

Rame Peninsula Parish Cluster Neighbourhood Development Plan

Representing the parishes of:

Antony
Maker-with-Rame
Millbrook
Sheviock
St. John

Final Summary of Evidence

As at July 2016

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	THEMES	1
2.0	HOUSING	1
2.1	RELEVANT NDP POLICIES	1
2.2	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: PENINSULA WIDE	1
2.2.1	<i>Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust 2014</i>	1
2.2.2	<i>Community Strategic Plan (Torpoint & Rame Peninsula Market & Coastal Towns Initiative, 2006)</i>	2
2.2.3	<i>Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies, 2015</i>	2
2.2.4	<i>Major Planning Decision: Caradon District Council - Application No 591009520 (REFUSED)</i>	2
2.2.5	<i>Major Planning Decision: Cornwall Council - Application Ref 09/01671/FUL (REFUSED)</i>	3
2.2.6	<i>Major Planning Decision: Cornwall Council - Application Ref 09/01671/FUL (REFUSED)</i>	3
2.2.7	<i>Neighbourhood Plan Consultation on Traffic and Infrastructure</i>	4
2.2.8	<i>Unsolicited comments from Cornwall Council Highway Engineers.</i>	5
2.3	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: ANTONY PARISH	6
2.3.1	<i>Housing Needs Survey</i>	6
2.3.2	<i>Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	6
2.3.3	<i>Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012</i>	7
2.3.4	<i>Antony Parish Housing Conclusions:</i>	7
2.4	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: MAKER WITH RAME	8
2.4.1	<i>Housing Needs Survey, 2013</i>	8
2.4.2	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014</i>	9
2.4.3	<i>Maker with Rame Housing Conclusions:</i>	9
2.5	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: MILLBROOK PARISH	10
2.5.1	<i>Housing Needs Survey, 2013</i>	10
2.5.2	<i>Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	11
2.5.3	<i>Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013</i>	11
2.5.4	<i>Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012</i>	11
2.5.5	<i>Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011</i>	11
2.5.6	<i>Millbrook Housing Conclusions:</i>	12
2.6	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: SHEVIOCK PARISH	12
2.6.1	<i>Housing Needs Survey, 2013</i>	12
2.6.2	<i>Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	13
2.6.3	<i>Sheviock Parish Housing Conclusions</i>	13
2.7	SUPPORTING HOUSING EVIDENCE: ST JOHN PARISH	14
2.7.1	<i>Housing Needs Survey, 2013.</i>	14
2.7.2	<i>St John Parish Survey, January 2012</i>	14
2.7.3	<i>St John Housing Conclusions</i>	15
2.8	RAME PENINSULA HOUSING THEME CONCLUSIONS	15
3.0	TRAFFIC & TRAVEL	16
3.1	RELEVANT NDP POLICIES	16
3.2	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: PENINSULA WIDE	16
3.2.1	<i>Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014</i>	16
3.2.2	<i>Cormac Rame Peninsula Transportation Feasibility Study, 2014</i>	17
3.2.3	<i>Transport Group Paper: Transport in the Rame Peninsula, 2012</i>	18
3.2.4	<i>Tamar Crossings Study Brief, 2012</i>	18
3.2.5	<i>Rame Pathways Initiative Proposal, 2012</i>	19
3.2.6	<i>CC Information and Statistics (2007-2011)</i>	19

3.2.7	<i>Cluster Parishes Transport Survey, 2010</i>	19
3.2.8	<i>South Cornwall Trail Bid (pre May 2007)</i>	20
3.3	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: ANTONY PARISH	20
3.3.1	<i>Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014.</i>	20
3.3.2	<i>Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012:</i>	20
3.3.3	<i>Antony Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:</i>	21
3.4	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: MAKER WITH RAME PARISH	21
3.4.1	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014</i>	21
3.4.2	<i>Maker with Rame Traffic and Travel Conclusions:</i>	22
3.5	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: MILLBROOK PARISH	22
3.5.1	<i>Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014.</i>	22
3.5.2	<i>Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013</i>	23
3.5.3	<i>Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012</i>	23
3.5.4	<i>Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011</i>	24
3.5.5	<i>Millbrook Phase 2 Traffic Study and Transport Assessment, 2009</i>	24
3.5.6	<i>Millbrook Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:</i>	24
3.6	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: SHEVIOCK PARISH	25
3.6.1	<i>Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	25
3.7	SUPPORTING TRAFFIC & TRAVEL EVIDENCE: ST JOHN PARISH	25
3.7.1	<i>St John Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	25
3.7.2	<i>St John Parish Survey, January 2012</i>	25
3.7.3	<i>St John Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:</i>	26
3.8	RAME PENINSULA TRAFFIC AND TRAVEL THEME CONCLUSIONS	26
4.0	RECREATION & OPEN SPACE	27
4.1	RELEVANT NDP POLICIES:	27
4.2	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: PENINSULA WIDE	27
4.2.1	<i>Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014</i>	27
4.2.2	<i>Flood Risk</i>	27
4.2.3	<i>Conservation</i>	28
4.2.4	<i>National Planning Guidance, Paragraph 109: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</i>	28
4.2.5	<i>Cornwall AONB Management Plan (2011 – 2016)</i>	28
4.2.6	<i>Tamar Valley AONB Management Plan (2014 – 2019)</i>	28
4.2.7	<i>Kingsand & Cawsand Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, 2013</i>	29
4.2.8	<i>Mount Edgcumbe means business Vision Document & Action Plan, 2013 29</i>	29
4.2.9	<i>Rame Millennium Project Feasibility Study, 1996</i>	29
4.2.10	<i>Plymouth's Historic Defences Management Appraisal, 1996</i>	29
4.2.11	<i>An Archaeological Survey of the Rame Peninsula, 1974</i>	29
4.3	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: ANTHONY PARISH	30
4.3.1	<i>Results of Anthony Parish Consultation, 2014</i>	30
4.3.2	<i>Anthony Parish Survey, 2012</i>	30
4.3.3	<i>Antony Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:</i>	30
4.4	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: MAKER WITH RAME	31
4.4.1	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014</i>	31
4.4.2	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusion:</i>	31
4.5	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: MILLBROOK	31
4.5.1	<i>Millbrook Parish Consultation January 2014</i>	31
4.5.2	<i>Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013</i>	32
4.5.3	<i>Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012</i>	32
4.5.4	<i>Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011</i>	32
4.5.5	<i>Millbrook Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions</i>	32
4.6	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: SHEVIOCK	32
4.6.1	<i>Sheviock Parish Consultation, Jan 2014</i>	32
4.6.2	<i>Sheviock Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:</i>	32
4.7	SUPPORTING RECREATION & OPEN EVIDENCE: ST JOHN	33

4.7.1	<i>St John Parish Consultation, Jan 2014</i>	33
4.7.2	<i>St John Parish Survey, January 2012</i>	33
4.7.3	<i>St John Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:</i>	33
4.8	RAME PENINSULA RECREATION & OPEN SPACE THEME CONCLUSIONS	33
4.9	OTHER KEY POINTS	34
5.0	RENEWABLE ENERGY	35
5.1	RELEVANT NDP POLICIES	35
5.2	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: PENINSULA WIDE	35
5.2.1	<i>Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014</i>	35
5.2.2	<i>BRS Solar Farm Proposal and Map, 2013</i>	35
5.2.3	<i>Paper setting out Parish Councils View on Renewables, 2013</i>	35
5.2.4	<i>Rame Renewable Energy (RRE) Report, March 2013</i>	36
5.2.5	<i>Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies, 2015</i>	36
	<i>Policy 15: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy</i>	36
5.2.6	<i>Green Cornwall, 2011-2020</i>	36
5.2.7	<i>Neighbourhood Planning – Renewable Energy Advice Note</i>	36
5.2.8	<i>An Assessment of Energy Efficiency and renewable Energy for Rame Renewable Energy, March 2012</i>	36
5.2.9	<i>Cornwall Area of Outstanding Beauty Management Plan (2011 – 2016)</i>	36
5.2.10	<i>Mendennick Wind Farm (PA12/12027)</i>	37
5.2.11	<i>Freathy Solar Park (PA/13/11705)</i>	37
5.3	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: ANTONY PARISH	37
5.3.1	<i>Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014.</i>	37
5.3.2	<i>Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012</i>	37
5.3.3	<i>Antony Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions:</i>	37
5.4	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: MAKER WITH RAME PARISH	38
5.4.1	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014.</i>	38
5.4.2	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions</i>	38
5.5	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: MILLBROOK PARISH	38
5.5.1	<i>Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	38
5.5.2	<i>Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013:</i>	38
5.5.3	<i>Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012:</i>	39
5.5.4	<i>Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011:</i>	39
5.5.5	<i>Millbrook Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions:</i>	39
5.6	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: SHEVIOCK PARISH	39
5.6.1	<i>Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	39
5.6.2	<i>Sheviock Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions</i>	39
5.7	SUPPORTING RENEWABLE ENERGY EVIDENCE: ST JOHN PARISH	39
5.7.1	<i>St John Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	39
5.7.2	<i>St John Parish Survey, 2012</i>	40
5.7.3	<i>St John Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions</i>	40
5.8	RAME PENINSULA RENEWABLE ENERGY THEME CONCLUSIONS	40
5.9	OTHER KEY POINTS	40
6.0	COMMERCE	41
6.1	RELEVANT NDP POLICIES	41
6.2	SUPPORTING COMMERCE EVIDENCE: PENINSULA WIDE	41
6.2.1	<i>Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust 2014</i>	41
6.2.2	<i>Cornwall Council Rame Peninsula Economic Profile September 2013</i>	41
6.3	SUPPORTING COMMERCE EVIDENCE: ANTONY PARISH	42
6.3.1	<i>Results Anthony Parish Consultation, Jan 2014:</i>	42
6.3.2	<i>Anthony Parish Survey, 2012</i>	42
6.3.3	<i>Antony Parish Commerce Conclusions</i>	42
6.3.4	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, Jan 2014:</i>	42
6.3.5	<i>Maker with Rame Parish Commerce Conclusions</i>	43
6.3.6	<i>Millbrook Parish Consultation, Jan 2014</i>	43

6.3.7	<i>Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013</i>	43
6.3.8	<i>Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011</i>	43
6.3.9	<i>Millbrook Parish Commerce Conclusions</i>	44
6.4	SUPPORTING COMMERCE EVIDENCE: SHEVIOCK PARISH	44
6.4.1	<i>Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	44
6.4.2	<i>Sheviock Parish Commerce Conclusions</i>	44
6.5	SUPPORTING COMMERCE EVIDENCE: ST JOHN PARISH	44
6.5.1	<i>St John Parish Consultation, January 2014</i>	44
6.5.2	<i>St John Parish Survey, 2012</i>	45
6.5.3	<i>St John Parish Commerce Conclusions</i>	45
6.6	RAME CLUSTER COMMERCE THEME CONCLUSIONS	45
6.7	OTHER KEY POINTS	45

1.0 Introduction

This report presents summary results of the evidence gathered during the process of forming Rame Peninsula's Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

Rame Peninsula NDP encompasses the administrative parish areas of Antony, Maker-with Rame, Millbrook, Sheviock and St John. In forming the NDP, some evidence is considered to be parish specific, whilst some is considered more relevant to the cluster of parishes as a whole. This is reflected in the structure of this document; which is set out according to themes (Housing, Traffic and Travel, Recreation & Open Space, Renewable Energy and Commerce); then, within each theme section, the findings from evidence are then set out under each parish and then as a cluster overall.

A number of sources of evidence have contributed to the formation of Rame Peninsula NDP. The sources of evidence are briefly set out in Section 2: Evidence Gathering. The results and conclusions drawn from these sources are then presented within the themed Sections.

Due to the variable nature of how the evidence has been gathered and presented – particularly the parish consultations e.g. actual respondent numbers for individual questions; percentages for individual questions; or defining 'majority' view – it has not been possible to present the data consistently.

1.1 Themes

The five main headings for this evidence report have been taken from the 2014 consultation themes agreed upon by the five parishes.

Evidence is summarised under each theme. The evidence relevant to each theme is presented by parish areas and, where evidence is applicable to all parishes, under a Peninsula Wide sub section.

This report sets out the summary of evidence supporting the Rame Peninsula NDP. Full details of this evidence can be sourced at <http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/emerging-policy-themes/>

2.0 Housing

2.1 Relevant NDP Policies

Rame NDP Policy 1: New Housing – Primary Residency
Rame NDP Policy 4 & 5: General Development
Rame NDP Policy 14. Rame Peninsula Gateway
Rame NDP Policy 15. Development in St. John Village

2.2 Supporting Housing Evidence: Peninsula Wide

2.2.1 Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust 2014

Of the 391 returns:

- Across the eight housing options put forward, all had more support than opposition – to varying degrees.
- 255 were strongly in favour of affordable homes for local people – scoring their answer their maximum of 5. A further 76 indicated some support (either scoring their answer as a 3 or 4). Only 51 respondents indicated a lack of support (scores between zero and 2).
- 203 were strongly in favour of starter homes for young people, with a further 111 indicating a level of support (score of 3 or 4).
- 192 were strongly in favour of sheltered homes for the elderly and a further 155 were strongly in favour of having an residential home for elderly residents. Over 120 indicated a level of support for both these options.
- 134 were strongly in favour of a Housing Trust owned and run by the community. A further 137 indicated some support (scoring 3 or 4). 87 were opposed to this proposal (scoring zero to 2).
- 143 were strongly in support of using redundant farm buildings for housing. A further 142 indicated some support (scoring 3 or 4). 90 were opposed to this idea.
- 123 would like to see more rental accommodation. A further 131 scored this option either 3 or 4. 107 were opposed to this.
- 170 were strongly in favour of infill and refurbishment of existing buildings. A further 139 scored this option 3 or 4. Only 57 were opposed to this proposal.
- More generally, residents were concerned that current infrastructure would not cope with more development; that brown field sites should be used in preference to green field sites; and concern regarding level of second or holiday homes in the villages.

For further information on Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/the-pensinsula-trust-consultations/>

2.2.2 Community Strategic Plan (Torpoint & Rame Peninsula Market & Coastal Towns Initiative, 2006)

This plan focuses on the long-term issues and challenges that will affect the environment, local economy, people and communities of the Rame Peninsula. It puts forward many practical proposals that we believe will help our area prosper. The Plan was been put together by The Torpoint and Rame Peninsula Market and Coastal Town Initiative (MCTi), which was set up to develop a community strategic action Plan for Torpoint and the villages across the Rame Peninsula.

To view this document please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/torpoint-rame-peninsula-market-coastal-towns-initiative-community-strategic-plan.pdf>

2.2.3 Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies, 2015

Objective 6: Ensure that infrastructure is provided that will enable development to benefit the local community.

Please refer to Cornwall Local Plan 2010-30, Visions and Objections;

http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/3623299/04_Vision_Objectives.pdf

Policy 28: Infrastructure

1. New development must be supported by appropriate infrastructure provided in a timely manner. The Council will continue to work in partnership with infrastructure providers and other delivery agencies to keep an up to date infrastructure delivery plan that will enable proposals, in accordance with the spatial objectives, to be brought forward.

2. Developer contributions, as a Community Infrastructure Levy and based on the strategic viability assessment, will be sought to ensure that the necessary physical, social, economic and green infrastructure is in place to deliver development. Contributions will be used to provide or enhance local infrastructure that is adversely affected by the development of a site but which will not be delivered on that site.

For further information please refer to Cornwall Local Plan 2010 – 2030, General Policies, Page 51 using the link below;

http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/3633085/05_General_Policies.pdf

2.2.4 Major Planning Decision: Caradon District Council - Application No 591009520 (REFUSED)

Submitted on 13th August 1991 for the construction of 15 small industrial unites, 2 retail units with flats over together with erection of five 2/3 bedroom and 15 2 bedroom terraced houses. Construction of new vehicular/pedestrian access to highway and provision on land situated at St Johns Road, Millbrook. Reasons for refusal includes: The site is approached by narrow and tortuous roads which are considered to be unsuitable to cater for the additional traffic which is likely to be generated by the proposal.

For further information please refer to;

<http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/online-planning-register/>

2.2.5 Major Planning Decision: Cornwall Council - Application Ref 09/01671/FUL (REFUSED)

Dated 21 October 2009, by notice dated 18 December 2009. The development proposed was for 22 new build affordable homes on land adjacent to Southdown Road. Proposal would have formed an extension of Phase One (Parsons Court), which was completed in 2008.

<http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/online-planning-register/>

2.2.6 Major Planning Decision: Cornwall Council - Application Ref 09/01671/FUL (REFUSED)

Inspectors decision to refuse on 1 June 2010 on appeal. Reasons for refusal included:

"*Local Road Network* 11. The proposal would therefore result in an increased use of cars which, to access services beyond the village, would travel either through the village centre and on to the major towns, or utilise one of the narrow and poorly aligned country lanes available, for example, to access St Johns or to head south to Furlanesend or east to Cremyll.

12. Planning Policy Statement 1 – *Delivering Sustainable Development*, (PPS1) and local guidance advocates that housing is provided in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Planning Policy Statement 3 – *Housing*, (PPS3) acknowledges that, at a local level, housing in rural areas can enhance and maintain their sustainability. However, I do not feel that the scheme is necessary in order to support Millbrook in this way. The proposed dwellings would be so remote from the wider provision of employment opportunities and other major infrastructure and service needs, as to make this an unsustainable location for housing. In this respect my findings concur with that of the Inspector in his report on the Caradon Local Plan First Alteration, (the Local Plan), and the deleted policy regarding housing allocation in Millbrook. He found that the village was not sufficiently sustainable to take the impact of a scheme for 40 open market houses.

13. The scheme would also conflict with Policy 28 of the Cornwall Structure Plan which requires development to address accessibility in relation to minimising the need to travel and increasing choice of travel by walking, cycling and public transport.

14. Roads within the village are narrow with the potential for inconvenience and delay. However, in such conditions speeds tend to be low and any increase in traffic from the proposal is unlikely to add to inconvenience or hazard, and to this extent I concur with the Highway Authority. Although it appears to be heavily parked, the most direct route to the site along New Road would also not, in my view, be significantly compromised by any additional traffic.

15. Roads on immediate approach to the village, particularly Hounster Hill, are of very limited width in places resulting in the need for a priority system,

while those secondary routes connecting back to the main A374, also have sections of narrow width and poor alignment. There are a number of recorded accidents on this road network, including specific concerns in relation to the St Johns road, which is acknowledged to be a popular route. Although levels of traffic from this scheme would be relatively low, nonetheless they would contribute to flows on this network. While my decision would not turn on this matter, this does add some weight to my concerns regarding the sustainability of this location”.

Please refer to Cornwall Council, online planning register;
<http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/online-planning-register/>

2.2.7 Neighbourhood Plan Consultation on Traffic and Infrastructure

In 2010 a Rame Peninsula wide consultation was undertaken to obtain views on traffic and the infrastructure in the NDP area. The consultation was widely advertised and questionnaire widely distributed. There were 8 questions in the questionnaire and a total of 1,993 replies received with each question receiving between 303 and 346 replies.

To the question: **What impact would new housing have on your area?**

More than 66% of the replies stated that new house building would be bad for local people and the roads would not be able to cope with the additional traffic.

Less than 33% felt that although new house building would be good for local people, the road access would have to be improved.

Only 3% of all replies felt new housing would have no impact.

To the question: **How good is your access to shops, leisure and health facilities?**

42% felt the facilities/services were only accessible by road travel.

39% felt the facilities could be access by a mixture of road travel and on foot.

Only 19% stated they could be accessed by foot.

Examples of comments received include:

Maker with Rame Parish: Buses and lorries should be encouraged to use a one way system into the Peninsula along road through Millbrook and out around the cliff road to prevent jams. Traffic bollard at Hounster Hill should be removed – this is dangerous to lorry drivers.

Millbrook Parish: Infrastructure into Millbrook needs to be looked at before more new housing.

Millbrook Parish: Whenever A374 Trerulefoot to Polbathic is blocked, access to the peninsula is very difficult. The coastal route cannot handle the increase in traffic.

Sheviock Parish: Crafhole village centre regularly gets gridlocked between West Lane and the Eastern perimeter of the village. The road is too narrow to accommodate 2-way flow of traffic. 40 tonne artic lorries use this route as well as double decker buses and numerous other larger trucks and 'white van men'. It is a nightmare. Traffic control measures are worse than useless.

Sheviock Parish: Something needs to be done at Antony – new road from Tregantle to A374 so that large lorries needn't do through Crafhole. My property is affected by the large lorries.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/cluster-parishes-transport-survey-2010/>

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/cluster-parishes-transport-survey-2010/rame-peninsula-traffic-infrastructure-survey-results/>

2.2.8 Unsolicited comments from Cornwall Council Highway Engineers.

The significant issues were succinctly summarised by the Area East Cornwall Highway Manager in 2010 when she wrote -

"Basically it [many and significant issues with traffic flow throughout the Rame Peninsula] hinges on the fact that once traffic leaves Trerulefoot roundabout on the A38, the only road supporting 2 way traffic is the A374 direct to Torpoint, all other routes within the peninsula are to a greater or lesser extent single carriageway.

Various villages have been traffic calmed over the years, the most notable being Crafhole and Antony. The calming in Antony village effectively prevents right turn movements of the A374 into the village by all but light vehicles. Therefore all HGV traffic has to access the coast road through Crafhole. The B3247 is frequently used as a diversionary route when the A374 is shut – this is narrow and winding between Crafhole and Downderry and leads to jams.

The route through Millbrook involves going down Hounster Hill on the approach which is highly unsuitable for HGV's and yet they frequently meet in the narrowest section because there is no other option."

2.3 Supporting Housing Evidence: Antony Parish

2.3.1 Housing Needs Survey

Undertaken by Cornwall Council: A total of 208 household surveys were sent out for Antony Parish, of which 46 were completed and returned giving a total response rate of 22%.

Of the 46 responses:

- 45 were main households of mixed tenure (owned, mortgaged, rented and so on);
- 1 was a second home;
- 5 households were in need of affordable housing; and,
- At least 10 households wish to be able to find housing within the parish.

Where views were given on criteria for housing entitlement the respondents generally wanted it for local people (or within agreed definitions as indicated with parish housing conclusions).

24 respondents indicated that they would support a small development of affordable housing and a further 6 said they might be supportive.

Homechoice statistics indicate twenty households registered (with 18 of these being independent from the respondents of the housing needs surveys).

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-antony/>

2.3.2 Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014

Whilst there was limited participation at the event, those present generally were accepting of development for Antony village, but had concerns about parking. Residents do not wish to see green field sites developed.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/antony-parish-consultation-events/antony-parish-consultations/>

2.3.3 Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012

147 surveys were distributed to all households in the Parish of which 101 were returned (69% response rate).

The majority of respondents were against housing development in the villages:

- 69 households indicating that they would not wish to see this;
- 22 in support of housing; and,
- 10 unsure.

There was a slightly more favourable response when affordable housing was suggested:

- 59 against;
- 24 in favour; and,
- 18 unsure.

However, more respondents felt that a need for affordable housing did exist:

- 41 disagreeing;
- 35 agreeing a need exists; and,
- 25 unsure.

Generally, there was support for young families moving into the village – only 18 respondents were opposed to this.

If development were to occur, then respondents would generally favour infill development and the majority were keen that restricted areas for development should continue (53 in favour, 13 against and 25 unsure); and 70 respondents wanted traditional housing styles to continue.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/antony-parish-consultation-events/antony-parish-survey-results-2012/>

2.3.4 Antony Parish Housing Conclusions:

1. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates there is a potential need for a small number of affordable homes in the parish.
2. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates that there is some support for a small project for the benefit of those with a local connection.
3. Suggested locations indicate Antony Estate land, but in any event land should be situated close to the village amenities. There was a suggestion that Wilcove may be unsuitable because of hills and sewerage issues.
4. The Housing Needs Report states that "Reassurance about priority for local people would need to be addressed by making appropriate provision in any section 106 planning obligation, and a detailed Local Lettings Plan covering both tenures".
5. It appears that despite concerns there is acceptance, from the residents, of the need for some affordable housing development in Antony village.
6. For development to be supported by residents, then residential areas need to be defined together with a focus on traditional housing style.

7. Infill development with restricted areas for development likely to be more acceptable.

For more information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-antony/>

2.4 Supporting Housing Evidence: Maker with Rame

2.4.1 Housing Needs Survey, 2013

Undertaken by Cornwall Council: A total of 750 surveys were sent out, of which 125 questionnaires were completed giving a total response rate of 17%.

Of the 125 surveys returned

- 83% were main households
- 17% were second homes

In identifying need:

- 19 respondents indicated that they had family members who moved away because of lack of affordable homes in the parish, but would like to return if this situation changed
- 9 households in need of affordable housing in addition to the interest inferred from the 19 respondents mentioned above.
- At least 10 respondents indicated they wish to remain within the parish.

There were 24 respondents answering questions about specific need for affordable housing. There are also a total of 48 applicants with a local connection to the parish registered with Homechoice (some of these having also completed the survey).

Of the 104 respondents who indicated their view on Affordable Housing:

- 83 respondents/80% indicated they would support a small development;
- A further 15 respondents felt that they might be supportive.

The majority would prefer to see small scattered developments. A number of potential development areas suggested.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-maker-with-rame/>

2.4.2 Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014

An event took place at which residents were able to find out about the process, use maps and post it notes to record comments and complete a paper survey. 42 residents completed a paper survey.

Of the 42 residents that completed a paper survey:

- 35 respondents indicated support for affordable homes and comments mainly related to these being for local people.
- 33 indicated support for residential apartments.
- 40 supported The Peninsula Trust's concept of a) providing supervised rented housing for the local young people to allow them to remain in the peninsula and b) providing not for profit residential/nursing home care within the 5 parishes.
- 14 agreed that there was a potential need for care home provision.
- 29 indicated that they would wish to see a reduction in second home ownership. There were concerns over the levels of second home ownership and perceived issues with maintenance of these properties. Conversely, there was an argument that second home owners contribute to the economy e.g. job creation.
- 24 would support in-fill.
- 28 would support conversion of farm buildings (caveats included protecting Greenfield sites; making use of redundant farm buildings and not undermining agricultural and farming; also sensitivity to landscape.
- 32 would support design standards for buildings. Residents didn't want inappropriate design, and there were comments relating to the need to conserve the attractive look of the villages and ensure a better fit with local architecture.
- 35 agreed in principle to expanding the conservation area (built environment).

Related comments concerned the need for development to be sensitive to conservation in architecture, avoidance of overdevelopment, and concern over flood risk issues.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/maker-with-rame-consultation-events/>

2.4.3 Maker with Rame Housing Conclusions:

1. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates a level of support for a small project within the parish for the benefit of those with a local connection.
2. The Housing Needs Survey states that the main preference is for renting, and the data suggests that affordable rented homes would seem most appropriate
3. The Housing Needs Report states that "Reassurance about priority for local people would need to be addressed by making appropriate provision in any section 106 planning obligation, and a detailed Local Lettings Plan covering

- both tenures”.
4. Generally, residents who have engaged with the process want to see houses for local people (whether rented or owned).
 5. Residents want to protect green field and landscape by looking at in-fill and conversion (e.g. making use of redundant farm buildings) options without harming the environment or the local economy.
 6. Support for housing design standards.
 7. Flood risk must be factored in when development is being planned.
 8. Some concern over the level of second home ownership but conversely a view that there was an economic benefit.

For further information please refer to;
<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-maker-with-rame/>

2.5 Supporting Housing Evidence: Millbrook Parish

2.5.1 Housing Needs Survey, 2013

Undertaken by Cornwall Council. A total of 1068 surveys were sent out in Millbrook parish, of which 147 were returned giving a total response rate of 14%.

Of the 147 returns:

- 100% were main households.
- 17 respondents indicated a specific need for affordable housing. At least 9 indicated they wish to remain within the parish.
- 82 respondents would support a small development of affordable housing for local people within the parish if there were a proven need.
- A further 14 indicated that they might be supportive.

Eligibility issues for housing provoked mixed views.

With regard to Homechoice figures, as at May 2013:

- A total of 162 applicants on the Homechoice register indicated a preference to live in Millbrook Parish.
- Of these, a total of 137 applicants have a local connection to the parish.

For further information please refer to;
<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/millbrook-housing-needs-survey/>

2.5.2 Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014

The consultation event attracted approximately 70 attendees. The overwhelming view was that there should be no further housing at Southdown, St John's Road/ Close, Blindwell Hill and Millpool Head. The only places identified as being appropriate for housing were Hounster Hill and adjacent to Manor Lodge, opposite Millbrook graveyard.

Housing development requires careful management to ensure that the "village feel" is not lost and that flood risk is not exacerbated. New development should also be in keeping with the style of the village.

The consultation identified a need for one/ two bedroom properties specifically suitable for elderly/ young people thus enabling larger houses to be freed up for families.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-ndp-public-consultation-25012014/>

2.5.3 Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013

No specific housing questions asked, but there were links to other themes within the context of the Neighbourhood Development Plan

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-consultation-community-groups/>

2.5.4 Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012

About 17 of the 60 invitees attended. In terms of scale of development, the most popular view was that there should be 1 or 2 dwellings in defined locations. The next option was for developments of less than 10 houses. There was also a suggestion that live/work accommodation should be considered.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-consultation-landowners-and-local-businesses/>

2.5.5 Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011

93 surveys were completed.

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-village-plan-update-november-2011/>

2.5.6 Millbrook Housing Conclusions:

1. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates a need for a scheme of affordable housing (with a mix of tenures –but predominantly affordable rented with some assisted sale.
2. The Housing Needs Report states that “Reassurance about priority for local people would need to be addressed by making appropriate provision in any section 106 planning obligation, and a detailed Local Lettings Plan covering both tenures”.
3. Development would need to be carefully managed and concerns over scale and site of development, and infrastructure factored in.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/millbrook-housing-needs-survey/>

2.6 Supporting Housing Evidence: Sheviock Parish

2.6.1 Housing Needs Survey, 2013

Undertaken by Cornwall Council. A total of 364 surveys were sent out, of which 67 were completed giving a total response rate of 18%.

Of the 67 returns:

- 90% were main households
- 10% were second homes

A small number of those responding were either aware of a family member wanting to move back to the parish, or requiring affordable housing themselves within the next 5 years.

From the Homechoice Register:

- 19 people, registered with Homechoice, have a local connection.
- 8 people on the register have indicated a preference for a home in Sheviock parish.

Support for Development:

- 37 respondents indicated they would support a small development of affordable housing for local people.
- A further 10 indicated that they might support such a development.

There was similar support for one main development or small scattered developments. There were some suggestions on land which might be suitable for development, including the Sheviock Lane area.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-sheviock/>

2.6.2 Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014

This event was linked to a green space consultation and approximately 100 attendees took part. Many of the responses did not differentiate between the four different housing options (affordable, market, sheltered and infill).

- 27 people indicated support for affordable housing (divided between Sheviock and Crafhole villages).
- 18 people indicated support for sheltered housing.
- 3 people indicated support for open market housing.

A number of comments reflected concern over the risk of homes becoming second homes. Some specific infill sites were suggested and some support for conversion of farm buildings, as appropriate.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/sheviock-parish-consultation-events/sheviock-parish-consultation-event-18012014/>

2.6.3 Sheviock Parish Housing Conclusions

1. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates a need for a small number of affordable homes (there is a level of support for a small project for the benefit of those with a local connection).
2. The Housing Needs Survey report suggests, based on financial data, that rented accommodation would best meet local needs.
3. The Housing Needs Report states that "Reassurance about priority for local people would need to be addressed by making appropriate provision in any section 106 planning obligation, and a detailed Local Lettings Plan covering both tenures".
4. The responses from the parish consultation generally reflect the housing survey in that there is, in principle, preference for small scale development for local people.
5. There was concern from the residents over the level of second home occupancy.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/housing-needs-survey-sheviock/>

To view the Crafhole Landscape Assessment please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/summary-of-evidence/landscape-assessment/>

2.7 Supporting Housing Evidence: St John Parish

2.7.1 Housing Needs Survey, 2013.

Undertaken by Cornwall Council. A total of 341 surveys were sent out, of which 36 were returned by Royal Mail as undeliverable. In total 23 questionnaires were completed giving a total response rate of 7%.

Of the 23 returns:

- The majority of responses (91%) were from main households and the remaining from second home respondents.
- Only 2 respondents indicated that their households would be looking for accommodation within the next two years, expressing an interest in remaining in the parish, and confirming that they have a local connection.
- There are 11 people on the Homechoice register, with a local connection, that require affordable housing, but only one indicated they wish to remain in the parish.
- 12 respondents indicated that they would support a small affordable housing development and,
- A further 3 respondents indicated that they might support one.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/st-john-housing-needs-survey/>

St John Parish Consultation, January 2014

Attended by approximately 60 residents. Residents appear to have a more favourable attitude towards small developments of one or two houses on the edges of the village of St John, including infill. Residents were not in favour of any large-scale developments in the Parish. There was very strong support for the requirements of complying with the St John Conservation Area and the maintenance of traditional style of buildings. Most residents were keen to maintain the green spaces around the village.

All three local farmers attended the consultation and in discussions it was evident that there was general support for farmers to build one or two additional dwellings adjacent to their farms – subject to these being for local people and not for open market. There was suggestion that a covenant to ensure that they would only be sold as part of the farm business could be an option.

2.7.2 St John Parish Survey, January 2012

There were 126 surveys completed (36 from Freathy householders and 90 from St John). Across the parish there was little support for development, although respondents wanted to encourage younger families to live in the parish. In Freathy there was a mixed reaction to the suggestion of changing rules regarding letting of properties and changes to Article 4.

There was a strong desire to protect the look and charm of the village, particularly in view of its conservation status. Residents concerned about the potential for “development creep” and felt that even infill would need to be carefully managed if it were to happen.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/st-john-parish-consultation-events/st-john-freathy-preliminary-questionnaire/>

2.7.3 St John Housing Conclusions

1. The Housing Needs Survey report indicates a level of support for a small scheme of affordable homes for the benefit of those with a local connection. Financial considerations point towards a preference for rented accommodation. These report findings should be read with caution. As pointed out in the report, the survey results need to be interpreted with caution, as they lack robustness as a stand-alone piece of evidence.
2. Parish consultation acknowledgement that more evidence re: housing sites and engagement with stakeholders (such as farmers and other landowners necessary).
3. Retention of traditional building style in conservation areas.
4. Infill and development of additional dwellings on farms (with covenant about local occupancy) may be acceptable to the parish. Real concern of over-development and the risk to the beauty and charm of the area – underlining the need to manage any development very carefully and ensure that development is very small scale, and in appropriate style.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/st-john-housing-needs-survey/>

2.8 Rame Peninsula Housing Theme Conclusions

1. A total of 2,731 housing needs surveys were sent out, of which a number were returned by Royal Mail as undeliverable, and some questionnaires were returned incomplete. In total 410 questionnaires were completed giving a total response rate of 15%.
2. The Housing Needs Survey report concludes that “Data from both the five surveys and the Homechoice housing register suggests that to varying degrees there is a need for affordable housing in the Rame peninsula. This would best be met through a mix of affordable housing tenures but predominantly affordable rented accommodation with some assisted sale (low cost/discounted sale or shared ownership.”
3. The Housing Needs Report states “The individual parish reports note that most respondents would support the provision of affordable properties in their communities, for people with a qualifying local connection, and controlled by section 106 planning obligation.”
4. The Housing Needs Report suggests further actions by the Neighbourhood Plan group to target and explore different elements of housing need and

- affordability levels could give added clarity.
5. Housing development is emotive and 'votes' and comments made by residents who have engaged in the parish consultations clearly show the problems. There seems to be a level of support for small-scale housing development (with various caveats on eligibility, tenure, location etc) but will need to be further tested with the community – and efforts made to engage them further in this debate.
 6. Affordable housing development as identified in housing needs survey, also generally supported by those who took part in the parish consultations.
 7. Residents are concerned about over-development and the associated infrastructure problems that more development (of any kind) will exacerbate.
 8. The need to protect the beautiful environment was highlighted. It is a driver for tourism, a factor in health and well-being and leisure asset. The need to factor this in when planning development is a key consideration.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/evidence-gatheringhousing-needs/>

3.0 Traffic & Travel

3.1 Relevant NDP Policies

Rame NDP Policy 2: Community Infrastructure Levy (Local Element)

Rame NDP Policy 8: Antony Village Bypass – Safeguarding of Land

3.2 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: Peninsula Wide

3.2.1 Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014

Of the 391 returns that gave a response to this section:

- Across the seven traffic and travel options put forward, 5 received more support than opposition.
- 205 were strongly in favour of a one-way routing system for HGV vehicles – scoring their answer the maximum of 5. A further 95 indicated some support (either scoring their answer as a 3 or 4). 70 respondents indicated a lack of support (scores between zero and 2).
- There was opposition to the proposal for new/wider roads. 108 scored this zero, and a further 94 scored it either 1 or 2. 165 respondents scored it 3 or above.

- 229 would like to see better water links (scores between 3 and 5); 121 scored this either a zero 'no thanks' or a low score of 1 or 2.
- 131 strongly support the idea of locally managed car parks. A further 142 indicate some support (scores of 3 or 4). 96 were opposed to the idea.
- 107 residents would strongly support more parking and a further 120 scored it 3 or 4. 138 scored this zero to 2.
- The majority of residents were strongly against traffic lights being installed. A further 72 were also unsupportive of this proposal. 112 would support traffic light installation.
- 113 would strongly support cycle lanes and green routes. A further 129 indicated a level of support for these. 115 were not supportive (fairly even split between scores of zero and two).
- 176 would strongly support the proposal for better bus services. A further 144 indicated support (scores of 3 or 4).

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/the-pensinsula-trust-consultations/>

3.2.2 Cormac Rame Peninsula Transportation Feasibility Study, 2014

The Rame Cluster parishes have long been concerned with traffic and transport issues in the peninsula, and in looking at development issues feel that an upgrade to infrastructure must be considered.

Cormac was commissioned by Cornwall Council to produce a Feasibility Study and the update produced in March 2014 was used to inform this report. The report text states that the content focused on:

- ❖ The potential to reduce the volume of traffic; both general and large vehicles, passing through the village of St John.
- ❖ Review the possibility of a new junction at the village of Antony.
- ❖ Consider a solution to ease the congestion at Hounster Hill in the village of Millbrook.
- ❖ A more general review of the traffic conditions on the Rame Peninsula. This included investigating the potential of a circulatory traffic system around the peninsula and managing restrictions through the village of Crafhole.

The preliminary findings shown below has been taken direct from the report (based on "observable engineering features and not environmental impacts or economic factors").

Rame Peninsula (generic)

- Implementation of signing traffic in a circulatory system around the peninsula however schemes elsewhere may negate the need for area wide solutions.

Antony

Three options are considered suitable to be put forward

- Option 3 – New Junction and connecting road; Option 5 – Reversal and widening of one way system on secondary junction and implementation of guidance signs for HGV's; Option 8 – Ghost Island Junction.

Please refer to Antony Junction Improvement Study 2015;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/1992-2/>

St John

- Continue with the implementation of signage at the St. John and Trevole Road junction to discourage movement of HGV's through St. John.

Millbrook

- Further design work on the two traffic light options to produce a preferred scheme.

For further information please refer to;
<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/rame-peninsula-traffic-management/>

3.2.3 Transport Group Paper: Transport in the Rame Peninsula, 2012

This paper, the basis for many of the discussions with Cornwall Council and Cormac made a number of recommendations - the main elements being:

- a bypass for Antony;
- traffic control at Hounster Hill, Millbrook;
- a voluntary one-way system for large vehicles;
- one-way circulatory system during major events;
- Introduction of 'Quiet Lanes'.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/transport-in-the-rame-peninsular-neighbourhood-development-plan-2012-v2.pdf>

3.2.4 Tamar Crossings Study Brief, 2012

The study brief outlined a piece of work to determine the long term package of measures designed to manage the Tamar Crossings. This could have a knock-on effect to transport infrastructure and add significant value to transport and traffic issues within the Rame peninsula – both for the resident and the tourist. Unfortunately, a final report has not yet been made available to the group, and therefore it is impossible to know what measures might be implemented by Cornwall Council and Plymouth City Council as a result of this work.

For further information please refer to;

https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/tamar-crossings-study-brief_2012.pdf

3.2.5 Rame Pathways Initiative Proposal, 2012

The transport sub-group produced a paper outlining a footpaths and bridleways initiative project. The paper sets out the desire to put a wider network of footpaths and bridleways throughout the parish and mesh this with the work of the Neighbourhood Plan. Funding was not secured to take this forward, but it demonstrates how the group have taken on board previous information provided to them, and the desire to look at better integration of travel/transport options, and reduction in car travel – as well as quality of life and economic benefits.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/rame-pathways-initiative-proposal-2012/>

3.2.6 CC Information and Statistics (2007-2011)

Whilst the statistics provided are not current (being mainly from 2011), slides from a Cornwall Council presentation did acknowledge 'many and significant issues with traffic flow through the peninsula'. Problems at Crafhole and Millbrook warranted specific mention.

Other statistics provided separately by Cornwall Council related to traffic flow at Tregantle in 2007 and accident/casualty stats from 2011.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/traffic-accident-data/>

3.2.7 Cluster Parishes Transport Survey, 2010

A transport survey was distributed across the five parishes in 2010. The survey contained six transport related questions and each question was answered by between 321 and 346 respondents.

From 346 responses

- Approximately 200 felt that traffic was severely congested during the tourism season.
- In terms of commuting, approximately 165 acknowledged that roads were busy, although only about 87 felt that they were adversely affected e.g. traffic jams.
- In terms of access to shops, leisure and health facilities, 144 respondents stated that they had no access to these (a number of these are in Millbrook or Torpoint) unless they travelled by road.
- Over 130 respondents felt that the area had reached maximum capacity and a number of residents felt that road and water transport should be improved.

- 218 respondents felt that new housing development would be bad for local people and create extra traffic problems.
- When asked about traffic speed along the A374; 141 expressed a desire to see this reduced; 94 would like it reduced in the villages only and a similar number (100) felt that current speed limits were acceptable.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/cluster-parishes-transport-survey-2010/>

America's Cup Traffic Plan (2011)

This was used to inform the transport sub-group's ideas for how a one way circulatory system might operate in the peninsula. The design of a proposed one-way system (with road signage etc) would provide structured traffic management to ease traffic congestion and maintain better traffic flow during major events.

For further information please refer to;

<http://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/highway-infrastructure-evidence/americas-cup-traffic-plan-2011/>

3.2.8 South Cornwall Trail Bid (pre May 2007)

As above, this document was used to inform the transport sub-group's when considering their transport and traffic priorities, and thus was a document that could inform their own recommendations.

For further information please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/south-cornwall-trail-bid-final.pdf>

3.3 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: Antony Parish

3.3.1 Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014.

There were no significant transport issues. A small number of residents from Wilcove would welcome a bus into the village once or twice per week. The only issue for Antony related to public transport for children to school.

For further information please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/antony-parish-consultation-events/antony-parish-consultations/>

3.3.2 Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012:

Traffic Management 66 of the 101 survey respondents felt that increased development in the peninsula would increase traffic problems in Antony village.

- A further 19 were unsure of the effect increased development might have on traffic.
- 17 respondents didn't feel that there would be problems.

With regard to traffic management there was a mixed view as to whether existing traffic calming measures (or a suggested roundabout at the Ring O Bells junction) reduced speeding problems.

However, 65 residents were generally in support of a layby/passing place halfway down Pengelly Lane in Wilcove.

- A significant majority of respondents would not wish to see parking restrictions (yellow lines) in Antony village; or a village car park.

Travel (Bus)

Of the 101 responses

- only 35 indicated that they use local buses.
- 21 thought frequency was sufficient.
- 42 respondents indicated they would use the bus service if more frequent.

Footpaths

- 89 respondents indicated that they use local footpaths.
- 76 support a new footpath from Wacker Quay to the village.

The majority of residents were unsure about how footpath maintenance could be improved.

For further information please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/antony-parish-consultation-events/antony-parish-survey-results-2012/>

3.3.3 Antony Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:

1. Residents were concerned that additional development would increase traffic problems.
2. There was no wish to see parking restrictions (yellow lines).
3. A village car park was not supported – but conversely, parking was mentioned as an issue at the 2014 event.
4. There were no defined transport or footpath needs.

3.4 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: Maker with Rame Parish

3.4.1 Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014

Traffic Management

- 34 of the 42 survey respondents were in favour of tackling congestion and capacity issues.

Some of the comments reflected the view that the solution wasn't increased road capacity through building of new roads (which might encourage more development and thus the problem remains) but managing existing local and tourism traffic. Suggestions and comments related to car parking provision including local parking problems (particularly in relation to Fourlanesend School) as well as car park arrangements for park and ride (and the current cost deterrent); better use of public transport; and implementation of traffic management schemes (e.g. one way systems, traffic lights).

Travel – Buses, Community Transport, Ferries, Cycling & Walking

- Around 25 to 33 were supportive of having policies covering transport. In particular: better integration of transport services (both to link up buses and ferries; as well as buses and rail stations); more use of water links; and improved park 'n' ride or park 'n' float facilities.
- 28 respondents were supportive of the principle of 'green routes' – although what this means in practical terms needs clarifying.

Walking/cycling facilities were also supported – albeit whether this is to improve existing or create new facilities will need to be defined.

3.4.2 Maker with Rame Traffic and Travel Conclusions:

1. Residents were concerned that additional development would increase traffic problems.
2. There was a desire to see parking improvements.
3. There was some support for traffic management, although not major new road projects.
4. Policies regarding improvement of transport options, to reduce car travel, including better integration of different forms of travel; better water links (and facilities); and infrastructure improvements would be supported.
5. Cycling and walking options need to be factored into travel options.

3.5 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: Millbrook Parish

3.5.1 Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014.

Traffic

From the 70 attendees there was widespread agreement for a one way system for HGV traffic round Military Road (provided that the road is capable of supporting more heavy traffic). The attendees would also support vehicle size restrictions, appropriate to the road infrastructure.

It was felt that roads in Millbrook and on the wider peninsula are overcrowded and unsuitable for any increase in traffic.

Travel (Bus Services)

There was strong support for better integration of local bus services from Millbrook with rail services/stations. There was also support for better bus links to Plymouth and Torpoint.

Attendees expressed support for expanding ferry/water links for travel to Plymouth, and indicated the importance of the Cremyll ferry.

Attendees would not want public rights of way taken over by private land owners.

For further information please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-ndp-public-consultation-25012014/>

3.5.2 Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013

There were 26 attendees representing 18 community groups.

Traffic Management

Attendees commented on traffic problems, such as those at Hounster Hill area, which had increased with expansion of Millbrook village and its neighbouring villages (e.g. Kingsand/Cawsand). The idea of a voluntary one-way system for large vehicles and buses was mooted, as was an exchange point at Tregantle (lorries offloading deliveries to smaller vehicles).

Travel (Bus Services and Ferries)

Six of the groups (and 12 people responding as individuals) indicated that they usually travel by car. Other forms of transport: bus, ferry, cycling, walking results were lower.

Comments on bus services included better bus links to Torpoint, Plymouth, Saltash and Liskeard. The Rame Peninsula Public Transport Users Group wanted greater commitment to public transport by the Parish Council, and also improved links to St Germans railway station.

The need to join up routes and have better facilities (clean bus stops; maps at bus stops etc) to encourage local people and visitors out of their cars was suggested.

For further information please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-consultation-community-groups/>

3.5.3 Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012

Traffic Management

About 17 of the 60 invitees attended the consultation and comments regarding traffic primarily focused on congestion at Hounster Hill and through the village, with some solutions suggested.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-consultation-landowners-and-local-businesses/>

3.5.4 Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011

There were 93 survey returns.

- The majority (56%) wanted the council to support improved safety features.

There was a general concern that the roads would not be able to sustain any more development. The narrowness of roads and the perceived danger to pedestrians was a cause of concern – with respondents having a mix of views about what traffic management solutions might resolve the issue.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/draft-plan/neighbourhood-plan-consultations/millbrook-parish-consultations/millbrook-village-plan-update-november-2011/>

3.5.5 Millbrook Phase 2 Traffic Study and Transport Assessment, 2009

This report was undertaken as part of a planning application for 22 homes on a green field site, adjacent to a recent development on Southdown Road in Millbrook.

The report considered various traffic flow, accident and other statistics; as well as referring to seasonal traffic changes and other impacts. These factors and current public transport and new walkway provision were acknowledged. The report concluded that the proposed housing development would be manageable in terms of transport and impact minimised if the housing was taken up by existing residents.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.files.wordpress.com/2014/10/millbrook-phase-2-traffic-study-transport-assessment-2009.pdf>

3.5.6 Millbrook Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:

1. Residents were concerned that additional development would increase traffic problems.
2. The report for Devon and Cornwall Housing although supporting their case for a phase 2 development in Millbrook did imply a level of impact on the transport infrastructure if the housing were allocated to those not already living in the area, and the need for pedestrian walkway.
3. There was support for improved traffic management (albeit, in what form not agreed upon) to improve traffic flow and make roads safer for

- pedestrians.
- 4. Support for better integration of travel modes.
- 5. Support for improved bus links to St Germans railway station and main towns.

3.6 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: SheviocK Parish

3.6.1 SheviocK Parish Consultation, January 2014

Of the 100 attendees

- 12 commented on better bus links to St Germans railway station (and to a lesser extent a variety of other locations).
- 4 people suggested various water links (seasonal) and
- 2 people wanted park and ride facilities.

3.7 Supporting Traffic & Travel Evidence: St John Parish

3.7.1 St John Parish Consultation, January 2014

Traffic

The main issue was the potential for traffic increase if there were more development on the peninsula. Improved signage would be a required, at a minimum.

Travel

There were no suggestions regarding bus services, park and ride, or new water links.

3.7.2 St John Parish Survey, January 2012

Traffic

Of the 101 survey returns;

- 109 thought increased development in Millbrook would bring more traffic and 103 felt this would cause problems in St John.
- Generally respondents felt traffic speed measures were seen as bringing no improvement or were unsure.
- Over 60 wanted to see more measures taken.

Residents in Freathy did not see parking as a problem and accordingly there was limited demand for a car park. Residents from St John took a more mixed view of parking problems but nevertheless didn't feel that parking restrictions were necessary, or that there was much of a need for a car park.

- 30 Freathy residents felt that there was a traffic problem along Military Road.
- 32 would like to see parking restrictions (yellow lines) implemented.

The majority of respondents wouldn't like to see the Ford closed to traffic.

Travel (Bus Services)

- 45 respondents indicated that they use the bus services.

- Similarly 56 said they would use it if it stopped in St John (it isn't possible to assess the majority are the same respondents).
- Only 13 respondents felt that the service was inadequate – most didn't know.

3.7.3 St John Parish Traffic and Travel Conclusions:

1. Residents were concerned that additional development would increase traffic problems.
2. Traffic levels along Military Road also highlighted as being problematic.
3. Support for better signage (to help address Sat-Nav issues) would alleviate traffic.
4. Parking restrictions not supported in the villages (but may be supported in relation to Military Road).

3.8 Rame Peninsula Traffic and Travel Theme Conclusions

1. There was concern from the parishes that increased development would bring increased traffic and travel problems, further exacerbating the current situation.
2. There was a general consensus from the parishes that there needs to be better integration of transport (bus, train, water and walking/cycling routes), in conjunction to other activities e.g. ticketing, information and facilities.
3. In looking at how travel options can be integrated, the availability of different modes and demand (local and tourist) will need to be reviewed.
4. There were some issue specific to individual parishes e.g. parking in Maker with Rame, which will need to be looked at further.
5. Traffic infrastructure issues need to be addressed. There is a general agreement that development will necessitate upgrade to infrastructure – the extent of these whether small discrete projects e.g. traffic lights at Hounster Hill; or major road works or projects e.g. by-pass for Antony; one-way system; are all being considered but any potential solution will need to be agreed and funded. It appears that there is most resident support for the idea of a one-way system for HGVs.
6. Measures and policies to reduce car travel e.g. walking and cycling for residents and tourists to be encouraged.

4.0 Recreation & Open Space

4.1 Relevant NDP Policies:

Rame NDP Policy 7: Conservation Areas
Rame NDP Policy 6: The Forts of the Rame Peninsula
Rame NDP Policy 10: Mount Edgcombe Country Park
Rame NDP Policy 13: Millbrook Lake and Green Space

4.2 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: Peninsula Wide

4.2.1 Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014

Of the 391 returns:

- 192 were strongly supportive of promoting and improving the footpath network. A further 141 indicated support, scoring 3 or 4.
- There was a very substantial majority in favour of supporting the AONB. 263 scored this a 5, 98 scored it either a 3 or 4. Only 11 of those who responded to this question, scored it between zero and 2.
- 123 strongly supported more allotment provision. A further 157 supported this, scoring it 3 or 4. 81 were not keen to see more allotment provision.
- The majority were in favour of supporting playing field provision. 173 scored it 5, a further 146 scored it 3 or 4. Only 47 scored it 2 or less.
- Many residents' comments emphasised the importance of the natural environment and green space within the peninsula, and the need for the area to retain its character.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.2 Flood Risk

36 of the 42 Maker with Rame survey respondents want sustainable drainage/flood risk management. There is likely to be evidence from the other parishes concerning this issue due to the winter storms 2013/2014.

The Point Europa/Peninsula Trust indicated that residents wanted sustainable flood management to be implemented. Over 300 respondents scored this 3 to 5 on the survey (zero being no support and 5 being strong support).

4.2.3 Conservation

40 of the 42 Maker with Rame survey respondents supported the conservation and sympathetic use of historic buildings and monuments as suggested by the Rame Conservation Trust. This was not specifically picked up by the other parishes.

The Point Europa/Peninsula Trust indicated that residents were in favour of the protection of historic buildings. 200 indicating strong support and a further 133 indicating support (score of 3 or 4).

4.2.4 National Planning Guidance, Paragraph 109: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;
- recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services.

4.2.5 Cornwall AONB Management Plan (2011 – 2016)

The qualities of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) are represented by its landscape character, natural heritage, historic environment, natural and built features and cultural associations, all of which are of great significance and value to the people of Cornwall and Cornwall's visitors. The AONB is a major asset for Cornwall and contributes substantially to the economy, as well as offering enjoyment, health and lifestyle benefits to half a million local people and up to five million visitors.

Access to the tranquil countryside of the AONB is vital for the health and well being of local people and the experience of visitors. A good public transport system and well maintained rights of way network are vital to the sustainable movement of people into and around the AONB areas, particularly from the main towns close to the AONB boundary.

4.2.6 Tamar Valley AONB Management Plan (2014 – 2019)

Our 20-year Vision: The people of the Tamar Valley are stewards of this rare valley and water landscape, of high visual quality, a unique wildlife resource with a remarkable heritage, which is a legacy of thousands of years of human occupation. By supporting a thriving community with a sense of belonging and identity, we will ensure the sustainability of the area as a peaceful, tranquil breathing space; at a time of unprecedented change.

To view this document please refer to;

<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.7 Kingsand & Cawsand Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, 2013

The purpose of this Conservation Area Appraisal is to clearly define the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area, and to suggest any possible amendments to its boundary. The appraisal should then inform development control decisions and policies and act as a foundation for further work on design guidance and enhancement schemes.

For further information please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.8 Mount Edgumbe means business Vision Document & Action Plan, 2013

A 3 year strategic plan for Mt Edgumbe Country Park.

To view this document please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.9 Rame Millennium Project Feasibility Study, 1996

The study aims to develop an environmentally sustainable programme of measures to aid regeneration of the area, with the particular objectives being to:

- (1) Improve the environment, especially the lakeside
- (2) To improve access for those without cars
- (3) Improve leisure facilities, especially access to water, for local people and tourists
- (4) Increase local employment/encourage business development.

To view this document please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.10 Plymouth's Historic Defences Management Appraisal, 1996

Part 2 (Caradon District) assessment of the condition of forts on the Rame Peninsula.

To view this document please refer to;
<https://ramepeninsulaneighbourhoodplan.com/>

4.2.11 An Archaeological Survey of the Rame Peninsula, 1974

A survey of all archaeological sites in the Rame Peninsula
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Thomas_\(historian\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charles_Thomas_(historian))

4.3 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: Anthony Parish

4.3.1 Results of Anthony Parish Consultation, 2014

A number of residents would like the Wilcove footpath extended to the River Lynher. There was also a desire to see play areas in both villages (Antony and Wilcove) maintained and improved; and a new village hall in Antony.

There was also support for maintaining agricultural land (i.e. no green field development) and ensuring camp sites are adjacent to the coastal road.

Concern was raised about potential loss of the village heritage; village community; and the adverse impact on natural environment and agricultural land.

4.3.2 Anthony Parish Survey, 2012

147 surveys were distributed of which 101 were returned (69% response rate).

Of the 101 returns:

- It was clear that (as indicated in the traffic and travel section) that there was strong support for footpaths.
- 89 of the 101 responses indicated they use the local footpaths.
- 76 respondents support a proposal for a new footpath from Wacker Quay to the village.
- 81 respondents want to see continued public access to Jupiter Point & Cove Jetty at Wilcove.
- 88 respondents support the retention of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) status in the parish. A further 9 were unsure and only 4 were not in agreement.
- 67 respondents also believe the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) designation for the Lynher River to be of crucial importance. 27 were unsure and 7 disagreed.

4.3.3 Antony Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:

1. Residents keen to maintain and extend footpath provision in the parish.
2. Protection of landscape strongly supported – as shown by the support for AONB/SSSI designations, and opposition to building on green field sites.
3. Some support for improved facilities (play etc) although limited data available on this.
4. An element of recreational facilities contained within land owner plans, but also some development on sites that would not be consistent with the resident views on the natural environment
5. Although there are no figures to indicate whether camping is supported or

not – the preferred location for such facilities was one adjacent to the coastal road.

4.4 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: Maker with Rame

4.4.1 Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014

A total of 42 surveys returned. Questions were asked around the themes of facilities, health service provision and open / green spaces.

Of the 42 returns:

- 28 were supportive of play area/sports facilities. However many felt that there were sufficient facilities but residents needed to better understand what was available and questioned whether best use was made of them.
- 38 respondents indicated strong support of use of the open/green spaces and beaches. There was wide agreement that the green and open spaces including the coastal aspect and the beach should be protected and maintained.
- 31 respondents were concerned that landscape character (or unique elements of the landscape) is at risk. This included issues around coastal erosion.
- 38 respondents were supportive of the Rame Conservation Trust proposals to conserve open spaces for public enjoyment; and the development of a woodland amenity for wider public use (although there were links to better management of existing amenity areas).

There were also a lot of comments relating to protecting allotments in the area – seen as a valuable resource.

4.4.2 Maker with Rame Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusion:

Majority of those returning surveys indicated strong support for open/green spaces and beaches – the landscape is important in many ways including: recreational, tourism and aesthetic terms. Residents value the landscape and want to ensure its protection.

4.5 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: Millbrook

4.5.1 Millbrook Parish Consultation January 2014

The consultation event attracted approximately 70 attendees.

There were a number of suggestions linked to tourism and the local economy, such as support for a youth hostel and more camping facilities at Maker Heights. Additionally, more cycle paths around the Rame peninsula to encourage tourism as well as local recreation.

There is a need for community growing spaces/ allotments to encourage self-sufficiency and healthy eating. Community composting might also link to the allotment provision.

Residents would welcome a village in bloom competition. Also bird watching huts around the lake.

4.5.2 Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013

26 Attendees representing 18 community groups.

The majority of respondents listed the lake / lakeside and beaches as the most frequently used and most important leisure facilities followed closely by play parks.

Other key comments include; a dedicated space for young people; retaining free recreational facilities due to low wage rural context; maintaining places for young people and families to go; using and enjoying the natural environment as part of leisure.

4.5.3 Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012

There were no specific questions around general recreational facilities.

4.5.4 Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011

There were 93 responses to the survey, and of those that answered the specific questions:

- A majority (70%) felt that the lake edges and island should be renewed and more could be made of it. The importance of protecting wildlife while maintaining the lake was mentioned.
- 56% felt that the Tanyard should be re-developed (although the extent of the development would need to be agreed).
- 46% felt that allotments should be created.

4.5.5 Millbrook Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions

1. Support for footpaths/cycle paths both for residents and tourism
2. Support for allotment provision.
3. The lakeside, beaches and play areas valued by the community – to be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced.
4. The natural environment seen as an asset and a leisure resource.
5. Some suggestions for camping/youth hostel facilities – linking to tourism.

4.6 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: Sheviock

4.6.1 Sheviock Parish Consultation, Jan 2014

From the 100 attendees, a key issue was the value of footpath provision. Generally respondents felt that current available open space answered requirements for play areas.

There were also suggestions for camping (Maker area in a neighbouring parish).

4.6.2 Sheviock Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:

1. Residents value footpath provision.
2. General satisfaction with play area provision.
3. Some suggestions for camping (Maker).

4.7 Supporting Recreation & Open Evidence: St John

4.7.1 St John Parish Consultation, Jan 2014

60 attendees at the event, who were generally supportive of the proposed new footpaths and some interesting conversations with farmers on the likely future of these permissive paths.

There were suggestions for a youth hostel and camping facilities at Maker Heights.

4.7.2 St John Parish Survey, January 2012

There were 126 surveys completed (36 from Freathy householders and 90 from St John). Of the 126 returns:

- 37 feel that there is a need for other facilities in St John and/or Freathy (it is unclear whether these relate purely to recreation facilities). Generally, the respondents seemed happy with the scope of recreation facilities.
- 57 respondents did not feel that a new play area (in addition to the one at the pub) was required.
- 108 respondents indicated that they have no need for an allotment.
- 103 respondents do make use of footpaths and a further 20 felt that their footpath management could be improved.
- 82 respondents would not want to see any changes to St John's Lake.
- 99 respondents support the retention of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) status across the whole of the peninsula.
- 83 respondents also believe the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) in St John's Lake is of crucial importance. 19 disagreed and 5 were unsure.

4.7.3 St John Parish Recreation & Open Space Conclusions:

1. Support for existing and new footpaths. Improving management of these might require some further work to identify how this can best be undertaken.
2. Generally residents do not require further play area provision or allotments.
3. Major support for retention of the AONB status and also the SSSI designation of St John's Lake.
4. Landscape holds great value to the residents.
5. Some suggestions for camping/youth hostel facilities (Maker Heights) – linking to tourism.

4.8 Rame Peninsula Recreation & Open Space Theme Conclusions

1. The value of the landscape (leisure/recreation; tourism; character –

- aesthetic value; and health and well-being/quality of life) and the need to protect, maintain and enhance is of crucial importance to the parishes and the residents. It is also an economic driver in terms of tourism.
2. Footpath and cycleway provision is valued and should be enhanced – not just as a recreational facility but also in terms of travel options (refer to Traffic and Travel section); and the economy.
 3. Camping at Maker and potential for developing further was raised by a number of the parishes as was youth hostel facilities (and also referred to in the Commerce section).
 4. There was some support for allotment provision (specifically Maker with Rame and Millbrook). The AONB status and SSSI designation (e.g. St John's Lake) is important to the parishes.
 5. Playing field provision is important but some parishes feel that they have sufficient facilities.

4.9 Other Key Points

A number of important points are highlighted in this section – recreation isn't just about formal facilities. It also links to but also about enjoyment of open space. There are specific links to the following:

- Economy: tourism element.
- Economy – footpath linkages to local villages and thus increasing footfall.
- Health & Wellbeing.
- Natural Environment and protection of green/open space including the coastal zone.
- Traffic and Travel – reducing car travel and congestion; and a desire for better integration of travel modes.

5.0 Renewable Energy

5.1 Relevant NDP Policies

Rame NDP Policy 3: Renewable Energy

5.2 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: Peninsula Wide

5.2.1 Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust, 2014

Of the 391 returns:

- There was a fairly even split between support and opposition for the development of wind turbines. In total 113 were totally against development of wind turbines and 100 were strongly supportive of the development of wind turbines. Collectively, there were 171 people scoring this between zero and 2; and 190 scoring it between 3 and 5.
- More respondents were supportive of the development of solar farms. 216 indicated support (between scores 3 and 5 – 108 scoring it as a 5); 148 scored it between zero and 2 (86 strongly opposed).

5.2.2 BRS Solar Farm Proposal and Map, 2013

British Solar Renewables (BSR) proposed a solar farm park on Antony Estate land at Freathy, which would impact on both Antony and St John parishes. BSR in conjunction with the parish councils had undertaken some consultation in the parishes. The parishes were in communication with BRS and representatives from the company attended a cluster meeting and individual parish events/meetings.

The five parish councils (those directly affected and those in the surrounding area) were generally supportive of the proposal, subject to clarity and mutual agreement over such elements as: community benefit (financial); permissive footpath provision; implementation of hedgerow screening as planned; and minimizing traffic impact.

5.2.3 Paper setting out Parish Councils View on Renewables, 2013

The parishes indicated that they wish to address energy conservation and generation. They would support community led energy installations if supported by nearby residents.

The paper set out the intention to produce policies in respect of turbines (with height restrictions) and other energy initiatives, subject to these having local support, giving community benefit and can be implemented without adversely impacting on the environment. Additionally, unplanned and ad-hoc large scale energy projects would cause concern within the

cluster parishes. In this vein, the proposed Mendennick Wind Farm was attracting considerable criticism and the proposed solar park proposal seen as more acceptable and less intrusive.

5.2.4 Rame Renewable Energy (RRE) Report, March 2013

The report was commissioned as part of an evidence base for RRE, and considers different options for renewable energy, although with illustrative examples. Potentially solar farms could bring the highest levels of energy generation, significantly more than wind or tidal.

However, improving or installing renewable energy for domestic use in conjunction with energy efficiencies (e.g. insulation) could bring benefits.

5.2.5 Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies, 2015

Policy 15: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Policy supports renewable energy including.....*In and adjacent to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and undeveloped coast, developments would not be allowed except in exceptional circumstances and should generally be very small scale in order that the natural beauty of these areas may be conserved.*

The policy states particular support for schemes led by local communities.

5.2.6 Green Cornwall, 2011-2020

Vision for encouraging renewable energy sources, and promotion of low carbon economy throughout the County in order to meet regional and national targets.

5.2.7 Neighbourhood Planning – Renewable Energy Advice Note

Guideline suggesting the promotion of community ownership of renewable energy schemes, and inviting local communities to investigate local energy saving and generation opportunities.

5.2.8 An Assessment of Energy Efficiency and renewable Energy for Rame Renewable Energy, March 2012

Undertaken by Exeter University Centre for Energy and the Environment, this report considers the potential extent of maximizing energy efficiency and generation on the Peninsula. The report highlights many domestic energy efficiency ideas and considers the maximum generating capacity of both domestic and large scale solar and wind.

5.2.9 Cornwall Area of Outstanding Beauty Management Plan (2011 – 2016)

Provides an overall strategy for the protection of the Rame AONB, including statements on planning policy within the AONB, and which are considered material considerations for any proposed development.

5.2.10 Mendennick Wind Farm (PA12/12027)

This was the first application for a RE scheme on the Peninsula, submitted in 2011 for three 81 metre high turbines on Mendennick Hill. The application contained a full Environmental Assessment but was *withdrawn* following objections from Cornwall Landscape Officer, Cornwall AONB, Cornwall Historic Environment Officer, Cornwall Environmental Health Officer, Natural England, Ministry of Defense (radar interference), St John PC, Millbrook PC, Shevioc PC, Antony PC and Maker with Rame PC. In particular the landscape officer referred to the adverse significance of the confluence of several exceptional sensitivity designations, and the danger of an unacceptable industrial intrusion on the dramatic landscape setting of the Cornwall Rame Head AONB.

There were a significant number of public responses with 440 letters of objection against only 20 letters of support.

5.2.11 Freathy Solar Park (PA/13/11705)

This was an application for a 12MW solar park on land at Freathy just south of the B3247. The application was submitted in December 2013 and was supported by the parish councils as having minimal effects on the landscape. However Cornwall Council refused planning permission because of the extent of high-grade agricultural land to be developed. There were 28 public comments of which 18 were letters of objection and 10 were of support.

In 2014 the developer British Solar Renewables resubmitted a smaller 7MW scheme, which did not sterilize as much high-grade land This was supported by the parishes of St John and Antony, and for which planning permission was granted by Cornwall Council.

5.3 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: Antony Parish

5.3.1 Antony Parish Consultation, January 2014.

No information relevant to this theme came forward from the event.

5.3.2 Antony Parish Survey, Autumn 2012

The household survey was used to gauge views on renewable energy – asking if they would support all kinds of renewable energy (levels of support for individual renewable energy options not sought). From the 101 survey returns, 49 were in favour, 24 against and 28 were unsure.

5.3.3 Antony Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions:

1. Potentially some support for renewable energy (particularly as more information has been coming forward on this) and the Parish Council has been involved with discussions on wind farms and solar parks.

5.4 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: Maker with Rame Parish

5.4.1 Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, February 2014.

27 of the 42 survey responses indicated 'in principle' support for renewable energy. Comments inferred more support for solar or hydro/wave power; with wind turbines less favoured. Conservation area constraints and considerations would need to be factored in when reviewing installation locations (whether personal homes or land-sites).

The idea of linking renewable energy scheme to a Rame community energy company was also suggested.

5.4.2 Maker with Rame Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions

1. In principle there is support for renewable energy projects (mainly solar or tidal). As with other parishes, the geographic location lends itself to discussion on tidal energy.
2. The potential for community energy schemes and income generation for the benefit of the community has been suggested.
3. Projects whether domestic or business/community projects would need to take conservation/environmental factors in to account.

5.5 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: Millbrook Parish

5.5.1 Millbrook Parish Consultation, January 2014

Opinion from the attendees (approximately 70) was divided over wind turbines and solar farms; with a more popular option for renewable energy being that of tidal/water energy. Potential sites named were Southdown, Maker, Mendennick and along the cliffs.

Solar panels as part of new build were considered important.

5.5.2 Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013:

There were approximately 25 attendees representing a mix of community groups. 11 attendees were in favour of tidal energy (no-one objected) and 10 in favour of ground source heating; Many attendees did not express a preference. Wind power, solar energy and bio mass energy attracted support from 9 or less.

It was felt that renewable energy had a place to play in domestic energy, businesses and community initiatives.

5.5.3 Millbrook Consultation with landowners and businesses, 2012:

About 25 attendees asked if, in principle they were in favour of wind power, solar power, ground source heat pump, tide energy. Ground source heat pumps, wind power & tide energy all equally received the most ticks. Other feedback was that 'There should be more investigation into Biomass boilers / logging / chipping'.

5.5.4 Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011:

93 surveys completed. Renewable energy was only briefly touched upon but there was a suggestion that renewable energy projects would be a good investment for the parish and a potential income source.

5.5.5 Millbrook Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions:

1. Tidal energy schemes attracted more favourable response.
2. Again, the idea of a community scheme meeting needs, being 'green' and generating income was seen as warranting consideration.
3. Consider solar panels as part of new development.

5.6 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: Sheviock Parish

5.6.1 Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014

There were few comments from the 100 attendees on renewable energy but there was an emphasis on any scheme being small-scale (or in the case of wind turbines, attendees did not want these to be too high). Wave energy was mentioned and the suggestion that "where the old tide mills were" was worthy of further investigation.

5.6.2 Sheviock Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions

1. There appears to be concern about the scale of development and actual physical height of any renewable energy installation, and there needs to be more community engagement on this issue to gain clarity on resident views.

5.7 Supporting Renewable Energy Evidence: St John Parish

5.7.1 St John Parish Consultation, January 2014

There was general acceptance from the attendees (approximately 60) of Antony Estate's proposed Solar Park plans at Freathy. There were also some suggestions for tidal energy projects – locations suggested included: Millbrook Lake and St John's Lake; and one Waste to Energy scheme at Cremyll.

There was little support for industrial wind turbine projects.

5.7.2 St John Parish Survey, 2012

From the 126 survey returns, there was strong support across the parish for renewable energy (98 in support; 10 against and 6 unsure). The majority of these were against wind turbines which it was felt would have a negative impact on the environment, but would support other renewable energy initiatives (e.g. tidal/wave; solar; waste to energy and offshore wind).

5.7.3 St John Parish Renewable Energy Conclusions

1. Good support for different types of renewable energy projects
2. Renewable energy projects likely to be supported within the parish – but wind turbine schemes unlikely to be looked upon favourably.
3. Again, the idea of community benefit was raised.

5.8 Rame Peninsula Renewable Energy Theme Conclusions

1. In principle there is support for renewable energy projects: tidal/water energy generation in particular attracting support, but other renewable energy sources also attracting some support e.g. solar (including plans for solar park at Freathy).
2. Some mixed response to wind turbines – and parishes would like to see criteria over height, community support etc., factored in.
3. Community benefit (financial support for locally defined projects) is important.
4. The potential for community energy schemes and income generation for the benefit of the community has been suggested.
5. Projects whether domestic or business/community projects would need to take conservation/environmental factors in to account.

5.9 Other Key Points

- Impact on the environment of any renewable energy project – as in wind turbine height which from previous applications has attracted criticism.
- Aesthetics of the environment and impact to residents and tourism.

6.0 Commerce

6.1 Relevant NDP Policies

Rame NDP Policy 9: Maker Heights

Rame NDP Policy 11: Commercial Growth area for Millbrook

Rame NDP Policy 12. Southdown & Foss Quay Boatyards

6.2 Supporting Commerce Evidence: Peninsula Wide

6.2.1 Cluster Wide Consultation by Point Europa/The Peninsula Trust 2014

Of the 391 returns:

- There was a very high majority who wanted to see the local shops and retail spaces preserved. 276 scored this 5, and a further 88 scored it between 3 and 4. Only 12 disagreed.
- Similarly there was strong support to maintain and improve public facilities. 176 scored it 5, and a further 164 scored it either 3 or 4.
- There was some support for both starter units for new businesses and making use of farm buildings for workspace. Both received over 250 responses of 3 or above. Between 80 and 100 scored these options between zero and 2.
- There was no clear consensus regarding the need for youth hostel, campsite and/or hotels. Responses against all scores were between 39 and 75.
- There was general support for training centres and apprenticeships for young people. 137 scored this with a 5, a further 158 scored it 3 or 4. 68 scored it 2 or lower.
- In terms of facilities, comments related to maintaining these all year round – for residents as well as for the tourist season.

6.2.2 Cornwall Council Rame Peninsula Economic Profile September 2013

This document sets out statistics relevant to the Rame peninsula.

- Population density is shown as being below the Cornish average (1.3 persons per hectare compared to 1.5).
- In 2011 there were 205 local business units – and 85.4% of these were micro-businesses. No medium or large units in the area.
- The main employment sector is accommodation and food services.
- Lower than the Cornish average employed in agriculture, forestry and fishing, wholesale and retail.
- Higher than the Cornish average employed in public administration and education.
- There is a significant higher figure of part time employees in the peninsula compared to averages across Cornwall and England.
- Total resident earnings are above the Cornish average.

6.3 Supporting Commerce Evidence: Antony Parish

6.3.1 Results Anthony Parish Consultation, Jan 2014:

The only data for this theme related to comments on whether a supermarket was needed in Torpoint. It was pointed out that there is one already and that such a development could bring access issues. Trevol Business Park was suggested as a potential site for a cut-price supermarket if one were to be built.

6.3.2 Anthony Parish Survey, 2012

147 surveys were distributed of which 101 were returned (69% response rate).

Of the 101 returns:

- The majority (65) were against commercial development of any kind.
- 15 were in support of commercial development, and a further 21 were unsure.
- 52 respondents indicated they would (or they do) use the village shop.
- 31 respondents would not (or do not) use the village shop and 18 respondents were unsure.
- 68 respondents use the village pub. 43 respondents think the village pub could be used for other purposes. 27 disagree and 31 were unsure.

6.3.3 Antony Parish Commerce Conclusions

1. New commercial development was not supported
2. Some support for existing facilities (village shop, village pub).
3. Supermarket development (in Torpoint) generally did not attract support.

6.3.4 Maker with Rame Parish Consultation, Jan 2014:

From the total of 42 survey respondents:

- A similar level of people agreed the need for commercial business requirement (25), retail business requirement (27) and small business units (33). 9, 11 and 3 respectively disagreed.
- 27 were in principle agreeable to tourist accommodation (not second holiday homes). However, this needs to be balanced with existing facilities – e.g. some would not want to see more campsites, others would like to see existing facilities developed and so on. The increase of tourist accommodation also raises concerns about parking, traffic and so on.
- The Rame Conservation Trust's idea for a creative industry hub (arts, music and craft) attracted 40 positive responses.
- 40 supported Rame Conservation Trust's concept of a small enclave of work/live units for small local businesses and sympathetic to the environment and administered by a Community Land Trust. Similarly, 40 agreed with The Peninsula Trust's proposal for new

workshop units to help local people create or expand their businesses.

- 40 supported the principle of services to help young people e.g. volunteering, training and apprenticeships.

6.3.5 Maker with Rame Parish Commerce Conclusions

1. A level of support for business development (small, and for the benefit of those wishing to set up or expand a local business).
2. Similarly support for work units or work/live units.
3. Perceived potential for businesses in the creative sector but scope for other business development relating to marine/water; retail and so on.
4. Support for training and employment opportunities for young people.
5. Some support for tourism (e.g. camping, accommodation) but needs to be further evidenced, and assess potential for development of existing facilities.

6.3.6 Millbrook Parish Consultation, Jan 2014

70 people attended the event. For commerce key comments include additional free and short term parking; cheaper rents for empty shops.

Millbrook also identified a need for smaller workshops and work/live units. Areas suitable for commercial development were identified as Southdown, the Old Mill and Hounster Hill.

There was generally felt to be no need for a large supermarket on the Peninsula, although a couple thought that one on at Trerulefoot would be acceptable.

Tourism was noted as a key economic driver that needs to be exploited.

More provision and facilities should be available for OAPs in the village.

6.3.7 Millbrook Community Group Consultation, March 2013

26 Attendees representing 18 community groups. The majority indicated that they make use of local shops and the post office. There was support for business/employment opportunities in the parish and Gallows Park, Maker and Millbrook Retail Park were all mentioned. Creative arts/craft; maritime, tourism and heritage based employment were all seen as potential areas to be considered to boost the economy.

There seemed to be support for helping young people gain employment skills through Apprenticeships.

6.3.8 Millbrook Consultation to Update Parish Plan, 2011

There were 93 responses to the survey of which 68% wanted the Council to support local employment opportunities.

6.3.9 Millbrook Parish Commerce Conclusions

1. Support for work units and/or work/live units.
2. Tourism a key economic driver.
3. Parking provision needs to be a factor when considering business development and encouraging use of local businesses.
4. Opportunities for young people e.g. apprenticeships encouraged.
5. Supermarket development not supported.
6. Some commercial development sites suggested (e.g. Pete's Garage & Maker Heights)

6.4 Supporting Commerce Evidence: Sheviock Parish

6.4.1 Sheviock Parish Consultation, January 2014

100 attendees were at the event and made suggestions of: a bigger shop, better Broadband, Mobile phone aerial for Portwrinkle, as requirements for improved business in outlying areas. Barn Barton was suggested as suitable for businesses.

- 38 were against supermarket development. No-one indicated support for this idea.

6.4.2 Sheviock Parish Commerce Conclusions

1. Improvements to broadband/mobile phone provision seen as factors in improving business operation and development.
2. No support for supermarket development.

6.5 Supporting Commerce Evidence: St John Parish

6.5.1 St John Parish Consultation, January 2014

The consensus was that there is no need for a large supermarket on the peninsula, although a small number of residents thought one on the outskirts of Torpoint (in the Trevol area) would be acceptable.

6.5.2 St John Parish Survey, 2012

From the 126 survey returns:

- 59 thought there should be more employment opportunities in the parish. 35 disagreed.
- 31 support more visitor accommodation; 22 did not agree. However, the majority (69) were unsure.

6.5.3 St John Parish Commerce Conclusions

1. Support for the re-opening of St John Inn.
2. No support for supermarket development within the parishes.

6.6 Rame Cluster Commerce Theme Conclusions

1. Tourism seen as a key driver to the area – but development (type/scale) needs to be handled carefully.
2. Desire to develop and support local businesses.
3. General support for camp sites/youth hostel facilities – mainly in terms of developing facilities at Maker.
4. Support for live/work units in Maker with Rame and Millbrook parishes.
5. Similarly support for training/employment opportunities for young people within Maker with Rame and Millbrook.
6. Three of the parishes have indicated a lack of support for supermarket development in their parishes.

6.7 Other Key Points

- Traffic and Travel – enabling easy movement/access; parking.
- Recreation – facilities including camping, maintaining landscape as a leisure resource and driver for tourism.