

PADSTOW TOWN COUNCIL

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

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



4 September 2020

TO: NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP

Councillors: C Watson-Smyth (Chairman), A P Flide, D N Vivian and Mrs T Walter

Also invited: R Buscombe (Cornwall Councillor)

Dear All

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group **to be held *remotely on Tuesday 15 September 2020 at 7.30 pm**. Please note agenda below for discussion and consideration.

Yours faithfully

KE Pemberton
Kathy Pemberton
Town Clerk

**Due to the current regulations in response to COVID-19 this will be a virtual meeting. If you wish to view the meeting or speak in the public participation section [NB: this is only on agenda items], please contact the Town Clerk by email to enquiries@padstow-tc.gov.uk or by phone on 01841 532 296, so you may leave a message and be contacted by a member of our team*

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interests
3. Public Participation: To receive submissions from members of the public relating to items on the agenda, in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct and Standing Orders
4. Meeting Note (17 December 2019) (p1-3)
5. Revised Draft Plan: i) To agree the Pre-Submission Version of the NDP as amended following "informal" Community Consultation on 1st Consultation Version and subsequent work of Task Groups; and ii) to agree that the Pre-Submission Version of the NDP be forwarded to Cornwall Council for environmental screening. (p 4 + Separate cover)
6. Consultation Comments Unrelated to NDP: To agree their referral to relevant bodies. (P16-20)
7. Project Plan: To receive an update (p 21)
8. Next Meeting: TBC

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

**Notes of meeting held on Tuesday 17 December 2019 at 6.00 pm at
Padstow Town Council Offices, Station House, Station Road, Padstow**

Present: Councillors A P Flide, D N Vivian, Mrs T Walter and C Watson-Smyth

In Attendance: Kathy Pemberton (Town Clerk), Councillor H M Saunders and 2 members of the public

1. **Election of Chairman: RESOLVED** i) to recommend to Council that Councillor C Watson-Smyth be elected Chairman of the NDP Steering Group. Councillor C Watson-Smyth took the chair for the meeting.
2. **Apologies:** None.
3. **Declarations of Interest:** None.
4. **Public Participation:** There was no public participation.
5. **Meeting Notes (19 June 2019): RESOLVED** that that the meeting notes were a true record of the meeting held on 19 June 2019.
6. **Analysis of Response to Informal Community Consultation on 1st Version of NP:** Councillor Watson-Smyth referred to the agenda report. He outlined that he thought it helpful to hold this meeting before Christmas in order that not only this group, but the public had all received the feedback following the latest round of public consultation. He outlined that overall he considered it was a positive response to the first draft. He offered his thanks to the public who had taken the time to respond, which was much appreciated.

He further outlined that although not the level past consultations had been used to in terms of responses he considered the detail of responses was encouraging and furthermore he believed that it's more likely that people will comment if they oppose something than if they support.

General comments from other members of the group was that overall response were positive and the analysis report in capturing the same helpful.

Councillor Watson-Smyth referred to an omission raised by Councillor Saunders within the analysis report namely on page 2 relating to PAD1 in which his opposition on this was not recorded. This was a mistake and the Town Clerk confirmed that she would raise the matter with the consultant, who had drafted the report, to update this matter.

ACTION: Consultant to be contacted to amend PAD1 as detailed in the notes.

Councillor Watson-Smyth went on to read out a note and suggested way forward and focus on the policies which had the most comments, namely:-

PAD5 – Local Green Space
PAD 6 – Settlement Area Boundaries (SAB)
PAD 7 – Development adjoining Padstow's SAB
PAD 11 – Rural Exception Site Development
PAD 12 – Second Homes

The suggestion was to approach working group members who provided support on these policies previously and assign the role of looking at the responses to provide a balanced and objective view on them and put forward their recommendations. It was hoped that they would be able to help in this regard, Councillor Watson-Smyth confirmed he'd be happy to be involved in these discussions also and suggested that perhaps other steering group members could offer support in this regard too.

He went on to say thoughts were that:-

- PAD 5 (Local Green Spaces); the sites nominated to be considered alongside the criteria for Local Green Spaces;
- Potentially PAD 6, PAD 7 and PAD 11 could be looked at together as they all impact on the development of land on the edge of the settlement areas; and
- PAD 12 (Second Homes), although attracting most unconditional support it might be worth looking at this too as some concerns have been raised about its consequences.

It was further suggested that the group could then meet again to review recommendations and potential impact, if any, on any of the other policies. The next meeting could also be used to discuss/consider any other policy related matters. In respect of the pre-ample/introduction, various comments were raised on this also and he therefore wondered if this could be reviewed by Council officers for the group to consider next time.

It was further noted that there were some non-policy related items raised, detailed in the report. These could be referred to the relevant PTC Committees for their consideration. Some of which could be issues already discussed.

There was some discussion on PAD5 and memories being refreshed that the further site being suggested was a small piece of triangular grass between Egerton and Treverbyn Road. In response to a query, the Town Clerk confirmed that one of the Local Green Spaces put forward by this group was Stile Field, this didn't fall within the criteria however, due to the responses received in this matter the group wished for it to be included.

There was some discussion on the development settlement boundary and comments around its adjustment. There was further discussion on the rural exception site development and concerns being expressed around housing development in the wrong place. One member made mention of other developments that would be required over the coming years such as possible extension of Padstow Cemetery and impact this could have on the surrounding area. One member commented that this issue was too big for a small group to look at; it needed a larger group. Councillor Watson-Smyth commented any recommendations would come back to this group,

furthermore this was reviewing the policies in light of the consultation responses received.

PAD12 was also discussed as this was attracting most unconditional support. There was much discussion on what was affordable, and percentage required to be built in new developments. The Town Clerk reminded the group that this was reviewing the responses received and suggesting any amendments, if required in light of them.

ACTION: i) PAD5 be referred to the relevant working group members to consider in light of consultation responses and report back to NDP SG; ii) PAD 6, PAD 7 and PAD 11 be looked at together by the relevant working group members to consider in light of consultation responses and report back to NDP SG; and iii) PAD 12 to be referred to the relevant working group members to consider in light of consultation responses and report back to NDP SG

- 7. Project Plan and Budget:** Members were referred to the project plan which was noted. The Town Clerk confirmed that Council had agreed budget for 2020/21 for NDP (£10,000).
- 8. Date of Next Meeting:** To be confirmed (to be set as and when required).

The meeting ended at 6.28 pm

Agenda Item 5

Report to Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - September 2020

Background

At its meeting on 17th December 2019 the Steering Group received a report of the first 'informal' consultation with the community on a version of the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The report included a series of suggestions from your Consultant as to how the Plan might be amended to take account of all the comments and representations received. It was acknowledged that the response from the community had generally been positive and supportive.

It was decided by the Steering Group that the comments on five policies should be referred back the task groups that originally helped formulate the draft policy, for the task group to consider whether the policy might need to be amended in the light of the volume and nature of the comments received. The following draft polices were referred to the task groups:

PAD5 – Local Green Space; **PAD 6** – Settlement Area Boundaries (SAB); **PAD 7** – Development adjoining Padstow's SAB; **PAD 11** – Rural Exception Site Development; and **PAD 12** – Second Homes

In July 2020 your Consultant was asked to 'work' with the task groups, and to prepare amendments to the draft Neighbourhood Plan in the light of all the comments received during the 1st Consultation on the Plan and the deliberations of the task groups.

Report

Members have been provided with an amended version of the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan in which all proposed amendments are clearly identified by **red text**. The amendments have been made to take account of:

- the recommendations of the task groups relating to five specific policies (see individual papers with recommendations on policies PAD5, PAD6, PAD7, PAD11, PAD12) (pgs 5-15)
- the many positive proposals received for improvements and additions or subtractions to the Plan, in line with the Consultant's suggestions that were considered at the last Steering Group meeting (see Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan Analysis of Response to Informal Community Consultation on 1st Version of NP, October 2019)
- the need to up-date text because of the changing context or further evidence

Next Steps

The revised draft Plan (the 'Pre-Submission Version') is required, by Regulation 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, to be the subject of a further consultation with the community and a range of statutory and strategic bodies. This will provide another opportunity for members of the community and others to express views on the draft Plan and its policies and influence its final content before 'submission'.

Prior to this formal six weeks' consultation process however, you are required to subject the draft Plan to environmental 'testing'. On application, the local planning authority will consult with the environmental agencies¹, before providing a 'screening opinion' on the environmental effects of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. If significant environmental effects are identified, an environmental report must be prepared².

Padstow Town Council would be required to commission a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) from suitably qualified environmental consultants. Any recommendations in the SEA for 'improvements' to the Plan to minimise the negative impact on the social, environmental and economic character of the neighbourhood area would need to be addressed before the Plan goes out for its Reg.14 Consultation.

Acknowledgment

Task Group members must be thanked for the commitment and diligence they applied to their task during August 2020.

Recommendation

The draft Plan as amended should be forwarded to Cornwall Council for an environmental screening and a request for its observations of the implications of the emerging Climate Emergency DPD on the Plan.

PW/PPNP/Sep20

¹ Natural England, Environment Agency, Historic England

² in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3) of regulation 12 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004

Local Green Space Task Group

Task Group members: Gill Vivian, Jon Pascoe, Charlie Watson-Smyth

Primary Question asked 29th July 2020:

Should the 'site at junction of Treverbyn Road and Egerton Road' be added to the list of Local Green Spaces to be subject to policy PAD5?

Replies:

TG1 (29th July 2020): Yes

In answer to your question, "Yes" I think the piece of land between Egerton Road and Treverbyn Road should be designated under PAD5 as a Local Green Space. Just to give you a bit of background, it was proposed to be stopped up and the footpath diverted around the outer edge, the inference being that the freehold owner of the land would then be able to marry the recovered land with his existing garden to make a plot sufficiently large enough to accommodate a reasonably sized house with estuary views capitalising on its location, but to the detriment of other neighbours in the immediate surrounding area. This is why it has been flagged up by members of the public during the consultation. The attached email¹ confirms that the stopping-up was rejected because of the lack of local support from the Town Council, local member and members of the public. Whilst it is no doubt in a number of people's self-interest, it is clearly special to those immediately affected by the alternative prospect of having a house there instead. By all means come back to me if you have any queries in respect of the above.

TG2 (30th July 2020): Yes

The land at Treverbyn, Egerton Road should be designated green space.

TG3 (3rd August 2020): Yes

My answer to the question is a very definite 'YES', it should be added to the list of Local Green Spaces. In fact, during these COVID-19 days, it has been used regularly by local residents as a place where they can meet whilst socially distancing for coffee and a chat - there were about 8 of them sitting there when Neil and I walked by the other day. It is very obviously serving an important purpose for the local community in an area which gets over-run with cars parking on the road during the busy summer months.

Conclusion and Recommendation:

The Task Group has voted unanimously in favour of the 'site at junction of Treverbyn Road and Egerton Road' being added to the list of Local Green Spaces to be subject to policy PAD5 in the Neighbourhood Plan.

It is therefore recommended that the 'site at junction of Treverbyn Road and Egerton Road':

- be included on the list of areas proposed to be designated as a Local Green Space and subject to a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan
- the owner(s) of the site be informed of the intention and invited to comment on the proposed designation

PW/PPNP/Aug20

¹ From TG1 9th Jan 2020

Dear Anthony,

Are you able to let me know the outcome of the proposed Stopping up and diversion application referenced below?

Padstow: Treverbyn Road - Stopping up and diversion application of highway verge and footpath

From Anthony Rayworth (Principal Adoptions Officer, Cornwall Council) 9th Jan 2020

As there were a significant number of objections and no support from the Local Member or Town Council, it did not meet the requirements under the Highways Act and so the stopping up was not progressed.

**Growth Impact Task Group
Regarding Draft NP Policy PAD6 'Settlement Area Boundaries'**

Task Group participants: Gill Vivian, Jon Pascoe, Tim Farley

Questions asked 3rd August 2020:

- a) Should land to east of Homer Park Road (shown approximately on aerial photo 1 below) be excluded from the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary?
- b) Should land at Upper Dobbin Lane (shown approximately on aerial photo 2 below) be included in the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary?
- c) Subject to advice to the contrary from Cornwall Council, should Porthmissen Close be included in the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary?
- d) As a principle, should all land within the AONB be excluded from the defined Padstow Settlement Area?

aerial photographs (not to same scale) with approximate boundaries



aerial photo 1
land to east of Homer Park Road, Trevone



aerial photo 2
land at Upper Dobbin Lane, Trevone

Question a) Replies:

TG1 (4th August 2020) No

I do not agree that this land should be excluded, as I agree with the reasoning for inclusion Principle 1 criterion e) "Curtilages which are contained and visually built-up area". There is very clear separation of this land from the open countryside, so that it sits naturally within the Settlement Boundary. With regards to 'rounding off', inclusion of this land 'provides a symmetry or completion to a settlement boundary'.

TG2 (6th August 2020) Yes

I have been thinking about this and clearly NCDC felt that it should be excluded and nothing has changed in this part of Trevone that alters the development pattern, therefore the same principal should continue to be applied here, so yes it should remain excluded.

TG3 (6th August 2020) Yes

Objectively, arguably, I think it could remain within, but I have not seen it in person, so if it visually relates closely to the countryside then exclusion is justified. Further, since it is the owner making representations, then there is clearly little chance it will be developed in the near future.

Question b) Replies:

TG1 (4th August 2020) No

I do not agree that the land at Upper Dobbin Lane be included, on the basis of Principle 3 criteria f) "Large gardens and other open areas would harm the structure, form and character of the settlement". Planning permission was granted retrospectively for the 'Black Shed' and the proposed settlement boundary corresponds with the limit of residential use agreed at the time. We are advised under 'rounding off' that "development should not visually extend development into the open countryside suitable sites are likely to be surrounded on at least two sides by existing built development". This is clearly not the case in this instance.

I am mindful of the requirement to be consistent in our decisions and believe these two cases to be quite different, one from the other. We are advised reference 'rounding off' to take a judgement on a 'case by case' basis.

TG2 (6th August 2020) No

It should be excluded. The BUA should include only the area that has been granted under the Certificate of Lawfulness – see the attached plan. This was a clear point made when the Certificate of Lawfulness was agreed at planning where it was felt that the curtilage as initially proposed by the applicant was inappropriate to the size of the building. The curtilage was therefore reduced in size and is now as per what is shown in the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary and so the additional land should be excluded.

TG3 (6th August 2020) No

There are other avenues for the owner to pursue to incorporate the land within the garden (presumably in the hope of establishing future development potential), but it is not for the NDP to pre-determine that.

Question c) Replies:

TG1 (4th August 2020) Yes

I agree that Porthmissen Close be included in the Trevone settlement area boundary.

TG2 (6th August 2020) Yes

Porthmissen Close should be included in the settlement boundary. A number (but not all) of the Treceus Farm applications were also brought forward as exception sites under Policy 9, and so if the BUA boundary for Trevone has to change to exclude Porthmissen Close, then so too should the BUA boundary for Padstow change to exclude the sites there brought forward under Policy 9.

TG3 (6th August 2020) Yes

I prefer yes. There is no element of the Exceptions policy that has any relevance to the development now it is (long) completed. I don't see how inclusion could possibly affect the tenure of the homes in the future, but if there is any indication that it could, I would say no. The site retains any protection afforded by the AONB. It is permanent development and without some reasoned justification, its exclusion would be unreasonable and illogical.

Nb. Advice has been sought from the local planning authority, Cornwall Council, as to whether it is appropriate to include a rural exception site development within a settlement area boundary. Cornwall Council has confirmed "our advice is to include extant permissions – and these definitely should be included if the development is built or if work has started. Their status as affordable housing is secured in perpetuity, and they are now part of the village"¹.

¹ Email from Group Leader, Neighbourhood Planning, Cornwall Council, 5th Aug 2020

Question d) Replies:

TG1 (4th August 2020) Yes

I agree all land within the AONB be excluded from the defined Padstow settlement area boundary.

TG2 (6th August 2020) Yes

To avoid any conflict with the policies, yes, all land within the AONB should be excluded from the development boundary for Padstow. The only thing that I would question with this is that we are not including the two temporary car parks (one next to Tesco, the other near to Prideaux Place) in the Plan, are we? Both are in the AONB and so this in itself may cause conflict otherwise.

TG3 (6th August 2020) Yes

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The Task Group has considered four specific matters relating to policy PAD6.

In making recommendations on these aspects of policy PAD6, it is recognised that any person(s), who feel that the proposed settlement area boundaries in subsequent draft versions of the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan are incorrect, can make further representations on the matter to either the Qualifying Body, via the Regulation 14 consultation²; or to the independent Examiner, via the Regulation 16 consultation³.

Based on the views expressed by members it is recommended that:

1. Land to the east of Homer Park Road should be excluded from the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary
2. Further land at the end of Upper Dobbin Lane should not be included in the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary
3. The Porthmissen Close housing development should remain included in the proposed Trevone settlement area boundary
4. All land within the AONB be excluded from the defined Padstow Settlement Area and therefore the proposed boundary in proximity to Sarah's Lane should suitably realigned

PW/PPNP/Aug20

² <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/regulation/14/made>

³ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/637/regulation/16/made>

Growth Impact Task Group

Regarding Draft NP Policy PAD7 Development Adjoining Padstow's Settlement Area Boundary

Task Group participants: Gill Vivian, Jon Pascoe, Tim Farley

Questions asked 7th August 2020:

- a) Should the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan have a policy that facilitates housebuilding throughout the plan-period (to 2030)?
- b) Is there sufficient evidence and opposition to warrant a change of approach from the 1st version of the Neighbourhood Plan?
- c) Does the policy in its current form provide sufficient protection to the AONB?
- d) Is the policy in its current form likely to lead to development proposals coming forward for land outside the settlement area boundary for Trevone?
- e) Are the criteria of the policy sufficiently robust to limit and influence the size, scale, type and rate of development?
- f) Should the policy remain restricted to residential and associated development on the edge of town?

Declarations:

TG1: *I think PAD7/2 were my comments but I do not wish to update them in any way.*

Question a) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) Yes

TG2 (9th August 2020) Yes

.. particularly in view of the recent 'White Paper'

TG3 (11th August 2020) Yes

.. the targets are minimum, the NPPF makes this clear and looking at local circumstances, I think it is wise to retain the flexibility to enable additional housing to address need.

The reason for my view is that the school remains massively under-subscribed (and getting worse) despite the completions at Treceus Farm. The school has now merged year groups because of funding shortfall. Anecdotally, local people are moving to the affordable homes (great), but few, or no families are moving to, or back to the area.

Question b) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) No

TG2 (9th August 2020) Yes

I believe the plan should allocate specific sites as a way of controlling future development, whilst incorporating the criteria listed in point 3 of your document.

TG3 (11th August 2020) No

Question c) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) Yes

TG2 (9th August 2020) Yes

I believe it does. My personal opinion, following the recent 'White Paper' is that in the future, very little will be protected anyway!!

TG3 (11th August 2020) Yes

AONB protections are in place and have a proven track record. There is no need to be more prescriptive.

Question d) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) No

Unlikely in the short term, and I think the NP does what it can to protect land outside of the settlement boundary that is within the AONB from coming forward.

TG2 (9th August 2020) Yes

.. and some of the comments received support this, stating the requirement for local housing needs in Trevone as well as in Padstow.

TG3 (11th August 2020) No

.. it very specifically states Padstow's Settlement Area Boundary.

Question e) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) Yes

TG2 (9th August 2020) No

There is a very clear requirement for local affordable housing and this needs to be strengthened in the policy

TG3 (11th August 2020) Yes

... proposals must demonstrably meet local needs; from experience the burden of proof is high to establish local need, if not identified by the LPA.

Question f) Replies:

TG1 (7th August 2020) Yes

I think it should remain as residential and mixed use. When considering this question I primarily relate it to the first field at the junction of the A389 and B3276 adjacent to Green Lane on the approach into Padstow, therefore a sensitive, well designed edge needs to be presented if this field is ever developed and I am not sure this could be achieved with light industrial buildings or leisure buildings by way of example.

TG2 (9th August 2020) No

There is reference to the requirement for additional commercial development in the comments and this should be included in the plan.

TG3 (11th August 2020) No

(perhaps 'mixed-use' needs to be defined, but generally means residential + other use), widening the policy to incorporate retail or leisure uses without being tied to residential is, in my view, important. Residential is being addressed adequately, so is employment.

Notwithstanding the effects of Covid on high streets, Padstow Town centre keeps moving towards galleries and tourist-orientated shops, there ought to be some provision to enable increased local retail provision displaced from the town centre.

Tourism is a double-edged sword, but Padstow benefits massively from it, through employment and tourist spending. Does 'mixed-use' unnecessarily restrict tourism and leisure? I think so.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The Task Group has considered six specific matters relating to policy PAD7 that were raised by respondents to the 1st consultation on the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

Based on the views expressed by members it is recommended that:

- a) The Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan should have a policy that facilitates housebuilding throughout the plan-period (to 2030)
- b) The current criteria-based approach to future development outside the Padstow settlement area boundary should remain in the next version of the Draft Plan
- c) It should be made clearer that land in the AONB is excluded from policy PAD7
- d) The supporting statement should emphasise that policy PAD7 applies to land adjoining Padstow's settlement area boundary only; and ensure other policies in the Plan provide the necessary planning context for Trevone
- e) The criteria should include a reference to the latest housing needs assessment
- f) The policy should facilitate residential and/or other suitable development that serve the needs of the local community

A suggested redraft of policy PAD7, based on these recommendations, is proffered overleaf.

Proposed Amendments to draft Policy No. PAD7 Development Adjoining Padstow's Settlement Area Boundary

Development proposals for new dwellings and/or community facilities and services on sites adjoining the Padstow's Settlement Area Boundary will be supported if:

- 1) the site forms a logical extension to the existing built-up area and is not an isolated development in the countryside;
- 2) it is appropriate to its setting in terms of scale, height and massing;
- 3) it is not within the AONB and it does not compromise or have an unacceptable adverse impact on the quality of the environment and the special landscape character of the AONB;
- 4) it meets a proven local need or demand and has the support of the local community;
- 5) it would not have an adverse impact on adjoining uses;
- 6) housing provision is based on an up-to-date housing needs assessment, and satisfies the Local Plan requirements for the proportion of affordable dwellings; and
- 7) it is consistent with the strategic requirements of the Local Plan and the development criteria set out in policy PAD8.

PW/PPNP/Aug20

**Growth Impact Task Group
Regarding Draft NP Policy PAD11 Exception Site Policy**

Task Group participants: Gill Vivian, Jon Pascoe, Tim Farley, Charlie Watson-Smyth

Questions asked 12th August 2020:

- a) Should the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan include a policy regarding rural exception site development?
- b) Should the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan provide further guidance on what would be considered as an appropriate size of development for a rural exception site?
- c) If there is a policy, are the current draft criteria sufficient?
- d) Should an additional criterion regarding Trevone be included in any rural exception site policy?

Declarations:

None

Question a) Replies:

TG1 (17 August 2020) No

I do not think a specific policy is required as it may cause difficulties in the future - this NP takes the Parish forward to 2030.

My preference would be for the NP to include a statement of support for rural exception site development within the Parish. This would recognise the requirement for social housing to meet local needs, and indicate a willingness to work with suitable partners to advance an appropriate rural exception site scheme, if this could not be delivered in other ways, without being too prescriptive. This brings together points 11 and 16 in PW's paper. I therefore have no further comments with regards to points b), c) and d).

TG2 (20 August 2020) No

Given that the intention of the policy was always to recognise the need for more affordable housing and express support, I think that it would be sensible to include a statement of support for exception sites, but The Cornwall Local Plan and NPPF have sufficient policies that can be relied upon and I'm not sure that an additional policy in the NDP adds anything further to Policy 9 of the CLP.

TG3 (20 August 2020) No

A statement of support would suffice.

The Local Plan policy covers the important elements of the matter, e.g. NEED must be clearly demonstrable.

PAD11 seems to seek to add further criteria that could be seen to justify its inclusion as a policy in the NDP, e.g. safe walking distance and "impact on neighbouring uses and openness of the countryside".

The "openness of the countryside" concerns me, this is too subjective and could rule out virtually any scheme. It is a Green Belt test that is typically not even applied to exceptions sites in the green belt. It is too onerous.

Safe walking, impact on neighbours – these are things that would be given due consideration in the development management process, in any case.

TG4 (20 August 2020) Yes

But flexible

Question b) Replies:

TG1 (17 August 2020) N/A

TG2 (20 August 2020) No

This would probably be better assessed in the context of its immediate surroundings, as per the guidance that you referenced.

TG3 (20 August 2020) No

This would be pre-determining future circumstances. We don't know what the housing need situation will be in 5- or 10-years' time. If there is genuine local need, it should be met.

TG4 (20 August 2020) No

That may change in the future

Question c) Replies:

TG1 (17 August 2020) N/A

TG2 (20 August 2020) Yes

I think so, though at PAD11 4) is there not always going to be an "adverse" effect on the countryside? If so and the intention behind the policy was always to deliver more affordable housing, then perhaps "adverse" should be amended to "significant adverse" or as an alternative add in "that cannot be satisfactorily mitigated".

TG3 (20 August 2020) N/A

See above – superfluous and too onerous.

TG4 (August 2020) Yes

Question d) Replies:

TG1 (17 August 2020) N/A

TG2 (20 August 2020) No

Planning should be looked at as a whole and should be a balance of considerations assessed on its merits. There are already policy constraints at various levels to developing in Trevone, primarily with its AONB status.

TG3 (20 August 2020) No

If the policy remains, there should not be exclusion of Trevone, if there is genuine local need, it should be met.

TG4 (August 2020) No

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The Task Group has considered four specific matters relating to policy PAD11 that were raised by respondents to the 1st consultation on the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan. The views of the Task Group can be conflated into a single recommendation.

Based on the views expressed by members it is recommended that Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan does not include a policy regarding rural exception site development.

As an alternative the Neighbourhood Plan should include a 'statement of support' for rural exception site development taking place in the parish area should the need and opportunity align. This statement would recognise the need and potential value of a predominantly social housing development, without being too specific or ruling out particular locations. It would indicate that the Town Council would be willing to work with suitable partners to advance an appropriate rural exception site scheme. It would demonstrate a flexible approach to addressing the housing need at the time.

The prevailing policy context would remain the Local Plan Policy 9 and any planning application for a rural exception site would be assessed by the local community on its merits and impact within that policy framework.

**Growth Impact Task Group
Regarding Draft NP Policy PAD12 Second Homes Policy**

Task Group participants: Gill Vivian, Jon Pascoe, Tim Farley, Charlie Watson-Smyth

Questions asked 21st August 2020:

- a) Should the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan include a policy regarding second homes?
- b) If a policy is included in the Neighbourhood Plan should the criteria be amended or added to?

Declarations:

TG4: PAD12/12

Question a) Replies:

TG1 (24 August 2020) Yes

TG2 (24 August 2020) Yes

TG3 (26 August 2020) Yes

I agree there should be a policy regarding second homes in the Parish Neighbourhood Plan. It is obviously of great importance to the community, and we have to respect their views.

TG4 (1 September 2020) Yes

Question b) Replies:

TG1 (24 August 2020) Yes

Perhaps add to the first sentence of the policy "whether through new build or conversion", for the avoidance of doubt.

I can see pros and cons of the policy, additional pressure on the second hand market is worrying, because that is really the best bit of the town, so I'd be willing to support some moderation of the policy, e.g. 50% of new homes. Monitor and review, either for NDP or for whatever comes next from the white paper.

Since this NDP process started there have been a lot of completions and presumably sales at Treceus Farm. Could we get data on occupancy? This would really help, and I suspect the developers could be convinced if they knew it was to potentially temper the policy.

TG2 (24 August 2020) No

Because of the overwhelming response we need the policy to go forward.

TG3 (26 August 2020) Yes

I think the criteria do need to be amended. I believe it is too restrictive to limit new housing development to 'Principal Residence', and alternative approaches should be looked at. 'Principal Residence' status would almost certainly ensure that few local people would be able to afford the new properties. We have to ensure that any new policy does not impact on the development of affordable housing, which is still a major requirement in the Parish. Reading the comments, there is a considerable difference between 'second homes' and 'holiday lets'. The former are not let out to the holiday market, whereas the latter are often treated as businesses, paying business tax, and resulting in a loss of income to the county. Perhaps a restriction on 'letting' new dwellings (as per the Treceus Farm development) would be worth considering.

Consideration should also be given to the fact that there is also the need for economic and commercial development within the Parish to provide better paid employment so that local people can afford the new housing.

TG4 (1 September 2020) Yes

Perhaps amended to review the policy after 3 years to see what effect it has had on planning applications approved post adoption of the NDP with a mechanism to remove / vary the policy if it is evident that future housing delivery, particularly affordable housing, has been

compromised. Alternatively, a mechanism the same as what is in place on the existing development at Treceus whereby the homes are not to be used for holiday rentals. In terms of the views of Cllr Laity, if she championed the H2 condition (I don't know if she did or didn't) then her view may not be entirely impartial and I think it is important to have some actual facts and figures from Cornwall Council about the impact it has had on open market and affordable housing delivery.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The Task Group has considered whether a 'Principle Residence' policy should remain in the draft Neighbourhood Plan in the light of the comments received from the consultation and recent evidence from elsewhere in Cornwall. The Task Group has concluded that such a policy should remain in the Plan as it goes forward for further consultation and scrutiny.

Based on the views expressed by members it is recommended that:

- a) The Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan should include a policy regarding a Principle Residence Requirement similar to that 'adopted' elsewhere in Cornwall.
- b) The draft policy should be amended as follows:
*"Proposals for open market housing (excluding one for one replacement dwellings) **whether through new-build or conversion**, will only be supported where first and future occupancy occupation is restricted by a legal agreement to ensure that each new dwelling is occupied only as a Principal Residence.
A principal residence is defined as a dwelling occupied as the resident's sole or main residence, where the resident spends most of their time when not working away from home.
Proposals for open market housing (excluding one for one replacement dwellings) without a requirement to ensure occupancy as a principal residence will not be supported."*
- c) Further consideration of the policy's wording, to make it locally appropriate, should take place after the next round of consultation (carried out under Regulation 14)
- d) The Town Council should participate in discussions at a county-level to explore other ways in which the needs and interests of local households can be given priority and precedence in the housing market.
- e) The impact of the 'Principle Residence' policy should be kept under close review and be reconsidered during the first and subsequent reviews of the Neighbourhood Plan.

PW/PPNP/Sep20

NDP STEERING GROUP: 15 SEPTEMBER 2020

AGENDA ITEM 6: CONSULTATION COMMENTS UNRELATED TO NDP:

The appended table is a list of comments received during the “informal” community consultation held last summer on the 1st Consultation Version of the Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan which are unrelated to the NDP but which raise a number of important community issues.

Are the Steering Group happy that the Town Clerk refer these comments to either Cornwall Council, the full Padstow Town Council (including relevant Committees thereof), or to any other relevant body as appropriate?

Comments Made on 1st Consultation Version of PPNP to be referred to Padstow Town Council

Comment Ref. no.	Comment
PP1	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.
NE4	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We should aim for Padstow to be at least carbon neutral, but ideally carbon positive.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2. Obj.6B Encourage sustainable housing design and development: I absolutely agree with this. We know 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. 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>
PAD2/1	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.
PAD2/2	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 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.
PAD2/3	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.

PAD2/6	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.
BE2	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.
HO1	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)
HO2	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.
TT1	Direct bus service to St Columb would enable direct bus routes to the west, Truro and Newquay.
TT2	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.
TT3	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 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
TT3B	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	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.
PAD13/1	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.
PAD15/1	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.
PAD15/2	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 residing in the town. Sincerely hope this issue can be looked at again.

PAD15/4	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.
PAD15/5	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?
PAD15/6	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.
PAD16/1	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.
PAD19/1	Continue to limit 'chain' shops in the Town Centre (e.g. rejecting Costa's bid for the Barclays site)
PAD19/2	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.
PAD19/3	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.
CW5	<p>Recreation facilities</p> <p>It was pleasing to note the Council is aware of the real issues here with the following statement: <i>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).</i></p> <p><i>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."</i></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</p>

	<p>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 groups, projects and the management of the Lawns sports facilities.</p> <p>I look forward to the next version of the plan, which I hope includes the points I have made here.</p>
CW6	It would be good to see greater concern and preparation for lower income groups and local interests.
CW7	Para. 12.5 There should be a positive statement to improve and further enhance and greater integrate the play area opposite the cemetery. Poltair Homes & Situ8
PAD25/4	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.

Padstow Parish Neighbourhood Plan – Project Plan Vers.8, July 2020

Plan Making

No.	Process	Method	2018			2019															
			Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug		
4.1	Options	generate development options	✓	✓	✓	✓															
4.2	Impacts	consider who/what will be affected	✓	✓	✓	✓															
4.3	Options Appraisal	options appraisal			✓	✓															
5.1	Policies	draft NP Policy statements				✓															
5.2	Proposals	prepare 1 st Draft of NP																			
5.3	Compliance	check compliances																			
5.4	Informal Consultation	Consult with local stakeholders																			

Plan Completion

No.	Process	Method	2020			2021															
			Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct				
5.5A	Evidence up-dating	Desk-based study on targeted topics																			
5.5B	Task group deliberations	Consider consultation responses on key policies																			
5.5C	Plan amendments	To reflect TG and SG decisions		S																	
5.6	Sustainability	SEA/HRA (as appropriate)																			
6.1	Consultation document	approve Pre-Submission Version of Plan																			
6.2	Statutory consultees	consult formally (Reg.14)																			
6.3	Community	apply consultation strategy																			
6.4	Stakeholders	consult formally																			
6.5	Consultation	prepare Consultation Statement																			
6.6	Amendments	consider comments & amend if necessary																			
6.7	Submission documents	Basic Condition Statement approve submission documents																		ST	
6.8	Submission	submit required documents																			ST