Corwall Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Allocations DPD): Pre-Submission (Regulation 19) Consultation

Representation Form

Please return your completed form by email: delivery@cornwall.gov.uk OR by post: Cornwall Council, Local Plans Team, Pydar House, Pydar Street, Truro TR1 1XU OR by hand: New County Hall reception (Truro) or any Cornwall Council One Stop Shop before 5pm on Monday 7 August 2017

Fair Processing Notice
Your feedback, which will be retained for the life of the plan, will help Cornwall Council to finalise the Cornwall Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Allocations DPD).

The 2012 Town and Country Planning Regulations require all comments received to be submitted to the Secretary of State, so your information will be shared with the Department of Communities and Local Government and the Planning Inspectorate.

By submitting this survey you are giving Cornwall Council your consent to put your full name (excluding personal contact details and any signatures) and comments into the public domain; for publishing online on the Council’s website and in hard copy. Information provided on the Equality Monitoring Form will not be published and will be retained for up to three months from the close of the consultation.

Part 1
1. Your contact details
You must complete this page for your representation to be accepted. The Council cannot accept anonymous representations.

Name: Michael Calder

Organisation (if applicable): National Trust

Address: ____________________________

Postcode ____________________________

Email Address: ______________________

Telephone number: __________________

If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing
2. Legal Compliance, Duty to co-operate and Soundness

This plan is published so that public comments can be considered alongside the plan when it’s submitted and examined by an Independent Planning Inspector.

The purpose of the examination, as stated in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), is to consider if the plan complies with:

Legally compliant – does the plan:

- Appear in the Local Development Scheme timetable which sets out when Local Development Documents are produced by the Council as part of the Cornwall Local Plan?
- Agree with the Local Planning Authority’s (LPA) Statement of Community Involvement?
- Comply with the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012?
- Have a Sustainability Appraisal Report (if required)?

Sound - A plan is deemed sound if it satisfies key points:

- Positively prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Duty to co-operate - this is a legal test that requires co-operation between local planning authorities (LPA) and other public bodies to maximise the effectiveness of policies for strategic matters. It is separate from but related to test of soundness. The LPA will provide evidence of how they have complied with any requirements arising from the duty.

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☒

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound?
Yes ☐ No ☒ Don’t know ☐

Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☒
Part 2

3. Your comments

Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas.

If you wish to comment on more than one area, please complete a separate survey for each.

- Bodmin
- Camborne/Pool/Illogan/Redruth (CPIR)
- Eco-community
- Falmouth and Penryn
- Hayle
- Helston
- Launceston
- Newquay
- Penzance and Newlyn
- Saltash
- St Austell
- Strategically important employment sites

Please give precise comments saying why you think the plan is or is not legally compliant or sound and explain how you would modify the plan to make it legally compliant or sound.

My comment relates to **(please select one)**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy (site) (please provide the policy number you are referring to)</th>
<th>Policy PZ-H8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy text (please state the section you are referring to e.g. employment, housing etc.)</td>
<td>Heamoor Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence document (please note which document you are referring to)</td>
<td>Heritage Assessment (June 2017), Heritage Impact Assessment (June 2017), Visual impact and Setting Considerations (Jan 2016); HIA Supplementary Papers, June 2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your comment
**Policy PZ-H8 (Heamoor): Approx 350 dwellings**

The revised Policy PZ-H8 (Heamoor), in the Site Allocations DPD submission version, contains a reduced site area from the earlier 2016 draft version of the plan. An area of 2.4 hectares towards the south east has been removed from the allocated site with no justification provided in the plan itself, but the Council’s response to representation ‘H8-Res15’ in the Cornwall Council Preferred Options Consultation 2016: Consultation Responses, suggests that an area of land needed to be excluded from the site due to an objection from the landowner. Unfortunately, the area of the site that has been removed is largely an area of defined ‘low sensitivity’ in terms of the potential heritage impacts on Trengwainton, together with just a small area of ‘medium sensitivity’ to the south (drawing number A093730-002 Heritage Impact Review, WYG, Feb 2016).

The Trust objects to the revised policy PZ-H8 (Heamoor), as development of the site includes significant areas of defined ‘high sensitivity’, and it has not been demonstrated that the developable site area proposed is sufficient to address the unresolved areas of potential harm from a development allocation of the size of 350 dwellings, with the ‘standard density’ proposed of 35 dwellings per hectare not being appropriate to this sensitive rural site, given that the Council’s own Heritage Impact Assessment (June 2017) states the need for a “**strong emphasis on ‘rural fit’**” (p.21).

The Cornwall Site Allocations DPD: Heritage Assessments (June 2017) indicates an impact appraisal of ‘Moderate’ but with “policy mitigation” codes it yellow ("**Minor**"), which is the grading shown on the map on page 3. However, this simply does not follow the documents own definitions in the “heritage impact assessment key” in Table 1. The definition of a “moderate impact” is one where there is the potential for harm but that it is “capable of moderation through mitigation”, so that the “**overall outcome would be less than substantial.**” The assessment for PZ-H8 states clearly that with the need for “a number of mitigation measures” “**the result is that there would be less than substantial harm.**” Therefore by the Council’s own definition the impacts should be coded, in the conclusion, as “**Moderate**”, not ‘minor’. Moreover, the Trust contends that despite the Council’s June 2017 evidence the principal areas of harm remain unresolved and therefore the impacts cannot be robustly coded. The new June 2017 evidence has not satisfactorily addressed the questions over harm, as detailed in, **Response to Historic Assessment for Site Allocations (Jan 2016): Heamoor, Penzance** (Bidwells; October 2016), and yet the benefits from the development of the site are now less with the reduction of the previous 435 dwelling allocation by 20%.

The Trust notes the now planned “**Strategic highway proposal**” through the site, as shown on Figure PZ1 (Page 17), which is the only strategic highway proposal identified on Figure PZ1, but is not included or clarified in Table PZ3: the Strategic Transport Measures (page 27/28), nor included or clarified in the site allocation policy PZ-H8, other than a note over the “vehicular access” and that there is an “opportunity” to create a bus route through the site, which should be considered. It is therefore unclear what the strategic highway “proposal” actually entails, making this unsound.

The actual assessment of impact of the access road that is provided in the Heritage Impact Assessment Supplementary Paper (June 2017) is fundamentally flawed as its conclusions are predicated on the current landscaping within, and adjacent to, Trengwainton, providing permanent screening of the development and access road, where it states:
- “It was noted from the general view from the terrace, that the existing mature trees, both within and surrounding the estate substantially frame the edges of the dominant view from the terrace, and which block the peripheral views over the land at Heamoor.” (p.20)
- The “mature trees” which frame the view “obscures the main development site from view.” (p.15)
- The landscape proposals aim “to merge into the wider backdrop of the dominant tree line”. (p.25)

However Historic England’s guidance on ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ (March 2015) makes clear: “The permanence or longevity of screening in relation to the effect on the setting also requires consideration. Ephemeral features,... may be removed or changed during the duration of the development, as may woodland or hedgerows, unless they enjoy statutory protection.” (para 29)

It simply has not been demonstrated that the Council, including its Landscape Architect, has had regard to the evidence that the Trust has made available in terms of the longevity of screening from trees within Trengwainton. The Symbiosis Consulting Report on the Overall Condition and Vulnerability of Trees: Trengwainton Garden (Feb 2016) states clearly in the executive summary that:

“iv). The outlook from the Terrace is vulnerable to the potential impact of residential development proposed to the south-east, interrupting the view towards Mount’s Bay. Specific trees that have been identified as key elements in assisting with screening and mitigating the visual impact of the proposed development are identified in the report as having only very limited longevity and are vulnerable to disease or storm damage because of their age. Interventionist management required to maintain these trees in the landscape will lead to a reduction in their canopy size and thus their contribution will be much diminished."

The potential impacts from both the access road and the residential development, due to the tree management measures that are necessary at Trengwainton, have not been assessed, despite the WYG ‘Trengwainton Park: Landscape & Visual Appraisal’ (Feb 2016) providing montages showing the potential visual impact of the development with necessary tree management measures having taken place.

This is also relevant to ‘Issue 4’ in the Response to Historic Assessment for Site Allocations (Jan 2016): Heamoor, Penzance (Bidwells; October 2016) in relation to Field M. The Council’s conclusions of its ‘Visual Impact and Setting Considerations’ (HIA, Appendix 2, Jan 2016, p.22 and p.10) is that the retention of trees between the site and the terrace at Trengwainton is “critical”, and yet they are outside their control, and the Council has demonstrated no regard as to the permanence or longevity of that “critical” screening.

Notwithstanding the above concerns the Trust supports exploration of opportunities for enhancement of the asset at Trengwainton as discussed on page 25 of the Heritage Impact Assessment Supplementary Paper (June 2017).

Turning to the Boscathnoe Lane mitigation proposals, in the Heritage Impact Assessment Supplementary Paper (June 2017), the Trust maintains that openness is a beneficial part of the identified ‘transition’ in passing from Haemoor (and Penzance) to Trengwainton, and screening would curtail this experience (Bidwells; October 2016), making the approach dark and tunnel like, which will harm this aspect of the setting and its contribution to significance. The Council’s own ‘Visual Impact and Setting Considerations’ (HIA, Appendix 2, Jan 2016) shows in diagrammatic visual form how openness on Boscathnoe, over the site, is an important attribute to the “transition corridor” (p.24).
Whilst there are now reduced benefits from the allocation it continues to remain uncertain how far heritage assets would be harmed and therefore how far such a proposal would meet both the local plan Spatial Strategy objective to “protect, conserve and enhance” the historic landscape and heritage (Policy 2 [d]), and the specific strategy aim for Penzance & Newlyn to “respect the historic environment.” As a result the National Trust believes the allocation policy to be ineffective, unjustified, and inconsistent with national policy, and therefore unsound.

**Supporting Evidence** (previously made available to the Council)
- Nicholas Pearson Partnership LLP *Trengwainton Setting Study*; Jan 2015.

How would you change the plan so it is legally compliant or sound?

Either remove **Policy PZ-H8** (Heamoor) allocation from the plan altogether and replace with a reasonable alternative site allocation (or allocations), or reduce the amount of the allocation to a figure that is deliverable in a way that demonstrably meets the local plan Spatial Strategy objective to “protect, conserve and enhance” the historic landscape, and make up the shortfall elsewhere. For necessary reductions in the developable site area and associated density issues – see section 6.0 of Bidwells, *Response to Historic Assessment for Site Allocations (Jan 2016): Heamoor, Penzance*; October 2016.
My comment relates to (please select one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy (site) (please provide the policy number you are referring to)</th>
<th>Policy PZ-H1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy text</strong> (please state the section you are referring to e.g. employment, housing etc.)</td>
<td>Long Rock (Approx 150 dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence document</strong> (please note which document you are referring to)</td>
<td>Heritage Assessment (June 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your comment

**Policy allocation:** PZ-H1 Long Rock (Approx 150 dwellings)

**Policy allocation:** PZ-E4 Long Rock East (3.2 hectares: approx. 9,400sqm of B1/2/8 uses)

The following comments are applicable to both policy allocations PZ-H1, Long Rock, and PZ-E4, Long Rock East.

Potential issues raised by the ‘neighbourhood extension option’ NE1 (Long Rock) were indicated by the Trust in their response to the consultation on the Community Network Areas Core Strategy Area Based Papers (Jan 2012) in a letter dated 1 March 2012; the land between Penzance and Marazion being particularly prominent in the views from St Michael’s Mount and increasingly subject to a ribbon form of development. In response to the 2016 consultation on the Site Allocations Preferred Options DPD the Trust commented that the contribution the proposed allocation sites make to the character of the bay and the setting of St Michaels Mount needed to be assessed before allocation, in line with Historic England guidance Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans Oct 2015).

The Council’s response to the Trust’s 2016 representations ‘H1-Res2’ and ‘E5 - Res3’ in the Cornwall Council Preferred Options Consultation 2016: Consultation Responses, put forward an action to review the impact on St Michael’s Mount. The Heritage Assessment for Penzance and Newlyn Site Allocations (June 2017) considers the site allocation as a whole under PZ-H1, as shown on the map on page 2. The impact on views from St Michaels Mount are now said to have been “reviewed” and the conclusion is that the “views would not be impacted” (Heritage Assessment; p.3), whereas the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Summary (Appendix 10) states that it is recognised that there could be an impact on the setting of St Michaels Mount from allocations PZ-H1 and PZ-E4, albeit deemed ‘minor’ (Table PZ2). This is entirely inconsistent, and the Council at Step 1 of the Historic England guidance appears not to have accepted that the grouping of heritage assets on the Mount has the potential to be affected by the allocations at Long Rock and has thus failed to consider further the relationship of the site to the asset under Step 2, or how to avoid harm, such as addressing the potential impact on views, under Step 4.

On the Mount, from the North Terrace, the south side of which is formed by the C12th church of St Michael (listed grade I), there are extensive views north, as identified in the listing description for the registered park and garden, and shown in the photograph below. Given that both Long Rock itself and traffic moving along the A30, to the rear of the allocation sites H1 and E4, are visible from the terrace adjacent to the grade I Church, it is clear that there at least a potential for an effect on this highly important grouping of heritage assets. The Church and Mount are assets of the highest significance, and the listing text to the main building describes the Mount as: “unique, there is no other building in England which has such a remarkable situation.” St. Michaels Mount attracts...
visitors from all over the world, contributing significantly to the regional economy. There is a statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act) 1990 that requires decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings. The Barnwell Manor Court of Appeal Judgement (C1/2013/0843) stated: “That general duty applies with particular force if harm would be caused to the setting of a Grade I listed building, a designated asset of the highest significance” (Para. 28).

To not assess what contribution the site makes to significance and how harm can be avoided through design requirements and enhancement maximised is not only quite remarkable, but is also unsound as the policy has been inadequately justified and is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF; para 137). The Allocations DPD itself makes clear that PZ-E4 (Long Rock-East) is in a “prominent” location (para 3.28) and its SA indicates in the individual site SA for PZ -E4, under ‘Landscape’, that there is the potential for development of the site to impact on seascape if the scale was “inappropriate”. What might be deemed ‘inappropriate’ is not set out in the policy, and the fact that the policy fails to even indicate that the issue needs to considered, renders the policy unsound, and does not demonstrate compliance with the statutory duty of ‘special regard’.

As well as ensuring that any harm to the heritage assets on the Mount is avoided and enhancement maximised, there should be a policy requirement to consider visual impacts on the St Michael’s Way, which passes to the north, east, west, and south of the allocation sites. The St. Michaels Way is the only long distance footpath in the UK to be designated a European Cultural Route by the Council of Europe, and any impacts from development on the experience of arriving in Mounts Bay for users of the path, on the approach to their destination, should be minimised.

Photograph taken on the Mount from the North Terrace adjacent to the church of St Michael (listed grade I), the views from which are noted in the listing description for the registered park and garden. The view includes Marazion Marsh and the allocation sites PZ-H1 and PZ-E4.
How would you change the plan so it is legally compliant or sound?

Assess what contribution the sites make to the significance of St Michael’s Mount, and how harm can be avoided and enhancement maximised. Establish necessary design requirements.

Also include a policy requirement to consider visual impacts on the St Michael’s Way, which passes to the north, east, west, and south of the allocation sites, and ensure that any harm is avoided.

My comment relates to (please select one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy (site) (please provide the policy number you are referring to)</th>
<th>Policy PZ-E4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy text (please state the section you are referring to e.g. employment, housing etc.)</td>
<td>Long Rock East (3.2 hectares: approx. 9,400sqm of B1/2/8 uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence document (please note which document you are referring to)</td>
<td>Heritage Assessment (June 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your comment

Policy allocation: PZ-H1 Long Rock (Approx 150 dwellings)
Policy allocation: PZ-E4 Long Rock East (3.2 hectares: approx. 9,400sqm of B1/2/8 uses)

The following comments are applicable to both policy allocations PZ-H1, Long Rock, and PZ-E4, Long Rock East.

Potential issues raised by the ‘neighbourhood extension option’ NE1 (Long Rock) were indicated by the Trust in their response to the consultation on the Community Network Areas Core Strategy Area Based Papers (Jan 2012) in a letter dated 1 March 2012; the land between Penzance and Marazion being particularly prominent in the views from St Michael’s Mount and increasingly subject to a ribbon form of development. In response to the 2016 consultation on the Site Allocations Preferred Options DPD the Trust commented that the contribution the proposed allocation sites make to the character of the bay and the setting of St Michaels Mount needed to be assessed before allocation, in line with Historic England guidance Historic Environment and Site Allocations in Local Plans Oct 2015).

The Council’s response to the Trust’s 2016 representations ‘H1-Res2’ and ‘E5 - Res3’ in the Cornwall Council Preferred Options Consultation 2016: Consultation Responses, put forward an action to review the impact on St Michael’s Mount. The Heritage Assessment for Penzance and Newlyn Site Allocations (June 2017) considers the site allocation as a whole under PZ-H1, as shown on the map on page 2. The impact on views from St Michaels Mount are now said to have been “reviewed” and the conclusion is that the “views would not be impacted” (Heritage Assessment; p.3), whereas the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Summary (Appendix 10) states that it is recognised that there could be an impact on the setting of St Michaels Mount from allocations PZ-H1 and PZ-E4, albeit deemed
‘minor’ (Table PZ2). This is entirely inconsistent, and the Council at Step 1 of the Historic England guidance appears not to have accepted that the grouping of heritage assets on the Mount has the potential to be affected by the allocations at Long Rock and has thus failed to consider further the relationship of the site to the asset under Step 2, or how to avoid harm, such as addressing the potential impact on views, under Step 4.

On the Mount, from the North Terrace, the south side of which is formed by the C12th church of St Michael (listed grade I), there are extensive views north, as identified in the listing description for the registered park and garden, and shown in the photograph below. Given that both Long Rock itself and traffic moving along the A30, to the rear of the allocation sites H1 and E4, are visible from the terrace adjacent to the grade I Church, it is clear that there at least a potential for an effect on this highly important grouping of heritage assets. The Church and Mount are assets of the highest significance, and the listing text to the main building describes the Mount as: “unique, there is no other building in England which has such a remarkable situation.” St. Michaels Mount attracts visitors from all over the world, contributing significantly to the regional economy. There is a statutory duty under section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act) 1990 that requires decision-makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings or their settings. The Barnwell Manor Court of Appeal Judgement (C1/2013/0843) stated: “That general duty applies with particular force if harm would be caused to the setting of a Grade I listed building, a designated asset of the highest significance” (Para. 28).

To not assess what contribution the site makes to significance and how harm can be avoided through design requirements and enhancement maximised is not only quite remarkable, but is also unsound as the policy has been inadequately justified and is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF; para 137). The Allocations DPD itself makes clear that PZ-E4 (Long Rock-East) is in a “prominent” location (para 3.28) and its SA indicates in the individual site SA for PZ -E4, under ‘Landscape’, that there is the potential for development of the site to impact on seascape if the scale was “inappropriate”. What might be deemed ‘inappropriate’ is not set out in the policy, and the fact that the policy fails to even indicate that the issue needs to considered, renders the policy unsound, and does not demonstrate compliance with the statutory duty of ‘special regard’.

As well as ensuring that any harm to the heritage assets on the Mount is avoided and enhancement maximised, there should be a policy requirement to consider visual impacts on the St Michael’s Way, which passes to the north, east, west, and south of the allocation sites. The St. Michaels Way is the only long distance footpath in the UK to be designated a European Cultural Route by the Council of Europe, and any impacts from development on the experience of arriving in Mounts Bay for users of the path, on the approach to their destination, should be minimised.
Photograph taken on the Mount from the North Terrace adjacent to the church of St Michael (listed grade I), the views from which are noted in the listing description for the registered park and garden. The view includes Marazion Marsh and the allocation sites PZ-H1 and PZ-E4.

How would you change the plan so it is legally compliant or sound?

Assess what contribution the sites make to the significance of St Michael’s Mount, and how harm can be avoided and enhancement maximised. Establish necessary design requirements.

Also include a policy requirement to consider visual impacts on the St Michael’s Way, which passes to the north, east, west, and south of the allocation sites, and ensure that any harm is avoided.
My comment relates to *(please select one)*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Policy</strong> (site)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(please provide the policy number you are referring to)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategy text</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(please state the section you are referring to e.g. employment, housing etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Evidence document</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(please note which document you are referring to)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your comment *(the box will expand as you type)*

How would you change the plan so it is legally compliant or sound?

If you require more space, please add more comment boxes following the same format above.
4. Duty to co-operate

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.
5. **Examination in public and further notification**

If your comment(s) request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination

- **No** I do not wish to speak at the public examination
- **Yes** I do wish to speak at the public examination

Please note even if you’ve selected that you wish to speak at the examination, the Independent Planning Inspector will decide who, if anyone, should speak publicly. Even if you select No, your written comments will still be considered by the Inspector and given the same weight as verbal comments at a hearing session.

**Further notification**

Please let us know if you would like to be notified on either or both of the following:

- The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
  - Yes ☒
  - No ☐

- The adoption of the Allocations DPD
  - Yes ☒
  - No ☐

If you have answered Yes to either of the questions above and your preferred contact details differ to those already given, please enter the details below.

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me
Name: Richard Blyth

Comment:
FP-M2 Parkengue
FP-H3 Treliever
FP-M4 Treliever Future Direction of Growth
1. Personal Details:

Name: (required) David Guiterman
Organisation (if applicable)
Address line 1
Address line 2
Town
County
Postcode (required)
Telephone number
Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).
If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing
Preferred method of contact Email

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant? Don’t know
Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound Yes
Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate? Don’t know

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

Policy (sites)

5. You have selected CPIR

Policy (sites)

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

Policy (sites)

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn

Policy (sites)

8. You have selected the town of Hayle

Policy (sites)

9. You have selected the town of Helston

Policy (sites)
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy ID</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE2</td>
<td>Halgavor Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE3</td>
<td>St Lawrence's Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE4</td>
<td>Callywith Urban Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-M1</td>
<td>Castle Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-E1</td>
<td>Beacon Technology Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-E2</td>
<td>Walker Lines/Carminow Road (Safeguarded employment site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-E3</td>
<td>Bodmin Business Park (Safeguarded employment site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-E4</td>
<td>Cooksland Industrial Estate (Safeguarded employment site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-E5</td>
<td>Callywith Gate (Safeguarded employment site)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The Bodmin policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension
Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension
Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village
Bd-M1 Castle Street
Bd-E1 Beacon Technology Park
Bd-E2 Walker Lines/Carminow Road (Safeguarded employment site)
46. Strategy Text - Newquay

Your comment

47. Strategy Text - Penzance and Newlyn

Your comment

48. Strategy Text - Saltash

Your comment

49. Strategy Text - St Austell

Your comment

50. Evidence documents

51. The Evidence documents you’ve selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

- Comprehensive Impact Assessment
- Cornwall Retail Report
- Eco-community Sustainability Report
- Employment Evidence Base Report
- Heritage Impact Assessments
- Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report
- Housing Evidence Base Report
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA)
- Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report
- Town Framework Document
- Transport Evidence Report
- Other

52. Modification

Please explain what modification(s) you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public?  

No, I do not wish to speak at the oral part of the examination

The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the
emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

The adoption of the Allocations DPD

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of any barriers you have faced when dealing with us.
Name: Brian Richards MBE

Comment:

I would like to make a representation on the proposed Allocations DPD for the Penzance, Heamoor and Newlyn area on behalf of myself, Brian Richards, [REDACTED].

Whilst understanding the need for local additional housing, I would like to make the following observations and objections to the proposed areas marked as follows:- PZ-H4, PZ-H5, PZ-H6, PZ-H7 and PZ-H8.

Given the new housing development shortly to be built on the old Cornwall Council site at St Clare, I believe if all of the proposed building sites shown above proceed as proposed, with as many as 700 new homes, excluding the St Clare development, this will lead to total gridlock on the road infrastructure in the Heamoor/Penzance road. This is particularly so at 'School run' time. This would make it particularly unsafe for the many students/pupils in the number of local schools, including Nancealverne ‘Special School’ who walk the pavement and at times take their own life in their hands at present, let alone if the number of cars greatly increase, as it inevitably would.

In the case of area PZ-H6, this is an area that is already a flood risk area, and has resulted in frequent flooding in that area in the past. New buildings in this area will only exacerbate this problem should the building proposal in area PZ-H6 proceed.

With regard to the PZ-H8, again, this is a flood plain, hardly surprising given there is a Dam in close proximity. Why allow an area of open countryside which is also an agricultural area to be built upon, at a time when it is acknowledged with the U.K. exit from the EU there is likely to be a food shortage due to fewer imported foods. Also, the building on open countryside is contrary to the local Councils own policy.

Looking at the proposals as a whole, it is estimated there will be an additional 1400 more cars travelling through the Heamoor area, and yet there are no plans to upgrade the Heamoor roundabout.

In my opinion, and taking all of the above into account, I believe the only proposed area that should be considered for building, would be on the PZ-H4 site. This particular area is an area that is very steep, making agricultural land
much more difficult to work. There should be a lesser risk of flooding, as there is a natural 'run off' downhill. The road infrastructure allows much easier access and exit to the entrance of the town, as it would be close to the existing roundabout ensuring there is much less traffic travelling into and out of the area of Heamoor and also into Newlyn and further west. It should, together with the new housing site at St Clare, provide sufficient new housing for local needs, bearing in mind there are other site proposals in other areas of the town for consideration.

Finally, should all of these proposed sites be accepted for future building, it will totally destroy the identity of Heamoor village which, again, is contrary to the Councils own policy.

I would urge extreme caution before agreeing to unnecessary housing when the actual need for local housing needs is for far fewer than that which is proposed.
Ref: 25

Name: Barbara Cock

Comment:

I am writing to raise my objections to the obscene proposed over development of the Heamoor and Penzance area. Whilst I do agree we need a few more affordable and tasteful, substantially built houses for locals, 719 properties is way too much for the reasons listed below:

1. The development proposal is way too large bearing in mind this is a small country village and not a major town. If we wanted to live in a town we would not be living here in the first place!

2. There is absolutely no mention of improving the road system which is already chaotic during school times both in the village and on all approach roads. As most families now own 2 cars and provision is only made for 1 car on new builds parking is likely to be a major problem, even more so than it is already.

3. Also no provision has been made for more shops, surgeries, hospital beds etc. and there is certainly no available places at any of the local schools.

4. Where is the employment going to come from?

5. Anyone who lived through and witnessed the horrendous flooding which occurred recently in the village would know better than to build more properties on the raised ground behind, i.e. Trannack, Polmennor areas. This is an absolutely ludicrous idea which will result in so much more run off causing even more problems and higher insurance policies. The Boscathnoe site is also marsh land and is underwater most of the winter.

6. We should also not be building on prime agricultural land in this day of need for local produce.

7. With any new building there must also be a clause included which prohibits any sale to second home owners and preferably for born and bred locals. Please note that I was born in Marazion, went to school in Heamoor and have lived in the area for most of my 67 years so am writing as a local and not an outsider.
I could go on but these are my prime concerns on which I feel most strongly.

No one in Heamoor is going to accept these proposals so we need proper consultation with all sides involved including the County Council, planning, developers, highways and of course the local inhabitants to come to a more realistic conclusion.
1. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (required)</th>
<th>Damian Warner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred method of contact</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

- Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant? Yes
- Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound Yes
- Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate? Yes

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

   - **Hayle**

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

   What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR

   What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

   What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn

   What would you like to comment on (you can select
8. You have selected the town of Hayle

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

16. The Bodmin policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension
Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension
Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village
Bd-M1 Castle Street
Bd-E1 Beacon Technology Park
Bd-E2 Walker Lines/Carminow Road (Safeguarded employment site)
Bd-E3 Bodmin Business Park (Safeguarded employment site)
Bd-E4 Cooksland Industrial Estate (Safeguarded
23. Hayle Policies

**H-UE1 Trevassack**

24. The Hayle policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H-UE1 Trevassack</td>
<td>The DPD appears to be well thought through. The plan mentions masterplanning the development land and whilst it may not be appropriate for the plan itself, as a landowner I would be interested to see more information on what this may, or may not include.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E2 St Erth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E3 Hayle Harbour Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-EM1 East Quay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-ED1 Penpol School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-D1 Barview: Future Direction of Growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-HS1 Tolroy Safeguarded Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-E1 Marsh Lane Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Helston Policies

26. The Helston policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He-E2 Tresprison Industrial Park expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-E3 Helston Business Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-ED1 Nansloe Academy Expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-E1 Water-Ma-Trout (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Launceston Policies

28. The Launceston policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H1 Withnoe Urban Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. Modification

Please explain what modification(s) you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, I do not wish to speak at the oral part of the examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The adoption of the Allocations DPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand
1. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (required)</th>
<th>Rachel Lambert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred method of contact</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant?  
Don’t know

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound?  
No

Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate?  
No

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

- Penzance and Newlyn

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?
7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

Policy (sites)

Strategy Text (main text in the document, including the Introduction and Monitoring sections)

Evidence documents

13. You have selected the town of Saltash
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

16. The Bodmin policies you’ve selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension
Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension
Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village
Bd-M1 Castle Street
28. The Launceston policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H1 Withnoe Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H2 Hurdon Road: Future Direction of Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H3 Kensey Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E1 Landlake: Future Direction of Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E2 Badash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E3 Scarne Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E4 Pennygillam Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E5 Newport Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Newquay Policies

30. The Newquay policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NQ-H1 Riel: Nansledan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-H2 Trevenson and Kosti Veur: Nansledan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-M1 Station Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-M2 Hendra: Nansledan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-E1 Treloggan Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Penzance Newlyn Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H8 Heamoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-M1 Harbour Car park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. The Penzance and Newlyn policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H1 Long Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H2 Posses Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H3 Gulval Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H4 Trannack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H5 Polmennor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H6 Joseph’s Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H7 Poltair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heamoor is already subject to flooding and I would question whether it could take more housing. Also, through ALL the housing proposals, there is no mention of % of affordable housing. I would STRONGLY question who this housing is for then, and whether it
can be justified at all (regardless of government quota). I believe affordable housing should be 80% of what is built, and firstly, using empty buildings should be looked at.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PZ-H9 St Clare</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H11 Barn Site, Gulval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H12 Gurnick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H13 Bellair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PZ-M1 Harbour Carpark</th>
<th>I am not in agreement with these plans at all. I think more should be done to change the usage and arrangements with current shopfronts in town, before building more on the car park site. I do not believe there is enough demand to fill a new site, and this will lessen the impact of the town centre even further</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ-M2 Coinagehall Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-M3 Wherry Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-E2 Stable Hobba Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-E3 Sandy Cove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-E4 Long Rock East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-E1 Long Rock Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Saltash Polices

34. The Saltash policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

| SLT-UE1 Broadmoor Urban Extension          |                              |
| SLT-E1 Stoketon Cross                      |                              |
| SLT-E2 Saltash Parkway (Safeguarded for employment use) |                              |
| SLT-E3 Moorlands Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use) | |
| SLT-E4 Saltash Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use) | |
| SLT-E5 Tamar View (Safeguarded for employment use) | |

35. St Austell Policies

36. The St Austell policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

| STA-M1 Pentewan Road          |                              |
| STA-M2 Edgcumbe               |                              |
| STA-E3 Par Moor               |                              |
| STA-R1 Old Vicarage Place     |                              |
| STA-E1 Holmbush Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use) | |


53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public?

The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Yes

The adoption of the Allocations DPD

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of any barriers you have faced when dealing with us.
1. Personal Details:

Name: (required)  Angela Blakeway

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant?  Don't know
Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound  Yes
Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate?  Don't know

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

Camborne, Pool, Illogan and Redruth (CPIR)

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?  Policy (sites)

6. You have selected Eco-Communities
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

16. The Bodmin policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

- Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension
- Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension
- Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village
- Bd-M1 Castle Street
- Bd-E1 Beacon Technology Park
- Bd-E2 Walker Lines/Carminow Road (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E3 Bodmin Business Park (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E4 Cooksland Industrial Estate (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E5 Callywith Gate (Safeguarded employment site)

17. CPIR Policies

18. The CPIR policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

- CPIR-UE1 Tolgus
- CPIR-E1 Tolvaddon Energy Park
- CPIR-E5 Dudnance Lane
- CPIR-ED1 Tuckingmill
- CPIR-E2 Barncoose Industrial Estate (Safeguarded employment site)
1. Personal Details:

Name: (required) | John Bennett
Organisation (if applicable) | Hayle Neighbour Plan Steering Group
Address line 1
Address line 2
Town
County
Postcode (required)
Telephone number
Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).

If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing

Preferred method of contact | Email

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant? | Yes
Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound | Yes
Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate? | Yes

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

Hayle

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?
5. You have selected CPIR

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash

---

| Policy (sites) | Strategy Text (main text in the document, including the Introduction and Monitoring sections) |
52. Modification

Please explain what modification(s) you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

The Transport Strategy Development, Appendix D, does not address a major problem that limits the usability of rail transport. Trains stop at St Erth primarily because of the interchange to St Ives. A substantial number of trains that stop at St Erth do not stop at Hayle. This means that schoolchildren and business people who get on a train at Hayle to go to school or work cannot be sure that the return train will stop at Hayle. They must either walk, take public transport or taxi or be collected. This is a major disincentive to using the train service. We suggest that the DPD should set a goal of requiring every train that stops at St Erth should also stop at Hayle. Through trains can still go directly from Penzance to Truro but any other train must stop at both St Erth and Hayle. This would not have a huge cost impact but would make the train vastly more usable for Hayle residents.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination? No, I do not wish to speak at the oral part of the examination.
The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

The adoption of the Allocations DPD

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of any barriers you have faced when dealing with us.
1. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (required)</th>
<th>Sally Trevithick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred method of contact</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate?</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

| Penzance and Newlyn |

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

16. The Bodmin policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

- Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension
- Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension
- Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village
- Bd-M1 Castle Street
- Bd-E1 Beacon Technology Park
- Bd-E2 Walker Lines/Carminow Road (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E3 Bodmin Business Park (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E4 Cooksland Industrial Estate (Safeguarded employment site)
- Bd-E5 Callywith Gate (Safeguarded employment site)

17. CPIR Policies

18. The CPIR policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

- CPIR-UE1 Tolgus
- CPIR-E1 Tolvaddon Energy Park
- CPIR-E5 Dudnance Lane
- CPIR-ED1 Tuckingmill
- CPIR-E7 Station Road
- CPIR-R1 Fair Meadow
- CPIR-E2 Barncoose Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)
26. The Helston policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He-E2</th>
<th>Tresprison Industrial Park expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He-E3</td>
<td>Helston Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-ED1</td>
<td>Nansloe Academy Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-E1</td>
<td>Water-Ma-Trout (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Launceston Policies

28. The Launceston policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAU-H1</th>
<th>Withnoe Urban Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H2</td>
<td>Hurdon Road: Future Direction of Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-H3</td>
<td>Kensey Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E1</td>
<td>Landlake: Future Direction of Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E2</td>
<td>Badash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E3</td>
<td>Scarne Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E4</td>
<td>Pennygillam Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU-E5</td>
<td>Newport Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Newquay Policies

30. The Newquay policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NQ-H1</th>
<th>Riel: Nansledan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NQ-H2</td>
<td>Trevenson and Kosti Veur: Nansledan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-M1</td>
<td>Station Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-M2</td>
<td>Hendra: Nansledan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NQ-E1</td>
<td>Treloggan Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Penzance Newlyn Policies

32. The Penzance and Newlyn policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PZ-H1</th>
<th>Long Rock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H2</td>
<td>Posses Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H3</td>
<td>Gulval Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H4</td>
<td>Trannack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H5</td>
<td>Polmennor Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H6</td>
<td>Joseph’s Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ-H7</td>
<td>Poltair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. Modification

Please explain what modification(s) you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public?

The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

The adoption of the Allocations DPD

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of any barriers you have faced when dealing with us.
Miss Sylvia Thompson

21-6-17

Dear Sir,

I received your letter concerning the Cornwall Sike Allocations Development Plan Document Submission Consultation.

In the section H01 my land is recommended for development after 2030. I strongly oppose this. Also mentioned was a possible A30 junction at Highlakes. I strongly oppose this.

I am not able to complete the online survey and hope this letter is sufficient.

Yours faithfully,
Name: Susan Benning

Comment:

I am writing to you concerning the above proposed building in my local area. I have no problem with the need for housing in Heamoor, what I do have a problem with, is this being done without thought to the infrastructure of Heamoor.

Housing is needed for the people on the housing lists, not for up country second homers. The Council’s own policy is not to build on open countryside and yet by building in the way you intend you will ruin the village feel of Heamoor. The village already suffers from flooding, if building goes ahead, flooding risks are increased.

Traffic at the Heamoor roundabout is already a problem at school times, with children having to run the gauntlet when crossing the road to either Mounts Bay or Heamoor primary school. School buses already have problems dropping off students and picking them up, and this increases on street parking problems in the surrounding roads increasing the danger to children going to and from school.

Surely the first thing to consider before looking at building more houses, is the infrastructure of the area. Increase in school places, more doctors, more facilities at the local hospital and road management schemes.
Comment:

I am making representation on the Allocation DPD, Penzance and Newlyn specifically code site

PZ/H4.Trannick.209 homes
PZ/H5.Polmennor.33 homes
PZ/H6.Josephes Lane.16 homes
PZ/H7.Poltair.30 homes
PZ/H8.Heamoor (Boscathnoe) 350 homes
Total 719 homes

I am objecting to all of these on the grounds that they are not sound.
I have lived in Heamoor for 48 years in that time we have had housing estates built around the village (Boscathnoe, The Reenes, Manor Way, Roscadgell) this has resulted in large increases in the traffic flow through the village add in the increase in school places and the number of buses needed for the children plus parents cars the road can in no way cope, should these proposed homes be built where could the extra traffic go.
Cars and vans are parked on the both sides of Madron road only the centre of road is left for traffic thus causing bottlenecks and that is today.
The air quality in the area near the distributor road is not good it will not be improved by even more traffic.
The intention is to build on open countryside this is against County policy I quote Local Plan Policy 7.
There is a lack of committed funding as shown in Cornwall Delivery and Investment plan for Penzance and Newlyn.
As I understand it there are no funds in place to improve the roads or to improve the drainage Heamoor is a flood risk area.
Have brownfield sites been investigated before destroying open countryside?
I ask you to give due consideration to my objection.
Name: Phil Hart

Comment: None this all appears to be sound.
Name: Pentewan Valley Parish Council

Comment:

Cornwall Site Allocations DPD - St Austell

We note that there is a traffic management scheme proposed for the A390 and would ask that this comes on stream as soon as possible.

We are aware that s106 monies have been allocated for this work and the continued delay in its implementation causes us concerns with regard to the current air quality, with the increased road usage due to new housing in Porthpean Road that is now built and occupied, and to the impact on the minor road network due to hold ups on the A390.

We would also ask that this work recognises the potential impact on feeder roads to the A390 and that it does not exacerbate the problems on these roads.

We also note that it is sought to encourage the greater use of public transport and believe that this is largely dependent on the proposed improvements.
Name: Emily Hudson

Comment:

I have had a read through the guidelines on the Development Plan Documents and am a bit confused if my request can form part of this or not.
Basically my son is a Changing Place Toilet user, he requires a toilet facility that has a hoist, adult sized change bench, toilet and sink. Without this facility we can't go out of our house for longer than about 1.5 hours. There are 3 town centres in Cornwall that have these toilet facilities that are open 7 days a week. So we can visit Wadebridge, Bude and St Austell and that's it.
I am desperate to take my son to other places, we definitely need more of these facilities. Recently large new tourism and retail developments in Cornwall have ignored the recommendation under the British Standard 8300 to install these facilities so we are still in the same situation.
How can we have more Changing Places Toilets in Cornwall?
Name: Roger Bingham

Comment:

I wish to raise my objection to the proposed housing in Heamoor and would raise the following points:

1 Mr Brown the chairman of your steering group stated that the developments at the back of Heamoor would have little effect on the existing traffic problems. He quoted a figure of 0.7 cars per household at peak times. With this figure I have related it to the PZ-H8 proposal of 350 dwellings, this equates to 1 car every 15 seconds on Roscadhill Rd arriving at Heamoor roundabout, in addition to existing traffic. He also suggested a reduction of traffic on the Madron Rd in Heamoor with the introduction of access to schools via Roscadghill Rd, adding additional traffic in both directions as there is a proposed bus gate at Boscathnoe Lane. Your "Consultations for planning policy and guidance documents" clearly state the traffic problems which would be incurred if other sites were employed and the need for the A30 as the main artery to be carefully planned. There is the additional problem of the pedestrian route taken by children going to school across this traffic, and the playgrounds along either side of the road.

2 My house was reroofed and the planning authorities stipulated natural slates. It is not a listed building and therefore any development adjacent to me should also have this stipulation made. It would provide a local industry with work and be in keeping, interlocking tiles are not and make an estate without any identity.

3 The Development Plan Documents state the average wage of £383 per week, any new housing should cater for this wage and be for local people only not to be a retirement estate for people outside the county selling up to buy cheaper in Cornwall and imposing additional strain on our existing services. There is a shortage of employment and therefore houses should be for locals not people sent down by other councils to form unemployment ghettos. The "Cornwall Community Land Trust" has the correct attitude to the housing of local residents.

4 The field adjacent to my house has been allocated as a Green space, in winter the bottom of this field is often flooded. Is there a guarantee that this field will not be developed in the future? When I first moved here I was surrounded by green fields, Roscadhill was extended to one of my boundaries over fields. Is there any hope of an end to this desecration of the countryside by developers making a fast buck and moving on? Are all the possible brown field sites used up or are they being sat upon until they make more money?
With the exit from the EU do we need to treasure our fields for the production of food to be a sustainable community?

5 The council have stated "it is felt that negative impact is outweighed by positive benefits". This may be the council’s opinion in Truro, but is definitely not that of the inhabitants of Heamoor and Penzance who have chosen this to be where they wish to live, Truro 40 years ago was a beautiful county Town. It is now a constant traffic jam and has sold its soul to the multinationals. Cornwall County Council should look at their mistakes in Truro and not repeat and impose it on other towns, especially Penzance.
Dear Sir,

I am writing to you regarding the Representation form you recently sent me for the Cornwall Planning Policy Consultation Documents about the St Austell Site allocation's Development Plan.

I am surprised and disappointed that you have not included the greenfield area flanking the St Austell By-Pass (Southbourne Road) as a protected green site that must not be developed; especially as you promote the Council as one that protects the environment, I think green spaces are important.

The National development guidelines say green fields should not be taken except where there is no other option. I suggest the taking of good agricultural land on Porthpean Road (St Austell) was totally unnecessary, and therefore illegal. As was the German Meadow development a few years earlier, which took a greenfield area which was totally unnecessary, -
...destroyed badger sets which is also illegal (unforgivable).

St Austell is vastly overdeveloped, so a lot of the homes are being bought by incomers, which fly in the face of the repeated mantra that it is being done for local people. The figures don't add up. People pressure on the environment, the pollution & the congestion are becoming unsustainable.

Can I have your assurance that the greenfield area off the St Austell Bypass will be safe from development, & that no further greenfield sites will be destroyed?

Yours faithfully,
Ref: Allocation of greenfield sites in Heamoor for housing.

Dear Sirs,

I wish to make a representation on the allocations DPD in Penzance and Newlyn, specifically the sites PZ-H4, PZ-H5, PZ-H6, PZ-H7 and PZ-H8.

I am very concerned about the proposed building projects, considering the following facts:

- Building on open countryside, which is against the council’s own policy.
- Flooding: namely the total failure to take account of the impact on existing properties in flood risk areas.
- Traffic: up to 1400 more cars, no plans to improve Heamoor roundabout.
- At school times, parts of Heamoor come to a standstill through sheer volume of traffic. A large flow of children also use these roads and footpaths at these same times. To increase traffic and people in this area can only present more problems let alone present a major health and safety issue.
- The addition to the mix of a lot of school children, can only
- Loss of prime agricultural land at a time of food insecurity.
- Infrastructure: it cannot cope now and there is no funding available to improve it.
- Loss of identity of Heamoor village, which is contrary to the Councils own policy.

Stephen Welsh
**Name:** Helen Reynolds

**Comment:**

**Objections to the proposed use of greenfield sites Heamoor Penzance**

I am making Representation on the Allocations DPD on the following areas

Area - Penzance & Newlyn
Site - PZ-H8 Heamoor (Boscathnoe)
Site - PZ- H7 Heamoor Poltair
Site - PZ-H5 Polmennor Road
Site - PZ-H4 Trannack

I am writing with great concern regarding the council’s proposed developments in and around Heamoor, Penzance and how this will impact on both the quality of life for the current residents & the local environment. I understand the need to build new affordable home so that the local economy can grow and develop, however I am concerned about the size of these developments and would like to object to particularly around the larger developments for the following reasons.

1 The impact on current residents in the area, in respect of quality of life, Heamoor is a village on the outskirts of Penzance and as a result enjoys open spaces and a clean environment, with a further 700 plus properties in the area, Heamoor is at risk of becoming a concrete jungle and all the social issues around such change.

2 Traffic, with two major school and the major trunk road to Madron, Heamoor already suffers major traffic issues during the week, parking is also now becoming a major issues in the village, to exacerbate the situation, should the development of 700 plus housing go ahead in and around Heamoor, there is a real risk of over 1500 extra resident cars in the tiny village of Heamoor which will cause grid lock, and reduced quality of life for all residence, both new & existing, this cannot be allowed to happen.

3 Infrastructure, Heamoor currently has very few amenities, to deal with such a large influx of homes & people, the roads are best poor & badly set out, I have already mentioned parking my fear that should the number of residents increase
we will see parking back onto the main A30 roundabout, causing issues beyond Heamoor, before even taking about such a large injection of homes there would need to be a large injection of infrastructure (new roads, school & shops etc.) but I understand there is no such plans, it would appear we are looking to do this on the cheap (typical of our current government) my understanding is there are plans to introduce 1970s style huts in our schools for any additional children to learn in, if that’s true, then Cornwall Council members should hold their heads in shame.

4 Flooding - I’m sure you are aware that fields are a source of drainage, and I’m very fearful that this natural source of water control from Madron & beyond will be lost causing issues around the lower parts of the village, Heamoor is often a victim to flooding and the loss of natural drainage will of increase this issue.

5 Affordability - I am concerned that again we will be building homes that are just not affordable to the local residents, (I purchased my home nearly 20 years ago and now I wouldn’t be able to afford my own home now) I am very concerned that the purchase price of the homes will ignore the average wages in the area, it’s not good enough to have a dozen houses in a 700 affordable, and I’m afraid this is what will happen.

In summary, I am aware of the need for new homes in Cornwall, but the Council Council needs to look a bit harder to identify brown field sites and allow the natural beauty of Cornwall to remain, we live in a country that’s clearly concerned about it’s actions on the environment and (unlike the St Clare site, using a brown field site) there is nothing in this development, that tells me this Council cares about the environment or the residents of Cornwall.

Thank you for your time reading my letter, I would be grateful if you could take this letter of my objection of the building of 700 plus homes in the Heamoor area, and that the Council Members look again at the development plan and look to use brown field sites similar to the proposed St Clare site.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this objection.
1. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: (required)</th>
<th>Allan Orton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (if you select email as your preferred method of contact and change your email before the Allocations DPD is adopted, please let us know).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred method of contact</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

- Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant? **Yes**
- Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound **Yes**
- Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate? **Yes**

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

- St Austell

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

What would you like to comment on
7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

10. You have selected the town of Launceston
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

11. You have selected the town of Newquay
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

12. You have selected Penzance and Newlyn
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

13. You have selected the town of Saltash
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

14. You have selected the town of St Austell
What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

15. Bodmin Policies

16. The Bodmin policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy (sites)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE2 Halgavor Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE3 St Lawrence's Urban Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-UE4 Callywith Urban Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd-M1 Castle Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 33. Saltash Policies

34. The Saltash policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Code</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLT-UE1</td>
<td>Broadmoor Urban Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT-E1</td>
<td>Stoketon Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT-E2</td>
<td>Saltash Parkway (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT-E3</td>
<td>Moorlands Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT-E4</td>
<td>Saltash Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLT-E5</td>
<td>Tamar View (Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 35. St Austell Policies

36. The St Austell policies you've selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Code</th>
<th>Policy Name</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA-M1</td>
<td>Pentewan Road</td>
<td>The priority here should be the link road, to carry traffic away from the south more efficiently. At the moment, without the proposed development, the junction of the two roundabouts is failing to move traffic efficiently. The new link road is needed now really. To add the extra burden of additional retail, housing &amp; office space without the new road just wouldn't work. Having cars sitting idling, throwing out pollution, isn't good for the environment, the local economy, pedestrians &amp; cyclists, or the drivers of the cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA-M2</td>
<td>Edgcumbe</td>
<td>This development needs to consider the the new link road from the Pentewan, and the general traffic flow in &amp; out of the area from the Newquay &amp; Bodmin directions. We need efficient traffic flow to improve the air quality within St Austell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA-E3</td>
<td>Par Moor</td>
<td>This is a good plan, but restricting it till 2023 is ridiculous. The Carlyon Bay beach development looks unlikely to ever happen, so to reserve the site as a construction depot for it is daft! The developer of Carlyon Bay should be allowed a maximum of 2 years (2019) to have access to this site. At the moment they've held the town to ransom since 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by leaving the beach in a mess, now their being allowed to influence another site for another 7 years!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STA-R1 Old Vicarage Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA-E1 Holmbush Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safeguarded for employment use)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Strategically Important Employment Sites

38. The Strategically Important policies you’ve selected are listed below. If you selected more than one policy, please type your comments into the relevant boxes.

| C-E1 United Downs, Carharrack (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E2 St Columb Major Industrial Estate (north) (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E3 St Columb Major Business Park (south) (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E4 Indian Queens / Moorlands Industrial Estate (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E5 Victoria Business Park, Roche (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E6 Doublebois Industrial Estate, Dobwalls (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E7 Moss Side Industrial Estate, Callington (Safeguarded for employment use) |
| C-E8 Trevol Business Park, Torpoint (Safeguarded for employment use) |

39. Strategy Text - Bodmin

Your comment

40. Strategy Text - CPIR

Your comment

41. Strategy Text - Eco-Community

Your comment

42. Strategy Text - Falmouth and Penryn

Your comment

43. Strategy Text - Hayle
you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can't be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn't comply we'd still like to know why.

Par Moor road - Don't wait 7 years to leave this site in an overgrown mess, waiting for the developer of Caryon Bay beach to do nothing!

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public? No, I do not wish to speak at the oral part of the examination

The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Yes

The adoption of the Allocations DPD Yes

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of
1. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: (required)</td>
<td>Lois Iddon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if applicable)</td>
<td>Budock Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode (required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td>Budock Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you're an agent, please state the individual or organisation you’re representing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred method of contact</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Legal Compliance, Soundness and Duty to co-operate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the Allocations DPD is Legally Compliant?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the Allocations DPD is sound</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider the Allocations DPD complies with the Duty to co-operate?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please select from the list below, which town your comments relate to. You can also comment on strategically important employment sites; these are sites which are located within more rural areas outside of the main towns.

- Falmouth and Penryn

4. You have selected the town of Bodmin

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

5. You have selected CPIR

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

6. You have selected Eco-Communities

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

7. You have selected Falmouth and Penryn

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

8. You have selected the town of Hayle

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?

9. You have selected the town of Helston

What would you like to comment on (you can select more than one)?
52. Modification

Please explain what modification(s) you consider are necessary to make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound and why this modification will make the Allocations DPD legally compliant or sound. Please be precise and suggest revised wording of any policy or text.

Although comments relating to the duty to co-operate can’t be amended at examination, if you think the plan doesn’t comply we’d still like to know why.

Budock Parish Council wish it to be noted that they fully support the plan in it’s current form.

53. Examination in public and further notification

If your comments request a change; do you wish to speak at the oral part of the examination in public?

No, I do not wish to speak at the oral part of the examination

The Independent Planning Inspector’s published recommendations of the emerging Allocations DPD under section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Yes

The adoption of the Allocations DPD

Yes

Please use this postal address to notify me

Please use this email address to notify me

54. Equality Monitoring

Please enter your postcode

Please give your age

How do you describe your gender?

How do you describe your ethnic origin? (Please read carefully before selecting the ethnic group that you feel most closely reflects your background).

Do you consider yourself to have a disability?

Is there anything we can do or put in place which would make it easier for us to offer you an equal service? (For example documents in large print, hearing loop etc).

Do you need someone to help you understand information? (For example someone to read documents with you or an interpreter).

It would help the Council to know of any barriers you have faced when dealing with
Name: John Martin

Comment:
I am making a representation on the Allocations DPD for area Penzance and Newlyn for the sites PZ-H4 through to PZ-H8.
It seems that you are going against your own policy in proposing to build on these greenfield sites and open countryside. Prime agricultural land will be lost, the infrastructure cannot hope to cope with more traffic and with more fields covered in tarmac where is the run off of water supposed to go? It is dangerous to walk the roads and pavements of Heamoor with many drivers disregarding the speed limits. How much worse will it be with four schools in the area with another 1,000 to 1,300 more cars using the roads?
I am not a newcomer to the area having lived in Heamoor for the last 46yrs! I also feel this could lead to Heamoor losing it's identity as a village (also contrary to Council's own policy!)
4 July 2017
170704 Letter to CC re DPD

By email to:
delivery@cornwall.gov.uk

Dear Sir / Madam

Cornwall Site Allocations Development Plan Document (‘DPD’)
Land off Tregenna Lane, Camborne, TR14 7QU

I write on behalf of Merlion Capital Partners (‘Merlion’) in respect of the above, issued for consultation.

Planning officers will recall that on 9 February 2017, an appeal was allowed for the construction of up to 94 residential dwellings and a 60-bed C2 residential care facility on this site. The appeal reference for this was APP/D0840/W/16/3142806, and the planning application reference was PA15/01794. Merlion hold the Tregenna Lane site under option and are progressing the site further towards delivery.

We note with some concern that the draft DPD and supporting documents do not appear to record or acknowledge the existence of this planning permission. I would refer officers to the below documents:

- **Figure CPIR1: CPIR Strategy Map,** page 86 of the draft DPD. This seems intended to identify all major planning permissions (10+ units) but does not identify the Tregenna Lane site. Web reference: [http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748911/cpir-strategy-map.pdf](http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748911/cpir-strategy-map.pdf)

- **Housing evidence, Appendix 1.** This also does not identify the Tregenna Lane permission. Web reference: [http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748790/cpir-housing-evidence-2016-appendix-1.pdf](http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748790/cpir-housing-evidence-2016-appendix-1.pdf)

- **CPIR Town Framework.** This also does not appear to make reference to the Tregenna Lane permission including on Figure 10: Green Infrastructure Strategy which is intended to show permitted housing sites. Web reference: [http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748822/cpir-tf-2017-pages.pdf](http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26748822/cpir-tf-2017-pages.pdf)

Could I ask that you record this letter as an objection to the plan, rectifying the omission of the Tregenna Lane site in any future publications, and keeping me informed as the DPD progresses.

Yours sincerely

Jon Gateley
Associate Director

cc. Peter North, Charles Chamberlain (Merlion)
1. Para 1.2 Does not say how this approach to planning is going to work the magic of economic and social development alongside sustainability. Strong doubts persist as to whether the assertion is correct.

2. Para 1.4 admits that the DPD only addresses ten towns and two eco sites. The majority of Cornwall is still rural despite the best efforts of planners and HMG to extend the concrete jungle as widely as possible.

3. The Minerals SPD gave a very neat summary of the whole plan and made it clear once again that there are only 34,000 jobs planned while 52,000 houses, at a minimum, are also planned. This is not good economic development for Cornwall. The working age population remains more than 30% economically inactive so are unlikely to have the means to buy houses. Meanwhile Coastline allegedly a social housing provider builds new houses while selling off good houses which they have not long ago refurbished in the same village. They are now property developers like the rest. What we really have planned here is overspill again like in the 1950’s and 1960’s to shift population from the over crowded SE to more pleasant areas, particularly those who have accumulated some capital and so can sell a modest dwelling in their current areas, buy a new better one here and bring their health and social care demand with them.

4. Meanwhile the rural areas (apart from those which are being grabbed into the urban areas by extending them) are to all intents abandoned to their own devices despite paying Council Tax at the same rate as urban areas. They are then ripe for gentrification and conversion to satellites of the urban.

5. Meanwhile joining in the neighbourhood plan game exempts places from allocations while alternative delights lie ahead for
them in inspections and referenda, as well as a good deal of labour and expense.

6 Why ever does Bude get a separate allocations DPD?

7 Para 1.8 the neighbourhood plans for parishes seem not to form part of this document?

8 Engagement, as far as I can make out is consultation which can be ignored while consultation, being statutory, is more difficult to ignore.

9 Housing evidence report, how much does this rely on the homechoice register? That has been shown to be a very unreliable measure of housing demand because of duplication and the inclusion on Band E names.

10 It is difficult to believe that a transport strategy has been considered for Truro which is already jammed most of the time and will be in permanent gridlock if several thousand houses are added at Threemilestone how ever much money is collected from developers.

11 Para 2.18 2 Green infrastructure still seems like a series of sticking plasters to offset consumption of hectares upon hectares of green field site. Why is SUDS only urban? Drainage is just as important in rural areas, if not more so.

12 Are the sites I see in Camborne and other places high quality design? If so I would hate to see poor quality design.

13 There is one in Stithians where complex measures have been taken to manage runoff water and within a week of tenants moving in the thing is being seriously excavated having produced a gusher with the first rains.

14 Noted that community engagement is deployed here not consultation, a much lower level of information exchange.

15 Para 2.19.6 who comprises the design review panel, how do they work? Have they issued guidance? Do they charge for their opinions? Is adherence to their recommendations obligatory?

16 Para 13.1 don’t understand the rationale for safeguarding the sites listed. Safeguarding from what? Rampant agriculture? House
building? Why are the sites listed chosen rather than those on the outskirts of Truro, Camborne, Falmouth or Redruth?

17 Making allocations is where the planning process adopted for Cornwall Local plan frays. It would have been better to set out policies, guidelines, principles and parameters for the process. Once you start to identify specific numbers or areas of land the whole thing dissolves into fighting about numbers while the policies, principle and so on get left behind.

18 The biggest failing of the allocations DPD, in common with most of the Cornwall Local Plan is that it has a grossly urban bias with the result that rural areas (in physical terms the largest part of the County) are left behind, flailing to obtain services and support on a grace and favour basis while urban areas such up the resources by right.
**Name:** Jethro Billinger

**Comment:**

I am making a representation on the allocations DPD in the area of Penzance and Newlyn regarding sites pzh4 pzh5 pzh6 pzh7 and pzh8.

I would like to express my objection to the proposed sites up for Plans to build huge numbers of houses around heamoor. Heamoor is a quaint beautiful little village in which I really like living. But now feel if these 719 new houses are erected. It will have a negative effect on our village. My reasons being I would like heamoor to remain a quaint beautiful little village in the countryside. If you were to build in the countryside around heamoor I think this would be a savage attack on the countryside. I believe this is against your own policies. Furthermore we do not have the needed infrastructure to cope with all the extra cars, traffic and space. As it can't cope as it is. I also feel you are destroying the character and identity of heamoor. Also by building on prime agricultural land you are taking away from our food security at a time of uncertainty. Take a look at the heamoor it's beautiful place. Please don't ruin it.

I understand houses need to be built. And i dont object to a few, But why so many around one village. I'm sure there is space and waste land that could be put to better use.
Dear Mr. Wood,

Thank you for your letter of the 20th June informing me about Cornwall Site Allocations Development Plan Document and in which you state that I own land within the development area. To my knowledge this is inaccurate since my family sold any land we possessed in Hayle to Bovis Homes about two years ago. The site is now being built on, phase two.

Yours sincerely

Mr. Lewis Wood
Head of Planning Policy & Partnership
Cornwall Council
TR1 1XU
Name: Beverley Brian

Comment:

I would like to make a representation on the Allocations DPD Penzance & Newlyn.

I object to PZ-H6 Josephs Lane.

I live in XXXXXX and have done for many years. I believe that the above site is unsuitable.

Building on open countryside should not be allowed, the congestion in Josephs Lane is very bad generally but especially during school times. Parking is very difficult for residents with or without driveways and so extra houses and traffic will obviously make the problem far worse. Also to consider is road safety, Josephs Lane is too busy and the proposed site is on a crossroads which seems to me to be a very dangerous idea.

Heamoor is a village and should remain so.
Name: Viv & Julia Matthews

Comment:

Representation on the Allocations DPD

Area = Penzance and Newlyn

Codes = PZ-H4, PZ-H5, PZ-H6, PZ-H7 and PZ-H8.

With reference to the proposed housing plans for Heamoor we wish to lodge our objection.

Whilst we agree there is a need for additional housing to meet Local Needs within the area we are concerned on a number of issues that appear to have been overlooked in identifying sites in and around the Heamoor village. PZ-H4, PZ-H5, PZ-H6, PZ-H7 and PZ-H8.

Cornwall Council has in the planning policy a "Green Infrastructure Strategy". The statement refers to planned network of green spaces and inter-connecting links designed, developed and managed to meet the environmental, social and economic needs of the surrounding area. The proposed development for the Heamoor area has issues on all of these key points:

(https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/green-infrastructure-strategy/)

The impact of increasing housing on a village that has continual problems with flooding at present and a recognised substantial area within the village already highlighted as a high flood risk zone does not in our view meet the above environmental strategy.

The additional traffic the huge housing development will create and nothing in place to relieve or improve the current road chaos that occurs daily throughout the year will also have a tremendous impact of the road infrastructure. This in our view would increase the likelihood of further road traffic accidents. At present cars/buses are constantly parked on the pavement on the road alongside Mounts Bay School causing pedestrians to walk in the road and preventing access for wheelchairs, mobility scooters or prams. Again this is contravening the above policy on environment or social needs.

Stated in the Councils document "A Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cornwall" I quote: "Cornwall stands apart from other areas in the southwest and the country through the sheer number and type of existing green infrastructure assets, which are integral to our heritage, identity and economy". The proposals made for the housing development appear to contravene a number of the statements made in the strategy document.

Your comments to the above would be greatly appreciated.
Name: Lindsey & Peter Torrie

Comment:

We email regarding the proposed building of 720 houses in the Heamoor area.

Whilst we appreciate that there is a need for some new houses, we feel that 720 is far too many. There is no infrastructure to support this many new houses and occupants. There is no employment, the existing roads are already over used and an accident is waiting to happen either on the main road through Heamoor or through Boscathnoe Way & Joseph Lane.

For this many houses to be built, we would need the existing schools to be considerably expanded, a Doctors surgery would be required plus shops, and West Cornwall Hospital would need to be upgraded with full A & E reinstated.

All the proposed sites are on flood plains, so how will this be dealt with, without major and very expensive new drainage systems being installed.

The sites in the area of Polmennor Road & Trannack will never cope with the increase in traffic as this is a single file traffic area due to cars parked, and more houses will only lead to more cars to be parked and increased traffic.

These are all Green field sites, necessary for food production, whether grown, cultivated or farmed, where as there must be other sites in Penzance & surrounding areas that are brown field sites, that should be used for housing purposes first. Such as the old Penwith DC offices.

It is understood that some of the proposed houses are to be Affordable, however the rate of wages in this area still makes these properties too expensive for local people to buy. Would it not make sense to have most of these available for locals to rent, via Housing Associations. It is also essential that these should be for locals, so that our locals can rent/buy and remain in the area where wish to live but can't find anywhere.