated loss of jobs / reduced working hours because of the reduced number of pupils. Delivery of affordable housing will help sustain numbers given that many of the residents are young families, therefore we should seek to encourage the delivery of affordable housing rather than unintentionally putting preventative barriers in the way. | Note supportive comment. Consider whether the respondent signposts additional evidence in support of the policy. |
| PAD10/4 | Un-specified | Key-Worker Accommodation A number of businesses in Padstow cater for the tourism industry but housing employees has become a real issue for both the businesses and, where there are staff houses, the neighbouring residents (anti-social behaviour). I therefore feel that a dedicated area for purpose-built staff accommodation that is managed, much in the same way as keyworker or student accommodation is managed, should be considered to remove the anti-social problems that are experienced by local residents. It would also remove the added pressure from businesses seeking to buy local housing on the estates, so that they instead can remain as family homes. In terms of location, I do think that somewhere on the edge of the existing industrial estate at Treceus would be most appropriate so that a suitably sized building could be constructed to meet the needs without looking out of place. | Consider whether the NP should go further in policy-terms regarding key-worker accommodation. |
| PAD10/5 | Parkenhead Lane | This document promotes providing more low-cost properties in the future either as rental or shared ownership scheme new builds of small houses. This is so important to hold on to a sustainable and vibrant permanent community. | Note supportive comment and view that future housing development should be predominantly rental or shared ownership scheme. |

| | | | |
|---|---------------|---|---|
| | | As far as providing starter homes here in Padstow, perhaps the outstanding 53 properties to be built should be rental or shared ownership scheme properties for local residents' use. As the Treceus Housing Development is already established. perhaps these properties can be built here. | |
| PAD10/6 | Trevone | Policy PAD 10 is also a Padstow only policy as no major developments are allowed or anticipated in the AONB. | Consider request that this should be regarded as a Padstow only policy. |
| PAD10/7 | Trevone | 9.13 "74% of respondents to the Housing Need Survey 2018 said they supported an affordable housing led development to help meet the needs of local people." We would like the 74% figure broken down to reveal how many of the respondents are resident in Trevone. Assuming this is a low percentage then, the previous comment above under 8.27 applies here. | Consider whether the views emanating from different settlement areas has any direct relevance to the policy. |
| PAD11 Rural Exception Site Development | | | |
| PAD11/1 | Un-specified | Housing associations could be encouraged to create a replacement of the Council housing lost to second homes | Note support for housing associations. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD11/2 | Dobbins Lane | I am less clear that para 9.17's suggestion that such housing in Trevone (which would be desirable) should be provided for by 'rural exception site development'. If this is the case, it needs to be a matter for the whole community to decide where this approach would work with least negative impact, not just the Planning offices. It should also be limited to long term rental accommodation since any 'affordable housing' purchase arrangements inevitably seem to convert to unaffordable housing. | Note views expressed. The NP will be subject to a Referendum when the whole community of the parish will be able to decide on the planning policies that should be applied by the LPA. The residents of Trevone will also be able to make comment and representations on any planning application made in their neighbourhood. |
| PAD11/3 | Un-specified | I believe Trevone could easily happen accommodate a second phase to the existing Affordable development to sit alongside the existing development controlled by Ocean Housing in Porthmissen Close, Trevone. | Note implied support for this policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD11/4 | Dobbins Close | Section 5 uses the words 'in perpetuity' – we have had trouble with this in London where a park given to the community 'in perpetuity' now ends with a meaning of 90-year period and is under threat for housing. I notice the words are used elsewhere in your document. My advice is if you mean 'for ever more' – then say that. | Consider, in consultation with the LPA, whether the phrase is 'in perpetuity' is the most appropriate one. |
| PAD11/5 | Homer Park Rd | In order to preserve the spirit that small scale affordable schemes are indeed small-scale, I hope that a policy be added stating "any proposal for small-scale affordable schemes be non-contiguous with any previously passed such schemes. | Consider whether the suggested clause is necessary or appropriate. |
| PAD11/6 | Beach Road | The list of criteria required to generate support for rural exception sites should be widened to include walking distance to school, to everyday shops, health/doctors, childcare/nursery and other services. Criteria 6 should be expanded to say 'and in all other ways meets the criteria of housing policy PAD9 and PAD7'. The new criteria should be introduced to ensure that development is not promoted in the AONB as for the reason stated above there can be no good reason to do so given availability of land not so protected. As stated above it would be better and ultimately more likely to meet the local needs and to deliver affordable housing on the edge of Padstow. At para 9.18 it is stated that policy PAD11 is consistent with AONB policy MD5. As quoted the policy is not at all consistent with this without amendment. | Consider whether the criteria of the draft policy should be added to or amended as suggested. |

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---|--|
| PAD11/7 | Trevone | Although I have no objection to a small (maximum 15 houses) extension to the present Porthmissen Close estate, I am very worried by the wording of this Policy. Has consideration been given to this wording actually creating a loophole? For example, I understand Beach Road has recently been purchased by a Development Company. This purchase would give access to Dave's Field. All the purchasers have to do is wait until the owners of Dave's Field (now or in years to come) are prepared to sell and if this Policy wording is included in the NDP, there would be difficulties in objecting to planning on that site. I don't think the wording of 4 and 5 is tight enough and the Council would do well to seek specialist legal advice. There are a number of unadopted roads within the Parish, not all leading to such a prime building site, but building on this particular site would be detrimental to the beauty of the area even if it provided some homes for locals. | Consider whether the draft policy should be amended in the light of the concerns expressed regarding specific locations in or on the edge of Trevone's settlement area, once the boundary has been reviewed. |
| PAD11/8 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | The Plan refers to small scale affordable housing schemes. It may be useful to quantify what small is and whether this is appropriate. Policy 9 of the Local Plan state that the primary purpose of development on Exceptions sites is to provide affordable housing to meet local needs will be supported where they are clearly affordable housing led and would be well related to the physical form of the settlement and appropriate in scale, character and appearance. We would suggest that appropriate scale is used instead of small scale. | Consider whether the wording of the policy should be revised as suggested or whether it is necessary to define what is meant by 'small'. |
| PAD11/9 | Parkenhead Lane | A Rural Exception Site policy may be needed to prevent unwanted speculative housing development of any kind in Padstow. But, paragraph 9.17 suggests there may be a need to also identified an exception site for in Trevone. However, the CLP says " the baseline for a housing target within an AONB will be zero", backed by the Examiner; The Housing Needs survey identified that no-one wanted to live in Trevone; PAD 11 says 'an exception site needs to be within a reasonable and safe walking distance of an existing settlement', which Trevone is certainly not with no paved area on the B3276. Therefore, Trevone needs to be removed from this Draft policy. | Note opposition to the draft policy covering the whole parish including Trevone and the AONB. Consider whether it should exclude areas of the parish or favour certain locations or sites. |
| PAD11/10 | Parkenhead Lane | PAD 11 may only be needed to prevent speculative development in Padstow, as CLP and ANOB Management Plan consider Trevone to be outside any development area. | Note comment and implied suggestion that the AONB should be excluded. |
| PAD11/11 | Parkenhead Lane | Housing and Housing Development uses data from the 2018 Housing Needs survey and from the Community Consultation in 2018. From a total of 1488 questionnaires only 52 returned related directly to housing needs. One question (Q18) asked where would the household like to live? Of the 44 responses to this question, none wanted to live in Trevone!! Therefore, the AONB must be protected and there should be no housing in the AONB | Note point made that Housing Needs data does not justify any housing development in the AONB area. |
| PAD11/12 | Trevone | Policy PAD 11 is unacceptable as there is no need for it. Rural exception sites are legislated for fully in the Cornwall Plan policy number 9. There is absolutely no need to expand on this policy in the Plan. No-one in the housing survey put Trevone as their first choice for affordable housing and the 'fingering' in paragraph 9.17 of a site in Trevone is also unacceptable. Sub-paragraph 3) of this policy in itself is also unacceptable. It is not for Padstow Town Council, through its NDP, to determine the composition of any community. In other parts of the country this would be | Note opposition to the specific reference to Trevone. Note view that this draft policy is unnecessary in the NP as the Local Plan deals adequately with exception site development. |

| | | | |
|----------|---------|--|--|
| | | called social engineering. This same comment applies also to paragraph 9.17. | |
| PAD11/13 | Trevone | <p>Padstow Town Council appear to be targeting Trevone as a rural exception area (9.17) and will agree to further development adjoining its settlement area using the 'extension' rule to an existing built up area (ref PAD7/1). Although not specified this can only refer to the extension of the Porthmissen estate completed in 2016 and located just down from Windmill on the right-hand side.</p> <p>We strongly object to any such further development of this site as:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would contravene PAD7/4 i.e. "It does compromise and have an unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of the environment and the special landscape character of the AONB" as it would reduce the amount of agricultural land and increase the already high volume of traffic in Trevone Road. 2. It would adversely affect the unique village character of Trevone and turn it into a town. 3. There is no evidence that "an increase in the number of young families would [also] help support local facilities and services and make Trevone a more sustainable community in the future." (9.17) The residents of the Porthmissen estate keep themselves to themselves and do not seem to support local functions and events. There is one farm shop and one beach shop in Trevone – all other 'local' facilities are in Padstow. 4. It would destroy the qualities that Trevone parishioners' value most about their area (7.1) namely, "Its scenic beauty, countryside, location, wildlife, peacefulness and pace of life." <p>If Padstow Town Council really does value these Natural Environment qualities, then their Extension rule runs counter to preserving and maintaining them and will without doubt destroy them. The Extension rule gives the Council carte blanche to override parishioners' concerns regarding the necessity to preserve Trevone's AONB eg:</p> <p>7.2 States that Trevone is part of the Cornwall AONB and "being part of the AONB means being protected by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 'to conserve and enhance its natural beauty'".</p> <p>8.5 "It is the overwhelming view of the community that incursions into our precious countryside should be strictly limited and controlled."</p> <p>8.21 "Local plan policy 7 states "the development of new homes in the open countryside will only be permitted where there are special circumstances."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. It would increase traffic levels that are already at a high and dangerous level. <p>Trevone's parishioners value the exceptional quality of their village and do not want any further extension development outside the settlement area that would turn their rural idyll into an urban sprawl; this cannot be the Council's aim intentionally or otherwise and its priority therefore should be to protect it against any such development.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> | Note the reasoned opposition to any extension of the Porthmissen estate at Trevone and concerns that the draft policy may facilitate it. |
| PAD11/14 | Trevone | 9.16 "The number of local households, 176, that was recognised as being in housing need at April 2018 is substantial." | Note suggestion that Padstow housing needs should be met at Padstow. |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|---|
| | | How many of the 176 are resident in Trevone? Assuming this is a low percentage then, the previous comment above under 8.27 applies here. | |
| PAD11/15 | Trevone | In summary, Trevone has unique character and its AONB must be protected for future generations and the Council must resist the urge to extend the settlement area to provide further sites for affordable homes development that would be better located within Padstow, or at least outside the AONB, bearing in mind the number already allocated within the Treceus development. The Council are no doubt aware that when five agricultural fields came up for sale in 2017 between Harlyn Road and Trevone Road, over 30 Trevone households felt so passionate about protecting the AONB and preventing further development, that they raised the capital to purchase the fields themselves with the sole purpose of preserving their agricultural heritage, natural beauty and the character of Trevone as a village. | Note opposition to exception site development at Trevone because of its character. |
| PAD11/16 | Un-specified | Paragraph 9.17 suggests that there may need to be a Rural Exception Site within the AONB of Trevone. PAD11 notes that exception sites must be within a reasonable and safe walking distance of an existing settlement. Trevone is not easily accessible as the main B3276 is narrow, has no pavement and is unsafe for pedestrians to walk along. Farm tracks do exist, but these are not accessible as they require climbing over stiles and walking up a steep hill, neither possible for many potential residents within the community. Therefore, Trevone should be excluded from PAD11. | Note opposition to exception site development at Trevone because of inadequate pavements and inadequate pedestrian routes. |
| PAD11/17 | Trevone | My concerns about PAD11 fall into two categories PAD11, without item 3, seems to be essentially a paraphrasing of Policy 9 in the Cornwall Local Plan. As such I consider it unnecessary and believe it, and associated paragraphs, should be deleted. Item 3 goes beyond Policy 9. There is no reference provided for what is proposed and no clarification given. Is the 'balanced community' that is referred to be based on age, gender, ethnicity, or what? Many communities have areas within them where some population traits are more common than others and those responsible for planning do not attempt to affect the mix. The adoption of item 3 would effectively give those making planning decisions the remit to make such decisions so as to alter the mix of persons within the community and, it might be argued, could be regarded as bordering, perhaps unintentionally, on some degree of social engineering. This is not something I would support and does not seem an appropriate within a policy for a Neighbourhood Plan. | Note view that this draft policy is unnecessary in the NP as the Local Plan deals adequately with exception site development. Respondent specifically questions criterion three. If the policy remains in the Pre-submission version of the NP, consider whether further explanation is needed in the supporting text as to what certain criteria mean. |
| PAD12 Second Homes | | | |
| PAD12/1 | Un-specified | I think there has been a lot of careful thought put into these policies, with due regard to protecting the unique and special nature of our town. Particularly glad to note Pad12 re: second homes. | Note expression of support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD12/2 | Un-specified | Is there a restriction on the size of 'replacement' 1 to 1 buildings? There seem to be several 'replacement' dwellings lately which are decidedly larger than the original building. Also is there a requirement to keep the replacement building in character with the area in which it is situated? | Consider whether the NP needs to set limits to dwelling replacement. |
| PAD12/3 | Un-specified | Support the proposal for local resident housing provision, including a restriction on holiday lets for 2nd homes | Note expression of support for the policy. |

| | | | |
|----------|----------------|--|---|
| PAD12/4 | Un-specified | Adopt a St Ives style plan and ban further second homes. | Note support for a St Ives type policy. |
| PAD12/5 | Un-specified | I support policy PAD12 regarding second homes and aim 7 to prioritise local housing needs. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/6 | Un-specified | I also support policy No 12 – Second homes. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/7 | Treverbyn Road | In favour, but can this be achieved? | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/8 | Treverbyn Road | Anything that addresses the balance between 2 nd homes and permanent homes has to be a good thing. We cannot just keep building houses in this beautiful spot, without any control over how they are occupied. | Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD12/9 | Raleigh Road | I think the Plan has been well put together and balances the needs of locals and tourists. It recognises the need to control the number of 2 nd homes and protect the environment. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/10 | Dobbins Lane | Agree with 9.24 to restrict second homes so as to strengthen the community and local economy. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/11 | Un-specified | Re: Adopt a St Ives style plan and ban further second homes. Great Idea. | Note support for a St Ives type policy. |
| PAD12/12 | Un-specified | <p>Whilst I fully appreciate the thinking behind this policy, the practicalities are that it will frustrate housing delivery, including the much-needed affordable housing. Note the delivery rates of housing in St Ives for the past three years which in May 2016 adopted the same primary residence policy to that proposed in the Padstow NDP.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted that there is a lag between consent and completions, we are now over three years on from when the policy was adopted and only 6 dwellings to date with the primary residence policy have been completed across all sites / consented schemes in St Ives (and I think two of these were the lifting of a holiday restriction on dwellings that were already built). Given the threshold for affordable housing to be triggered is 10 units, this would indicate that only small-scale schemes of one or two dwellings are being constructed and no affordable housing is being delivered because of the burden placed on development sites with the primary residence policy. Mortgage lending for primary residence housing is limited and where mortgage products are available the interest rates will be higher than standard mortgages so the cost of servicing the debt will be greater to those living in the properties. The uncertainty of sales (because of the primary residence policy) puts off developers from looking at bringing sites forward, and without sites of a certain size that have open market housing cross-subsidising the affordable then no homes are being built for anyone.</p> | <p>Note concern about potential impact of policy on new housebuilding.</p> <p>In the light of all the comments received, consider whether policy should remain in this or another form in the Pre-submission version of the NP.</p> |
| PAD12/13 | Un-specified | Houses that come under the most pressure from second homeowners are those wanting properties in the older, more quaint parts of the town. The policy does nothing to protect the existing housing stock here from being purchased by second / holiday homeowners so pressures will continue from these prospective purchasers. The outskirts of Padstow are not where holiday homeowners want to be - Cornwall Council confirmed that only 2% of the houses on the outskirts are second / holiday homes. I therefore feel strongly that Policy PAD12 will do more damage than good and will prevent any affordable | Note comment and view expressed that the policy will have adverse implications on the local market older character properties in the area and a negative impact on the supply of affordable housing. |

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---|---|
| | | housing from coming forward and will unintentionally put pressure on the existing stock pushing prices even higher and out of reach from those wishing to remain in the local community. | |
| PAD12/14 | Trevone | 9.24 I support this. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/15 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | <p>We have sympathy with the problem and the Plan's ambition to favour full time residency, but the LSE report has identified unplanned market consequences. There have been two articles recently which highlight the impact of the second homes policy on St Ives and it has been shown to have a negative impact upon local residents in terms of tilting the open market away from locals.</p> <p>Like many popular Cornish coastal resorts Padstow has succeeded in attracting destination tourism; often visitors are converted into wanting to own a 'small part' of Padstow and become 'accepted' within and by the community through buying a second home. Also, investors are attracted to acquiring holiday let homes because of the potential investment return, measured against an economy where traditional investment returns are currently low.</p> <p>We have sympathy with the problem, from the community's viewpoint, through trying to reduce the demand for second / investment homeownership. The proposed restriction in favour of full-time residency for any new open market homes built is likely to have adverse impact on the market.</p> <p>Our views expressed in relation to this draft policy are made in good faith, using our experience of housebuilding funding, mortgage availability, market economics and buyer's aspirations.</p> <p>We support the principle that new homes should be led by delivering affordable homes / community value. To achieve affordable homes delivery, a balance needs to be struck against some open market housing delivery via s106 Agreements, otherwise affordable homes delivery could stall unless funded through Government grants. Government has greatly reduced grant requiring RP's to use cross subsidy models.</p> <p>Through restricting newly built open market homes, as proposed, without the Neighbourhood Plan having the ability to retrospectively restrict existing housing stock in similar fashion, runs the risk of creating a distorted market. The approach proposed would not deter second home ownership but is likely to increase demand and consequential value of existing unrestricted private homes stock disproportionately.</p> <p>The continuing second home demand focused on a smaller pool of homes could exacerbate the ability for local people to afford homes in the heart of the town. The local community would have no control over this market.</p> <p>The resultant likely increase in the average home price in the uncontrolled parts of the town is likely to increase the average sales values across the wider housing stock further distancing local people from affordability.</p> <p>Ironically, the aim to restrict new homes, if any were built might lag behind in value because of the occupancy restriction, but mortgage companies are less inclined to grant mortgages where there is such a 'market' restriction.</p> | <p>Consider the case and evidence presented by the respondent.</p> <p>In the light of all the comments received, consider whether policy should remain in this or another form in the Pre-submission version of the NP.</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>One only has to look at restricted affordable homes sales. Local Authorities recognise that first time buyers can only secure a mortgage providing the restriction on occupancy can be lifted if a mortgage company has to take possession following default allowing the property to be sold unrestricted on the open market. Without this 'mortgagee in possession' clause, no mortgages would be available to first time buyers.</p> <p>It is our contention that considering how to help better balance housing market supply and demand is not a black and white answer through simplistic restriction of one sector.</p> <p>The London School of Economics (LSE) recently published report (June 2019) referred to previously, evaluated the impact of such restrictions both in the UK and overseas. St Ives, which trailblazed an occupancy restriction through their NDP according to the report, has suffered unfavourable unplanned consequences and market distortion. We would urge the Padstow Steering Group to consider the report as relevant evidence. We attach a copy.</p> <p>The communities view is understood and the Plan's aim admirable, as we recognise that Padstow leaders are keen to create a vibrant community with housing and consequential wellbeing serving all sectors of local society. However, to achieve would require a raft of policy decisions.</p> <p>We would urge the Padstow Steering Group to brainstorm alternative approaches, which would allow the community to benefit in different ways. It would be wrong for us to guide such a conversation, other than to say that at Treceus Farm we voluntary offered to promote homes for local people for a minimum period before being offered to people from outside of Padstow and we prevented any homes being purchased for holiday letting. That has delivered success and has led to over 80 new affordable homes being created. We are grateful to the Steering Group for acknowledging this.</p> | |
| PAD12/16 | Dennis Road | <p>I note with interest the proposal to follow St Ives Town Council's initiative to place a residential requirement on new build housing. While this move was applauded by the local residents when it was introduced in St Ives I understand that the unintended consequence has been to bring new housing development to a virtual standstill as developers are unable to build and sell houses at prices that will bring a return on their investment. Older properties in St Ives are now favoured by second home seekers, and there are very few new homes being built and sold at affordable prices to locals. I think Padstow Parish council should take note and proceed with great caution in implementing a similar policy.</p> <p>Have members of the council considered other possible measures to discourage second home purchases that inflate property prices for locals? I am not sure what powers the council has but are there other possible strategies that would not discourage developers?</p> <p>It is a very important matter to keep Padstow as a vibrant living community for young working families</p> | <p>Consider the concerns expressed by the respondent.</p> <p>In the light of all the comments received, consider whether policy should remain in this or another form in the Pre-submission version of the NP.</p> |
| PAD12/17 | Parkenhead Lane | <p>I also think there are sufficient second homes and holiday-lets in this area and that these should be limited in the future as they have done in St Ives.</p> | <p>Note implied expression of support for the policy.</p> |
| PAD12/18 | Trevone | <p>I support in principle policy PAD 12 but am concerned about some of the negative assertions/wording in the following narrative. I attach a marked-up copy of this</p> | <p>Note support in principle for the policy but concern about</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|------------------|--|---|
| | | page. It has to be recalled that it was 'locals' who sold their houses to second homeowners etc in the first place. In addition, in paragraph 9.22, I challenge whether the sustainability of Trevone is compromised by second homeowners. 'White van man' in this area was never out of work through the financial crisis and the community in the village is flourishing. | the potential negative impact. Review wording of supporting text after agreeing any revisions to the policy. |
| PAD12/19 | Trevone | On a more positive note, we are fully in agreement to the Council's plan for Second Homes (PAD12) in general and the Principal Residence rule in particular. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/20 | Un-specified | Like most permanent residents, I do strongly oppose the development of second homes and the destruction of the actual fibre of the village of Trevone by them. Really enough is enough. We have more than is ever needed, there is no excuse to build anymore. Lots of them don't fit in, architecturally, with the existing style of properties and lots, especially the wooden ones, just look hideous and stand out horribly. The second home industry brings traffic, both contractors and of course private vehicles. Their nuisance, noise, quantity and pollution that results is not acceptable. Cornwall, we all know, is one of the most popular holiday spots in the UK, we have our fair share of foreign vehicles using our very busy road network too, which adds to the congestion in peak holiday times. Continued building work can only increase this. Consideration should be given to reduce the traffic problems it causes. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/21 | N Prideaux-Brune | Second homes - Difficult one this. I have huge sympathy with the strength of local feeling about second homes, although I recently saw a news article which suggested that the approach taken in St Ives has not necessarily had the desired effect, and in some instances has been counterproductive. Other options, such as a local tax on second homes, might be worth considering? | Note concern about possible negative impact of the draft policy. |
| PAD12/22 | Treverbyn Road | Development of new properties should not be allowed to be used to let as second homes. Homes for locals should be made more affordable. | Note expression of support for the policy. |
| PAD12/23 | Church Street | 2nd Home Ownership -- paras 9.5, 9.22, and 9.23 I found your comments on second home ownership interesting and very relevant. When we purchased our house most of the top end of Church Street was permanently occupied as main residences. Today there are only two houses at the top of Church St which are occupied as principal residences. The other change is that 2nd home ownership has changed. Whilst in the 1980s and 90s the pattern was for houses to be bought for the owner's own use or for their family or immediate friends, the most common sight today at the front door is the black key box and advert for a letting company. The most common approach seems to be to modernise and sanitise the property for letting and the owners to only visit themselves at best a few times in the year. It is no longer a second home but a commercial business and so should perhaps be reclassified as such and a way found to control expansion where it is detrimental to the town's development as a community. The other aspect of ownership in the 1980s was that properties were frequently in very poor condition (ours was dreadful) and it would have been almost completely impossible to obtain a mortgage. We have invested time and funds in restoring and retaining countless old features. | Note support in principle for the policy but concern about the potential negative impact. |

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|---|
| | | I would like to see you recognise the difference between the investment/ letting/business second home and those who have worked to see Padstow retain its old character and make their property a “real second home”.. I applaud your proposals to prevent new housing being purchased for second homes but have heard that St Ives have found unexpected adverse consequences by adopting similar restrictive policies. I would suggest that the PPNP team approach the St Ives NP team and see if these proposed policies for Padstow will avoid having similar difficulties. | |
| PAD12/24 | Un-specified | A mate lives in St Ives and there are now no building jobs for locals left because the developers don't make money. It's been a disaster for young local people that need well paid jobs. It's a great idea that has had the opposite effect I think. | |
| Transport, Travel and Parking – Topic Overview | | | |
| TT1 | Un-specified | Direct bus service to St Columb would enable direct bus routes to the west, Truro and Newquay. | Refer comment to Town council. Not a NP matter. |
| TT2 | Padstow | The amount of cars, buses & lorries coming into Padstow is getting unbearable now for people who live on the A389, the park & ride buses are so noisy & polluting going backwards and forwards every 10-15 mins with sometimes 4/5 people on big double decker buses which is crazy. All lorries & buses going into the town should use the alternative route away from the school & residents on the B3276 past the cemetery where the noise wouldn't affect anyone. Something has to be done as this situation is only going to get worse with the amount of people visiting Padstow. I'm all for the Park and ride but it has to be set up properly with digital displays on entering Padstow saying how many spaces are actually left in the town to stop cars driving all the way down to only discover there's no spaces so then driving all the way back up to park in the park & ride!! If done properly it will also stop the volume of cars going unnecessarily down to the town. We live in a beautiful place which is slowly being destroyed by unnecessary new builds, pollution, people & traffic. Padstow was once a lovely village. | Note respondent generally agrees with Overview. Consider whether anything can usefully be added to the introductory text. |
| TT3 | Grenville Road | Road network - I note the comment “Perhaps the matter of most concern to the community is the road network and the several traffic issues”. I agree that traffic management and the roads are a concern. Objective 9A (Improve and extend the footpath network) should include: 1. The need for an official footpath and cycle-path from the junction of the B3276 and the A389 through to the top of Polpennic Drive. The lack of one is dangerous; residents and tourists currently walk on the road or battle through the vegetation. 2. In addition to the critical need address in 1 above, I propose there is a need to extend a footpath and cycle-path to at least Jury Park, if not the Caravan site. 3. Many people from the existing Treceus Farm development and Grenville Road (and roads leading of it) dash across the A389 to get to either the bus stop (notably the Wadebridge school pupil dash) or to Tesco. I know there is the traffic island a little further up, however this is simply ignored. With the proposed further expansion of the Treceus Farm development, the possible further expansion of the Treceus Industrial Estate and all the additional pedestrian traffic that may bring, particularly school age children and the elderly, I | Note respondent generally agrees with Overview. Consider whether anything can usefully be added to the introductory text. Road maintenance is not a NP matter. This comment should be referred to the Town Council. |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | feel it a clear safety requirement that a managed crossing is put in at the top of Grenville Road to the bus stop and Tesco, e.g. a pelican crossing 4. Road maintenance: This may be a Cornwall Council responsibility, but it would be good to see the Town Council keep the pressure on for updated road surfaces, you will understand why I put forward the state of Grenville Road as an example. | |
| TT4 | Treverbyn Road | Parking is a nightmare in Padstow and parking permits should be for homeowners in roads at top of town e.g. Glynn Road, Netherton Road, Dennis Road, Treverbyn Road, Egerton Road. | Parking controls and management is not a matter for the NP. The comment should be referred to the Town Council. |
| PAD13 Local Travel and Safety | | | |
| PAD13/1 | Treverbyn Road | I think the emphasis should be put on keeping the roads around the harbour safe and accessible. At present there are too many unnecessary obstacles along the side of what is already a narrow road making it difficult to access the North Quay in particular. It is important to remove A-boards and street traders unbelievable when they are sat underneath signs saying 'no street traders'. These obstacles making it unsafe for public safety. | Street and traffic controls are not matter for the NP. The comment should be referred to the Town Council. |
| PAD13/2 | Beach Road | Given the acknowledged severe problems with travelling and congestion in the centre of Padstow and in Trevone, this policy should be broadened to include and presumption against development which will exacerbate any such congestion. | Traffic impact criteria should be considered in the context of specific development policies. |
| PAD13/3 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | We would support such a policy as long as it is viable and deliverable. The Plan needs to be flexible in accepting pedestrian / cycle routes as shared surfaces. An electric bike charging point is an interesting proposal. Like public car charging points, they should be located in public areas, such as car parks, although security would be challenging. | Note support in principle for the policy but concern about how such a policy will be interpreted and implemented. |
| PAD13/4 | Un-specified | Generally supports facilities for alternative means of transport. | Note support in principle for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD14 Electric Vehicle Charging | | | |
| PAD14/1 | Netherton Road | Not just new homes need electric parking points, existing homes need access to such points as well. | Consider whether to extend the policy to mention new buildings. |
| PAD14/2 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | We would support and would suggest they should be located in public areas such as pubs and car parks, providing there is accessibility to nearby facilities. Whilst waiting for charging, people will want something to do, hence recommending that they are concentrated near existing facilities. We agree that domestic trickle charging points should be provided in all new homes. | Note comments. Consider whether it is necessary to further describe what is meant by suitable locations. |
| PAD14/3 | Un-specified | EV Charging points should be required, not supported, for all new homes and commercial development. Many local authorities are including this in development plans nowadays. | Note view, but the NP cannot go as far as requiring EV Charging points. |
| PAD15 Public Car Parking Areas | | | |
| PAD15/1 | Un-specified | Car park capacity signage, as used in Newquay, would probably alleviate some of the car roundabout syndrome in the summer, and relieve congestion in the town. | Traffic management is not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |
| PAD15/2 | Un-specified | Also, as a local resident I would like to propose Resident Parking Permits. I know that you are still not guaranteed a space outside your home and a cost would occur but I'm sure this would be acceptable for most people | Parking control is not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | residing in the town. Sincerely hope this issue can be looked at again. | |
| PAD15/3 | Raleigh Road | I am concerned about our car parking. I think if we create more public car parking we will get more visitors in town than we can manage. We have to accept that when the parking is full, the town can't take any more. Resident parking for those living in the centre of town still needs addressing. | Note concern about the potentially negative impact of additional public car parking areas. |
| PAD15/4 | Dobbins Lane | I wonder whether electronic monitoring and reporting of parking spaces could be useful at the arrival points to Padstow to prevent people coming into the town centre only to find they must drive straight back out. Might we also limit the central car parks to young families and elderly people and encourage others further develop their health and stamina by parking further away? We could increase the number of loading only bays to advantage. Including off road parking in new developments is sensible. | Parking control is not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |
| PAD15/5 | Un-specified | I also support the suggestion of real-time car park capacity signage, and it should be on show before the Park and Ride site, in an attempt to stop wasted journeys around town adding to congestion and pollution. Could the Park and Ride buses be a) single-deckers and b) electric/hybrid? | Parking control and bus service provision are not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |
| PAD15/6 | Un-specified | We all know that the Padstow town centre has very limited parking making the park-and-ride invaluable. However, during some extremely busy times I've seen it closed. Could that please be looked at as it will relieve the need for visitors to drive into town looking for parking. | Park-and-ride opening times is not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |
| PAD15/7 | Un-specified | ... whilst PAD15 entirely supports new car parks, this seems to be the wrong way around and there is a danger that every field around the town will turn into a car park in the summer. | Note concern about the potentially negative impact of providing additional public car parking areas. |
| PAD15/8 | Trevone | PAD15 and the subsequent paragraphs seem to be somewhat blinkered in that it is silent on measures that may ameliorate the need for further public car parking. I suggest that this policy be amended to include support for such measures. | Note doubt that further public car parking is necessary. Other measures are referred to but not specified. |
| PAD16 Off-road Parking | | | |
| PAD16/1 | Treverbyn Road | Cars are double parking on both sides of many of our roads i.e. Dennis Road making it impossible to pass and especially emergency vehicles needing to get through. Double-yellow lines should be placed on at least one side. | Parking control is not a NP matter. Refer suggestion to Town Council. |
| PAD16/2 | Beach Road | There should be an additional limb to this policy where the development proposals result in the loss of private parking would not be supported. | Consider whether the policy should be extended to prevent the loss of off-road parking as a result of new development. |
| PAD16/3 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | This is clearly an important issue that the Plan wishes to contribute to lessen the problem. We would support this. | Note support in principle for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD16/4 | Trevone | Policy PAD 16 is not needed for Trevone. The reference to Trevone in paragraph 10.11 is a wrong interpretation of the results of the questionnaire and should be deleted. To the question 'Do any of the following need addressing: parking in Trevone, 54% agreed and 46% disagreed. The problem in Trevone is inconsiderate parking in the holiday season and builders' vehicles. This is not a problem to be resolved by new development proposals, particularly as development is not expected in | Note the opinion that a policy requiring adequate off-road parking provision for new development and encouraging the provision of additional off-road parking should not apply to Trevone. |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | Trevone. The comment about 'free parking space' relates to Padstow only. | |
| Local Economy and Tourism – Topic Overview | | | |
| ET1 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | The NDP is seeking to broaden the employment opportunities and reduce the reliance on lower paid tourism jobs. We would draw attention to the land to the north of Treceus industrial Estate as a preferred option for expansion of businesses in the town. We would suggest the potential of Newquay Spaceport proposals could offer opportunities for a modern business park in Padstow, allowing it to attract high quality specialist businesses, away from but well positioned to Newquay. To attract, such ambition, if agreed by the community would need to be articulated. | The respondent identifies specific as suitable for expansion of businesses in the town. Consider how the policies in the Pre-submission version of the NP may impact on the nominated land. |
| ET2 | N Prideaux-Brune | Tourism - Speaking as an institution (i.e. Prideaux Place) which depends heavily on Padstow's tourism industry I hope that there will genuinely remain a proactive openness to sensible and sustainable ventures aimed at visitors. Whilst there is understandable wariness from the local community about being invaded each year there is precedent showing that, with changing tastes and fashions, "destination" towns can find that their visitors have moved elsewhere. We should keep our eye on the ball. | Note comment and hope that the NP will facilitate sustainable tourism. |
| PAD17 Business Development | | | |
| PAD17/1 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | We consider that this policy is too restrictive as new businesses and expansion of business are not necessarily located adjacent to the settlement boundary of Padstow. | Note objection from developer to the restrictive nature of this draft policy. |
| PAD18 Treceus Industrial Estate | | | |
| PAD18/1 | Un-specified | Look to improve local employment opportunities that is not tourism related, especially on Treceus Farm Industrial Estate (though its appearance needs to be improved) | Note implied expression of support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD18/2 | Dobbins Lane | 11.14 shows good thinking about developments on the Treceus Industrial Estate. | Note support for the policy reasoning. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD18/3 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | We agree with the sentiment of this policy but consider that it should be written in a more positive light. A Neighbourhood Plan is a tool for encouraging development in the right place. We recommend you replace the negative language. | Note criticism of the way the policy is written. Consider whether it should be re-worded in a more positive, development-encouraging manner. |
| PAD18/4 | Parkenhead Lane | I agree that Treceus Industrial Estate is in need of improvement and is of vital importance to our economic growth. | Note implied expression of support for the policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD18/5 | Trevone | Paragraph 11.14 gives some views on the undesirability of 'storage, warehousing and distribution businesses'. No evidence/reference is given for this view as being something that Padstow Parishioners endorse. Nor is anything said about the potential benefits throughout the Parish for new businesses of this type. I suggest that the lack of robust substantiation of the views expressed mean that this paragraph needs to be either properly referenced or else deleted. I would not necessarily view this type of business as undesirable, it would depend on employment created and the leveraging it gave to other businesses. | Respondent questions whether the community agrees with the statement that "development proposals for storage, warehousing and distribution businesses will not be supported, because they generally provide low levels of employment in relation to the floor space provided". The purpose of the informal consultation on the NP was test whether policy positions such as this were favoured or otherwise by the community. |

| | | | |
|--|----------------|---|--|
| | | | Review the policy position in the light of the response to the consultation. |
| PAD18/6 | Treverbyn Road | Treccerus industrial estate should not be over-developed. | Note implied opposition to the draft policy if it results in Treccerus Industrial Estate being over-developed. |
| PAD19 Padstow Town Centre | | | |
| PAD19/1 | Un-specified | Continue to limit 'chain' shops in the Town Centre (e.g. rejecting Costa's bid for the Barclays site) | This is not something the NP can exercise control over. Refer the comment to the Town Council. |
| PAD19/2 | Egerton Road | Some restrictions should be placed on the traders on the Quay providing tattoos and hair braiding. The queues for these traders block the road and passageway around the Quay. They have now started selling various items which puts them in direct competition with rate paying shops who are at an unfair advantage. | This is not something the NP can exercise control over. Refer the comment to the Town Council. |
| PAD19/3 | Treverbyn Road | Nothing addressing the harbour area and its proliferation of street traders appears in the Plan. Many of these traders suggest they offer a service but are simply selling tat. The crowds which gather round them cause obstruction to pedestrians and traffic. Some are now appearing on the bandstand which does have a specific and enhancing purpose. For years now nothing appears to have been done to prevent the numbers of these people who are not apparently paying anything into the local community. | This is not something the NP can exercise control over. Refer the comment to the Town Council. |
| PAD20 Tourism Development | | | |
| PAD20/1 | Dobbins Lane | 11.23 Excellent summary of objectives for sustainable development in relation to tourists. | Note endorsement of policy approach as set out in para. 11.23 |
| PAD20/2 | Un-specified | I feel the policy itself reads fine, but some of the sub-text is perhaps a little negative and may be counter-productive, particularly in respect of local opinion (para 11.21). There is evidently a conflict between local opinion on this matter and being guided by the NPPF and taking a positive plan approach. Given this is a planning document I wonder whether the negative aspect should come out, or some additional text is introduced to emphasise more clearly how this policy will be addressed in a positive manner. | The respondent expresses concern about how the community's views on tourism are reported and may be interpreted. Consider whether the supporting text should be less negative. |
| PAD20/3 | Trevone | Sub-paragraph 3) of policy PAD 20 is incorrect and needs to be altered to conform with the Cornwall Plan. Policy 23.2a) states that 'Proposals must conserve and enhance the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB and ...' | Respondent wishes criteria 3 to be re-worded to align with the LP. |
| Community Wellbeing– Topic Overview | | | |
| CW1 | Netherton Road | Additionally, I would like to see emphasis being given to PAD23, PAD24, PAD25. Community wellbeing is a vital component of every neighbourhood. | Note support for policies in this section. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| CW2 | Raleigh Road | There is still a lot of emphasis given to the skate park as per the initial town consultation. Well done on building the skate park but there is little mention of all the youth activities that are currently available e.g. SCC, guides, rowing club, sailing club, surf lifesaving etc. | Consider whether community facilities need mentioning in the introduction. Nb. the NP is not a town guide or gazetteer. |
| CW3 | Dobbins Lane | Para 12.5 talks of parks and amenity services and the possibility of extending these. It would seem more beneficial to educate people to make the most of the natural environment and its spaces, both to provide adequate outdoor activities and to train up future guardians for the Estuary, beaches, rocks, cliffs etc. This | Note comment. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------|--|--|
| | | is made clear in para 12.16 but may need to be applied more widely. | |
| CW4 | Dobbins Close | clause 12.17 – ‘under provision of outdoor sport’ - you do have some good golf courses relatively close – it’s a shame they do not count. | Note comment about near-by golf courses. Consider whether they need mentioning. |
| CW5 | Grenville Road | <p>Recreation facilities</p> <p>It was pleasing to note the Council is aware of the real issues here with the following statement: There are concerns that the physical and social infrastructure needed to ensure the area remains a sustainable place to live, is under strain and vulnerable to a growth in population and visitor levels and changing lifestyles. The capacity of health facilities to cope with future demands is a matter of concern. The area is well-provided with community buildings, but several still require improvement and modernisation. The area is under-provided with public open space and recreation areas, which seems to disadvantage young people. The Town Council has been looking to address this with the recent development of a skate park and considering other recreation facilities, such as a Multi-Use Games Area (MUGA).</p> <p>And that the 2016 study of public open spaces noted “the level of outdoor sports spaces is significantly lower than the average for larger towns in the county.”</p> <p>I commend the Council on the excellent work to deliver the skate park and wholeheartedly agree with the need to develop the courts and area in the Lawns Car Park. My family played on them this week (and the other court was in use too).</p> <p>1. Obj.16A Ensure recreational spaces are sufficient to meet local demands; Obj.16B Support initiatives that provide opportunities for young people: It would be good to have one tennis court and one multi-skills court and both need to be maintained, the current state of the surface is awful and putting people off.</p> <p>I would also encourage support of any improvement to the Jury Park football field for recreational purposes.</p> <p>2. Obj.14A Promote the timely provision of physical and community infrastructure; Obj.15A Support improvements and enhancements to existing community facilities; The green space outside the courts should be protected and should have more public seating areas/benches by the courts so parents/family can let children play whilst being close by. There should also be some more benches around the skate park (one inside too at the top end). A water fountain outside both the courts and the skate park will help children stay hydrated and healthy.</p> <p>3. Obj.14A Promote the timely provision of physical and community infrastructure; Obj.15A Support improvements and enhancements to existing community facilities; The social club building should look better (although this may not be the Council’s responsibility), and I would support the Council’s desire to acquire the library building – my children have used the library extensively for 7 years which has helped their education, and some form of reading provision should be maintained, even if it’s a reduced stock of books with the ability to reserve books in, something we do a lot.</p> <p>Whether or not the library/reading provision happens the building should be a superb hub for community</p> | <p>Note support for policies in this section and recent improvements.</p> <p>Consider whether the respondent offers any further evidence of community needs and aspirations that could be added to the Overview.</p> <p>Refer comments regarding the Town Council and public assets to the Town Council.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | groups, projects and the management of the Lawns sports facilities. I look forward to the next version of the plan, which I hope includes the points I have made here. | |
| CW6 | St Petrocs Meadow | It would be good to see greater concern and preparation for lower income groups and local interests. | Refer comment to Town Council. |
| CW7 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | Para. 12.5 There should be a positive statement to improve and further enhance and greater integrate the play area opposite the cemetery. | Refer comment to Town Council. |
| PAD21 Community Infrastructure | | | |
| PAD21/1 | Treator | I appreciate that housing must be improved and building in marketable areas - such as Padstow and its surrounds - is important. Consideration, however, must be taken into account that the already stretched public services (doctor's surgery, NHS dentist places, banks etc.) are supplemented with the increase in population. I note in section 12.3 that concerns have been raised in the past. As it stands, we already have multiple service provision problems, for the summer increase in population in Padstow - no banks, one inaccessible post office, poorly planned disabled parking provision, and too much access for unregulated hawkers and street traders, making pedestrian access difficult. | Note concern about the adequacy of community infrastructure. |
| PAD21/2 | Un-specified | Additional provision for the doctors in particular will be required as the Town expands | Note concern about the adequacy of community infrastructure. |
| PAD21/3 | Dobbins Lane | Paras 12.6-8 - worth addressing these points - another good contribution from the Neighbourhood Plan developers. | Note endorsement of policy approach set out in paras. 12.6 – 12.8. |
| PAD21/4 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | Major development should be able to lead as well as follow in tandem community infrastructure. Many infrastructure projects will be beyond the control of the Plan. | Note view that new development could be the lever for new community infrastructure. |
| PAD21/5 | St Petrocs Meadow | What provision is being made to cope with the expanding population of Padstow in terms of school, surgery, parking? There is plenty of concern about environment, nominally, but no real awareness of green space and human impact. | Note concern whether sufficient consideration will be given to the adequacy of community infrastructure. |
| PAD22 Community-based Initiatives | | | |
| PAD22/1 | Dobbins Lane | Para 12.9 references a renewable energy project but does not mandate inclusion e.g. of solar panels on all new builds, use of green roofs, encouragement of geothermal heating where possible, establishment of grey water systems or other initiatives relating to individual developments. I may have missed this but would heartily recommend its inclusion. | Note suggestion that the policy or supporting text should advocate a negative carbon, high specification for all new developments. |
| PAD22/2 | Poltair Homes & Situ8 | We would support this ambition. | Note support for policy. No change necessary as a result of this comment. |
| PAD23 Community Facilities | | | |
| | | | No comments received – so no change is necessitated by the consultation |
| PAD24 Recreation and Sports Facilities | | | |
| PAD24/1 | Treverbyn Road | A leisure centre for Padstow would be a good idea. | Note support for a local leisure centre. |
| PAD24/2 | Church Street | Para 12.17 I hope that there is NO plan to introduce a golf course into Padstow as it must be the most land hungry activity as well as being one of the most elitist sports from which few local residents would ever benefit | Note opposition to any golf course development in the area. |
| PAD25 Facilities for Young People | | | |
| PAD25/1 | Beach Road | This policy should be expanded to include reference to any such support being conditional on the environmental impacts especially within the AONB to have been | Note concern about the impact of this policy. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | demonstrated to meet the requirements of the NPPF in this respect. | Nb. policies are not applied in isolation. All relevant policies in the NP should apply to all development proposals. |
| PAD25/2 | Un-specified | ...engagement with the school and recognised local youth organisations. | The respondent suggests the supporting text should refer to engagement with relevant local bodies and organisations. |
| PAD25/3 | Trevone | PAD25 refers to facilities for young people. Why is there not an equivalent policy for other age groups? | It is unclear whether the respondent opposes this policy or what kind of age-related policies are being advocated. |
| PAD25/4 | St Petrocs Meadow | Be more supportive of the Sea Cadets such that PTC could contribute to a full-time QM for the unit thereby keeping everything in good order. | Refer comment to the Town Council. |
| Monitoring the Plan | | | |
| MP1 | Netherton Road | Having completed the Development Plan the pace and priorities of implementation will be important. I would like to see priority given to such policies and issue as PAD9, PAD10, and PAD11 to encourage affordable houses for local residents and people with key employment to support the local community. | The NP could include a statement or sub-section on implementation, if the Town Council was prepared to commit to such. |
| Glossary | | | |
| | | | No comments received – so no change is necessitated by the consultation |