

**CORNWALL SITE ALLOCATIONS
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT
EXAMINATION**

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS TO CORNWALL COUNCIL
FROM THE APPOINTED INSPECTORS**

Introduction

1. This note follows our Initial Questions (INSP.S2, Q9-15) and the Council's response (CC.S3 and annexes). It is also referred to in the CSADPD Guidance (INSP.S3).
2. The following additional questions are to clarify our understanding of the CSADPD and the evidence behind it, chiefly in relation to housing supply and delivery. They also aim to ensure that associated evidence is available in a consolidated and accessible form.
3. Responses to these questions should be returned by **29 December 2017** in order to allow Representatives sufficient time to consider them in advance of the Examination Hearings.

Main Modifications

4. As already indicated ***the Council is asked to maintain a single, up to date list of all modifications that it proposes making to the CSADPD, including some potential Main Modifications (MMs) referenced below. This should be placed on the Examination Website.***

CC Response

A Statement of Modifications has been prepared, ready to be uploaded on the examination page on the website, which is set out in Appendix 1.

Note: the modifications reflect agreed and signed Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with Highways England and Historic England, which are both appended (Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 respectively)

Further note: the same but unsigned Highways England SoCG was previously appended to the Council's response to previous Inspectors questions INSP.S2).

5. Any proposed MMs will be considered during the Examination alongside the CSADPD as submitted.

Q16 - Definition of the designation 'Direction of Growth'.

6. The description of sites allocated as Future Directions of Growth in the CSADPD varies: allocation H-D1, for example, specifies that 'the site should not be delivered until after the plan period', compared to LAU-

H2, which is 'not anticipated to come forward until after the plan period'.

7. The Council responded to Q9 of INSP.S2 on this matter (CC.S3), indicating its willingness to include a single definition for the Future Directions of Growth, to be included with the introductory sections of the SADPD. ***We consider this should be put forward as MM for clarity and effectiveness.***

CC Response

There are four future directions of growth: HD1 in Hayle, FP-M4 in Falmouth/Penryn, and LAU-H2 and LAU-E1 in Launceston. A single definition is proposed below; which is followed by some explanatory text (for the inspectors) regarding some of the specific circumstances in relation to each site explaining why there are subtle difference in how each site is referred to in the SADPD.

A single definition is proposed to be included on page 1 as a new paragraph 1.5 as follows : '1.5 **Future directions of growth are allocated sites which are not required to meet the levels of development within the Plan period, as set out in the Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Polices document. They are however allocated to highlight the longer term strategy for a town, in terms of clarifying certain aspects of provision around strategic infrastructure, and/or, to provide an element of certainty around place making and masterplanning for site allocations needed in this Plan period.**'

Existing paragraphs 1.5 to 1.9 to be amended to 1.6 through to 1.10.

It is acknowledged that there are some subtle differences in relation to how each of the four directions of growth are referred to in the SADPD, which was deliberate. The reasons for this are as follows:

HD1 Barview in Hayle: the landowner of this site, while initially indicating this site would be available for development, subsequently indicated that the site is not available in the short to medium term. Furthermore, there is a reference within criteria c) that the site should not be brought forward until the new A30 junction has been delivered – this is to reflect the pressure that the site could have on the highway network without a new junction.

FP-M4 Treliever in Fal/Penryn: this site is not required for university related uses within the Plan period, but adjoins FP-M3 which is required, and forms a logical extension for anticipated requirements after 2030. However, due to its importance, the Council wants to maximise the opportunity to deliver the Treliever site (FP-M3), so it wants to allow FP-M4 to come forward within the Plan period IF it is demonstrated that it will make a positive contribution to the delivery of FP-M3. (This is reflected in Policy FP-M4 (b); although it should be noted that the reference to Treliever (FP-M3) was incorrect (i.e. it

indicates incorrectly FP-M2), so a change to the reference forms part of the Council's Schedule of Changes, which is appended)

LAU-H2 Hurdon Road: this is a relatively large area that together with three other allocations, form a relatively significant southern expansion to Launceston. A key element of the southern expansion and the long term strategy is the provision of a Southern Loop Road (SLR) which will enable better movement and permeability for existing and future residents, which is set out in the Launceston Transportation Strategy. While the completion of the entire road is not required for highway capacity reasons to deliver the LPSP level of growth, elements of the SLR will need to be delivered (through LAU-H1 and LAU-E2) within the Plan period. This means it is important to understand the capacity that the road has to provide for in its entirety, to ensure that the early delivery of parts of the road are future proofed. There is an aspiration amongst the local elected members for the road to be brought forward in its entirety early; if this were the case, it would promote development on the site (LAU-H2) to support its delivery; for this reason the term 'anticipated' was used within policy LAU-H2 criteria (a).

LAU-E1 Landlake Road: this site is identified for employment use as it is relatively flat and adjoins an existing employment area. The topography in and around Launceston is such that the landscape has few sites level enough to support larger footprint buildings; this is one reason why the site has been identified now even though it is not required in the plan period. It will also include and deliver an element of the proposed southern loop road, discussed under LAU-H2 above. Furthermore the landowner has indicated the preference that it be brought forward for employment use beyond the current plan period, while making the adjoining site LAU-E2 Badash available for employment use within this plan period.

Q17 - Distribution of development and rate of delivery compared to LPSP strategy

8. In response to INSP.S2, Q11, the Council explains that the anticipated site allocation delivery trajectories are set out in a spreadsheet supporting the Council's Monitoring Report for the year ending 31 March 2017.
9. We note that, within that spreadsheet, several CSADPD site allocation references appear to be absent or incorrect, and that only a proportion of overall site allocation housing numbers are forecast to be delivered within the CSADPD period.
10. In response to INSP.S2, Q12, the Council explains that the latest housing permissions and delivery data, dated 1 April 2017, is contained in the 'Updated Housing Delivery Data' worksheet of the

'Overall Comments' spreadsheet of comments received during the CSADPD consultation period.

11. In response to INSP.S2, Q14, the Council has set out, including in annex 6 to CC.S3, the site specific characteristics which have informed the level of residential density forecast for different site allocations.
12. ***In the light of the above, the Council is requested to produce one table which sets out the following, by town:***
 - (i) the most recent housing supply evidence compared to LPSP targets,***
 - (ii) the total housing allocation figure for each relevant CSADPD allocation,***
 - (iii) the anticipated housing delivery trajectory over the CSADPD period for each allocation, and***
 - (iv) any factors which have informed (ii) and (iii) above.***

Council Response

The Council has provided the information which is available in Appendix 4. Table A(ii) within Appendix 4 sets out the summary position with regard to delivery for the towns contained within the Allocations DPD (as at 1/4/17), which represents the most up-to-date position. Tables 1 through to 11 in Appendix 4 go on to provide the detail for each town/community covered by the Allocations DPD, including: Trajectory information that is published on the Council's website; Commentary on how the housing targets for each site were calculated; as well as some commentary on delivery. The data in Appendix 4 should be used as the most up-to-date information (i.e. as at 1/4/17).

Q18 - Clarifying the existing housing supply figures

13. In the 'Updated Housing Delivery Data' worksheet of the Council's 'Overall Comments' spreadsheet of comments received during the CSADPD consultation period, the terms 'net' and 'gross' housing do not appear to be defined. Anticipated 'windfall' housing delivery figures within that worksheet are not consistent with those set out in LPSP Table 1 'Apportionment of Local Plan Housing Provision (as at 31st March 2016)'.
The Council is asked to clarify the terms 'net' and 'gross', as set out above, and indicate what evidence supports the revised windfall allowance now predicted to arise compared to that forecast in the LPSP.

Council Response

The terms 'net' and 'gross' are referred to within the tables set out in Appendix 4. The definitions of these terms are as follows:

- 'gross' relates to the total quantum of development identified from the source of delivery in question (e.g. permissions, SHLAA etc), regardless of whether it will be delivered within the Plan period; and

- 'net' relates to the quantum of development that is considered will come forward within the Plan period

Furthermore, the methodology used to get from 'gross' to 'net' figures differs depending upon the source of delivery in question. As a result the methodology for each is set out below:

- Permissions Under 10: The Gross figure relates to all extant permissions; the Net figure is the gross figure discounted by 10% to reflect a general estimated level of non-delivery based upon past trends;
- Permissions Over 10: The Gross figure relates to all extent permissions; the Net figure:
 - excludes any permissions that are extant but are known to not be coming forward; and
 - excludes any proportion of a scheme that is projected to come forward beyond the Plan period (as set out in the Trajectory);
- Urban SHLAA: The Gross figure represents all SHLAA sites within the urban area that was deemed potentially appropriate for housing development (as set out in the relevant town based Housing Evidence documents that were submitted); the net figure is the gross figure discounted by 30% to reflect a general estimate of non-delivery within the Plan period
- Allocations: The gross figure represents the total number of dwellings contained within the site allocations policies; the net figure represents the number of dwellings that are anticipated to be delivered within the Plan period (as set out in the Trajectory)

Windfall

The reason for the change in Windfall between the 1/4/16 and 1/4/17 summary tables is because Windfall was only included for the final 10 years of the Plan period, but the Council also excluded Windfall from its 5 year supply to ensure there was no double counting with extant permissions. As a result, with the 5 year supply period eating into the final 10 years of the Plan period, it means each year the level of windfall reduces by a pro-rata proportion (in the case of 1/4/16 to 1/4/17, it has been reduced by one-ninth, reflecting one year's worth of Windfall). Therefore each year when the trajectory is published, delivery over the next five years is made up from extant planning permissions on small sites and the yield in year six to the end of the Plan period is made up of windfall on small sites.

Q19 - CSADPD provision for retail

15. In responding to INSP.S2, Q12, the Council explain that 'no targets have been set within the LPSP regarding the delivery of retail floorspace'. We note, with regard to LPSP Policy 4 'Shopping, Services and Community Facilities' that supporting Table 2 sets out 'Local Plan Retail Floorspace Capacity Requirements 2010-2030' (*our emphasis*).

16. ***The Council is asked to clarify its response to INSP.S2, Q12, with reference to Table 2 supporting LPSP Policy 4 with respect to the use of the term 'requirement' against the evidence that the CSADPD need not make any retail allocations.***

CC Response

The Council acknowledges it was inaccurate in its response to the inspector's earlier question 12 in note INSP.S2, in stating that no targets have been set within the LPSP regarding the delivery of retail floorspace within the Plan period. The following clarifies the explanation as to the approach to retail in the SADPD:

Each town section seeks to ensure that an appropriate response to future retail floorspace capacity targets is provided, in accordance with Policy 4 of the LP:SP. In most towns retail allocations are not required, due to either no capacity requirement within the Plan period, or, a very small capacity towards the latter part of the plan period. (The Inspector to the Local Plan agreed with this assertion in his final report). The Council proposes a modification to the text of the SADPD on page 8, to further clarify this if the Inspector agrees as follows; new para 2.17:

'2.17 In accordance with Policy 4 of the Cornwall Local Plan, Retail Evidence Base Reports have indicated that retail allocations in most towns are not required within the Plan period due to either 'no' capacity requirements within the Plan period, or, relatively low capacity requirements, later in the Plan period when retail capacity estimates are more uncertain. Where sites including retail uses are allocated, within Penzance & Newlyn, Redruth, Newquay and St Austell, the reasoning for each allocation is set out within each retail strategy section of the relevant town. The Retail Evidence Base Reports can be viewed on the Councils website. The Council will continue to review retail requirements and will allocate land, as part of future reviews of the Allocations DPD, if it is appropriate to do so.

Existing para 2.17 to 2.19.6 to be amended to 2.18 through to 2.19.7.

The reason for the allocations for A1 uses, in part or in full, in Penzance & Newlyn, CPIR (Redruth), Newquay and St Austell is because in each instance the sites in question is within the town centre and was felt that their allocation and delivery would offer the opportunity to improve the vitality of their centres.

In line with Policy 4 of the LPSP document, Appendix 5 provides an update on the more significant (e.g. over 100sqm) planning permissions granted / expired / superseded since the GVA Retail Study Update, to give an indication of their impact on the retail requirements sets out in Table 2 of the LPSP. This review should only be considered as a general guide, because retail assessments and their subsequent sqm requirements for a town are sensitive to many different factors (e.g.

the economy, permissions in other towns, retail trends, turnover of different types of store, etc)

Table 2 of the LPSP and the review set out in Appendix 5 shows that most requirements are only generated later in the Plan period and even at this time they are generally very modest. Due to the lack of available town centre sites and that retail assessments/ requirements are very sensitive to various factors (e.g. the economy, permissions in other towns, retail trends, etc), it was decided that the Council should review requirements in future years, as part of the review of the SADPD, rather than allocate out of town sites at this stage (which could result in overproviding retail space and having a detrimental impact upon the town centre); an approach advocated in the Cornwall Retail Study Update. As a result, the Council considers that any allocating of out of town sites, should be delayed until a time when any, more significant, requirement can be substantiated; in the meantime the Council's approach supports the aspiration to protect / enhance the existing town centres, in line with the NPPF and LPSP Policy 4.

The Council considers that further modifications within each town section regarding retail is not required, as the existing retail strategy text (within each town section) clarifies why no allocations are required in relation to capacity requirements, or if an allocation is identified, why. Furthermore, the text in the retail strategy sections reflect the position within the Retail Study Update, which still represents the most accurate and reliable position regarding retail requirements for each of the towns.

The following are relevant excerpts from the SADPD:

Penzance: page 22, para 3.36 states that there is '*capacity for approximately 820sqm of new convenience floorspace and 580sqm of comparison floorspace, up to 2030*', and para 3.37 identifies the Harbour Car Park as a mixed allocation site to include some retail uses that will link with town centre.

Hayle: page 63, para 4.28 indicates limited capacity for convenience and comparison floorspace and that permission has been granted for over 24,000sqm. Para 4.29 states that '*there is no capacity for further retail development within the Plan period, so there are no retail based allocations.*' (it should be noted that the retail study concluded that the large amount of permitted floorspace at Hayle also reduced capacity in Penzance and CPIR).

CPIR: page 89, para 5.26 states that there is '*the capacity to deliver approximately 650sqm of convenience floorspace and 3,348sqm of comparison floorspace up to 2030*' with the capacity not coming to fruition until the end of the plan period, years 2025 - 2030. Fairmeadow CPIR-R1 is allocated in Redruth, while a site in Camborne is highlighted which will be considered in future reviews.

Helston: Page 114, para 6.25 states that *'there is still limited capacity to deliver further retail space; 869sqm of convenience floorspace and 721sqm of comparison retail floorspace within the Plan period. Furthermore, this capacity would not be generated until close to the end of the Plan period. With a lack of deliverable town centre sites at the current time, together with no capacity within the short to medium term, no retail allocations have been identified. However the retail capacity of the town and the availability of town centre or edge of centre sites will continue to be reviewed.'*

Falmouth & Penryn: Page 136, para 7.31 states that *'there is no capacity to deliver further convenience floorspace within the Plan period; whilst there is only capacity for approximately 300sqm of Comparison floorspace, generated at the end of the Plan period'* and at para 7.32 that *'there is not a requirement to allocate sites for retail development'*

Newquay: Page 174, para 8.25 states that *'as a result of various unimplemented permissions there was no further capacity for retail floorspace within the Plan period. As a result, there are no retail focused allocations for Newquay'*, Para 8.26 then explains the qualitative reasons for allocation NQ-M1 Station Quarter as a mixed use site, which could include retail uses.

St Austell: page 198, para 9.37 clarifies that there is no capacity (quantitatively) to deliver further retail within the plan period. Para 9.38 then sets out the qualitative and regeneration reasons for allocating STA-R1 Old Vicarage Place as a town centre redevelopment site.

Eco-communities: Page 219, para 10.16 sets out the context for any retail uses (in what will be a new community) in that *'Any retail within the Eco-community sites should be proportionate to the scale of the development being provided, in doing so delivering facilities and services that are only seeking to provide for the residents of the eco-community sites and complement the (St Austell) town centre offer.'*

Bodmin: Page 233, para 11.25 states the following *'The Cornwall Retail Study Update (2015) indicates there is no capacity requirement for further convenience floorspace, whilst there is the capacity to deliver approximately 1,400sqm of comparison floorspace near to the end of the Plan period'*. Two sites are then referenced in the text (Dennison Road & Fore Street Car Parks) that are not allocated due to uncertainties over delivery, but as para 11.29 states would *'represent a good opportunity to strengthen the town centre offer.'*

Launceston: Page 256, para 12.26 states that *'there would be capacity for approximately 2,000sqm of convenience floorspace and 2,200sqm of comparison floorspace between 2015 and 2030; although the study indicates that capacity is very limited for the next 5 to 10 years'*. Para 12.27 then states the following: *'The lack of available larger sites within or on the edge of the town centre, together with the timeframe*

when the additional retail capacity is estimated to come to fruition, means there is not the intention to allocate any sites for retail development at the current time; however this position will be monitored'.

Saltash: *Page 281, para 13.17 states the following: 'there is capacity to deliver 1,012sqm of convenience floorspace and 954sqm of comparison space between 2015 and 2030¹. With the relatively modest capacity figures, combined with the fact that the study indicates that the vast majority of the capacity not materialising until the last 5-6 years of the Plan period, it is not felt necessary to allocate land for retail growth at Saltash.'*

As with other types of development, the Council will monitor the delivery of retail commitments and completions annually, and if necessary will intervene during future reviews of the SADPD to allocate retail sites if evidence clearly demonstrates there is a substantive requirement within the plan period, and the Council is confident that requirement will come to fruition.

Brian Sims

Lead Inspector

8 December 2017

Thomas Bristow

Inspector

¹ Cornwall Retail Study Update 2015. Figures represent net sales area