



INSP.S4 Matter 2 Penzance & Newlyn Spatial Strategy & Allocations

Cornwall Council Position Statement

02 February 2018

a. Is the strategy for Penzance consistent with the LPSP?

Yes, the Site Allocations DPD (SADPD) was developed over a period of time, which both supported the production of the LPSP and the strategy for Penzance & Newlyn, as well as the SADPD responding to the final LPSP. The following table highlights key elements of the CNA objectives within the Cornwall Local Plan Community Network Area sections, together with comments on how the SADPD strategy and policies compliment them.

LPSP CNA Objectives (Summary of key points)	Comments
Objective 1 – Housing Meet the local housing needs	SADPD identifies various sites that will deliver the LPSP housing target
Objective 2 – Economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broaden/diversify local economy; • promoting opportunities and employment prospects within the marine/rural economies; • Developing Penzance as West Cornwall’s retail centre, tourism hub and strategy for harbours/waterfront of Penzance-Newlyn 	SADPD has safeguarded the largest industrial estate, whilst identifying various other sites that could deliver commercial growth. The range of sites includes those with easy access to the A30, through to sites adjacent to the Newlyn harbour, to support marine industries. The Economic Growth section for Penzance is also aligned with the ambitions set out in the LPSP.
Objective 3 – Travel Manage traffic impacts, to support/develop more sustainable travel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support the long-term future of mainline rail network • provision of air/sea routes to Isles of Scilly and public transport provision in far west 	SADPD transportation strategy for Penzance & Newlyn will manage traffic impacts from growth, plus this has a focus on sustainable transport. The Harbour Car Park (PZ-M1) policy recognises the importance of the site as an interchange for both bus/rail. The SADPD doesn’t put forward proposals that could have a detrimental impact on the link to Isles of Scilly, plus is discussed within the strategy text (endorsed by the Isles of Scilly Council)
Objective 4 – Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate levels of strategic and social infrastructure delivered • maintaining current level of hospital provision; • minimising vulnerability of key infrastructure to flooding 	SADPD sets out proposals for the improvement of the area’s infrastructure to support growth, as well as improve the existing situation. When identifying sites for development, flood risk formed a key element of the consideration. The GI strategy and site policies discuss the importance of appropriate SUDS schemes being implemented, which could both address new development

	and have a positive impact down stream
<p>Objective 5 – Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure development is sensitive to outstanding natural/built/historic environment of the area including AONB..... • Maintain separate identities between Penzance, Newlyn, Heamoor, Gulval and Longrock 	<p>Housing and Employment Evidence base documents demonstrate the Council has undertaken an extensive assessment process to identify sites that are both deliverable and minimise impacts on designated assets, etc. The process involved firstly looking for appropriate sites within the existing urban area, before considering greenfield sites. Furthermore, the Council ensured the site allocations don't join up communities (any more than they currently are) so that their separate identities can be maintained</p>

b. Is the existing housing land supply situation based on robust, up to date evidence?

Yes. Updated information (as at 1/4/17) was provided and summarised within the response to the Inspectors' questions (INSP.S6) – set out in the Council response CC.S4 and detailed in CC.S4.4.

c. Is the approach to the selection of sites for allocation consistent with Strategy, including with respect to the use of previously developed(brownfield) and greenfield(agricultural) land?

Yes. As set out in the Penzance Housing evidence document (D15.1), the Council first sought to identify appropriate sites within the existing urban area to satisfy the growth targets within the LPSP. Only when this search was exhausted did the Council seek to allocate greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement. The Council didn't consider it necessary to allocate many of the sites identified within the urban area because they were either very small and/or policies within the LPSP provided sufficient support to enable delivery.

There are various allocations that support other elements of the strategy:

- PZ-E3: supports marine employment ambitions
- PZ-M1/PZ-M2: supports aspirations to improve the vibrancy of the town centre

The size of many allocations, in comparison to other towns in the SADPD, demonstrates the work that the Council undertook to ensure it minimised impacts on designated assets, reflected in the Penzance Housing Evidence Document (D15.1), Heritage Impact Assessments (D3), etc; which is summarised within the Sustainability Appraisal work conducted through the development of the SADPD.

It is recognised that some of the sites are on Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land. However, all land surrounding the conurbation is characterised by an amalgamation of Grades 1, 2 and 3, so whichever land is chosen to deliver the LPSP targets, it will take at least some Grades 2 and 3 land. This was reflected within the assessments undertaken to select sites, summarised within the SA, and on balance the benefits that the sites offered outweighed the small loss of agricultural land, compared with the total quantum within Cornwall.

d. Will the site allocations achieve the vision and aims for Penzance as set out in paragraph 3.6 of the CSADPD, with particular regard to maintaining the character of different areas?

Yes. The Council was careful in selecting sites that didn't merge a neighbourhood/community with an adjoining village/community. For example, the Trannack allocation (PZ-H4) was drawn away from Gulval, to ensure a green buffer was maintained.

It is recognised that a number of sites are being allocated in/around Heamoor; however the growth of Heamoor does not necessarily result in the loss of identity. Its growth will offer the opportunity to maintain/enhance the facilities within Heamoor, which will help to increase its sustainability and in turn its separate identity.

e. Will mixed use allocations PZ-M1, PZ-M2 and PZ-M3 effectively support the vitality of the town centre?

Yes. The sites, particularly PZ-M1/PZ-M2, will provide a range of uses that will increase the number of employees/visitors that come to the town centre. Furthermore, PZ-M1 sits within the town centre boundary, whilst PZ-M2 and PZ-M3 are not seeking A1 uses, so that demand is directed to PZ-M1 or vacant premises within the remainder of the town centre.

All 3 sites are located on the path of the proposed Mounts Bay walking & cycling route (discussed in the SADPD's Transportation and GI Strategies); this is proposed to bring more visitors into the area and the allocations create the opportunity for stopping points, enabling visitors to go into the town centre, which will again help to increase footfall.

f. Does the Plan make effective provision to safeguard the Marazion Marsh Special Protection Area and other protected habitats?

The HRA (D2) considered impacts of development on Marazion Marsh SPA and other protected habitats. It concluded that all but two of the allocations

were of a distance from the SPA that they were unlikely to have any significant effects on interested features.

With regard to the two allocations immediately adjacent to Marazion Marsh (PZ-H1/PZ-E4), the HRA concluded that '*No direct habitat loss will occur*' and '*There will be no loss of supporting/buffering habitat or fragmentation as a result of the allocation*'. The HRA goes on to recommend various measures to minimise any impacts, which are reflected within the site allocation policies, relating to construction, water quality and vehicular access.

Finally, the SA (D5/D5.10) reflects the outcomes from the HRA and the Council concluded that any residual effects were outweighed by the positive benefits that would arise from delivery of the allocations.

g. Are the individual allocated sites and proposed land uses suitable, having regard to planning and environmental constraints?

The Penzance Housing Evidence document (D15.1) sets out the assessments undertaken to identify sites to allocate; this was supplemented by various other assessments, such as the HRA (D2), SFRA (D4), etc. These assessments considered all main planning and environmental constraints, in doing so enabling the Council to rule out land that would be inappropriate for development.

The SFRA (D4), prepared in consultation with the Environment Agency, demonstrates that the uses are compatible with the flood zone for the site in question. The HRA (D2) considered the impact of the sites on designated assets and appropriate mitigation has been identified and reflected within the relevant policies.

The allocations were subject to a HIA (D3), which was prepared in close consultation with Historic England. This concluded that the sites, with the proposed mitigation measures within the allocation policies, ensured impacts were less than substantial, and that any remaining impacts were managed to an acceptable level, when balanced against the benefits of bringing the sites forward for the proposed development. (Discussed further in response to questions i and j.)

Finally, the Sustainability Appraisal summarises the impact of sites on the various different planning and environmental constraints and on balance the Council felt that the benefits outweighed any residual impacts.

h. Is there robust evidence to demonstrate that allocations and infrastructure would be delivered at a sufficient rate and suitable timescale to meet the minimum numerical development requirements for the town, including with reference to the five year housing land supply required by the NPPF?

Firstly, the housing apportionment for Penzance & Newlyn is not a minimum; the inspector for the LPSP examination, in his report dated 23/9/16, regarding the distribution of housing numbers, indicated:

*"139. I conclude under issue 5 below that a change is required to ensure that the overall housing requirement is regarded as a minimum. **However, it is not necessary to similarly indicate that all the apportionments for each town and CNA residuals should be minimum figures. The basis for the apportionments is not an exact science and some flexibility in delivery is reasonable.** (part of MM17)"*

In answering inspectors questions INSP.S6, the Council provided updated statistics regarding its housing supply position (set out in Table A(ii) of the Council's response - CC.S4.4). An extract is set out below, which shows the various sources of delivery could provide 2,250 dwellings (net), which represents 105% of the area's housing apportionment.

Area	Local Plan Target	Delivery TOTAL		Delivery against Target	
		Gross	Net	Gross Delivery against Target	Net Delivery against Target
a	b	o	p	q	r
Penzance & Newlyn	2,150	2,267	2,250	105%	105%

In addition to these sources, it is recognised that there are other recently developed proposals, which could deliver further housing:

- St Clare allocation (PZ-H9): Recent permission granted for part of the site to deliver 127 dwellings (3 short of the policy level); however 2hectares of the allocation falls outside of the permitted scheme, which could deliver a further 40-50 dwellings
- Plans are being progressed by local members to deliver town centre regeneration projects, which includes additional housing
- Emerging housing monitoring work indicates that by Nov-17, 37 dwellings had been permitted on small sites, which is already above the average annual Windfall allowance, with one-third of the year still to go

With regard to delivery of sites:

- Long Rock (PZ-H1): Developer preparing an application; anticipated to be submitted in 2018
- Trannack (PZ-H4): Landowner prepared outline masterplan and access arrangements. They have secured a development partner to bring forward a scheme; initial contact between the team and the Council undertaken

- Heamoor (PZ-H8): Main land owner approached by various developers seeking to secure an option; owner waiting on outcome of examination before proceeding
- St Clare (PZ-H9): Permission granted, developer on site
- Coinagehall (PZ-M2): Council owned and working with preferred developer

As a result, there is sufficient identified supply of sites to ensure the LPSP housing apportionment for Penzance & Newlyn is met, plus support the Council's 5-year supply.

With regard to infrastructure delivery, the Council's response to the inspectors questions INSP.S2, provided an update on some core elements of infrastructure provision (including Transportation: CC.S3.1; Education: CC.S3.3). Other updates include:

- Feasibility study undertaken by the Council to enable expansion of Heamoor School
- Outline designs prepared for the upgrade of junctions along the A30; the Council plans to support deliver by seeking grant funding to support delivery
- Core element of the ped-cycle strategy, the Mounts Bay cycle route, is being developed by the Council; plus options for improving ped-cycle links between Branwell and the town centre are being developed by the Council
- Development of healthcare centre at St Clare is under construction
- Council started to deliver the One Public Transport System for Cornwall project (OPTSC); over £50m of funding secured, with further bids in progress. Improvement of key bus corridors has begun, including Penzance to St Ives/CPIR; plus improved waiting facilities, RTPI, contactless payment, etc.
- Improvements to Penzance railway station are on-going, with sleeper lounges due to be completed by Mar-18
- Half-hourly mainline rail service in place in 2018
- Funding secured to deliver flood protection measures along parts of the Penzance/Long Rock coastline

i. Do allocations PZ-H1 and PZ-H4 make effective provision for the preservation of the setting of Grade I Listed St Michael's Mount, in accordance with national policy?

Yes. The Council considered the relationship of the land at Long Rock (PZ-H1/PZ-E4) with the Grade I Listed St Michael's Mount and assessed the potential for impacts arising from development of the land on the assets setting.

In consultation with the Council's Heritage officer and Historic England, the Council's HIA concluded that in light of distance, topography, low lying level and location of the sites, existing vegetation, and the rising landscape to the north behind the sites, that there was very limited potential for any impact from development of the sites as proposed. This work was further reviewed and updated in 2016 concluding that views of and from the Mount would not be impacted by appropriate development of the allocations.

In light of the Council's HIA concluding minimal potential for impacts on the Grade I Heritage asset (supported by Historic England); and that higher level policy (within the LPSP policy 24) requires development proposals to be informed/ guided by appropriate assessments of potential impacts on heritage assets; the Council has not included specific wording within the allocation policy to specifically address the relationship between the land and the asset. However, if the Inspector is so minded, the Council would be prepared to include additional wording within the policy referring to a requirement that any development of the land is informed/guided by an HIA that reviews the relationship and setting of the Grade I St Michael's Mount with the land and future development of the site allocation.

j. Does allocation PZ-H8 make effective provision for the preservation of the setting of Grade II* Listed Trengwainton, in accordance with national policy?

Yes. In considering land at Heamoor, the Council gave substantial consideration to the relationship between the land and the Grade II* Listed Trengwainton, undertaking a range of historic assessments following the guidance published by Historic England, as well as taking into consideration the documents the National Trust shared with the Council. The Council engaged proactively with Historic England's officers, including its Registered Parks and Gardens Inspector throughout, to ensure that it maintained an appropriate/robust approach to all five stages of the process, and in finally agreeing with them that the assessment is a robust historic environment evidence base. Specific regard was given to the setting of the historic asset and any potential for impacts that might arise from allocating PZ-H8. Within the assessments particular attention was given to the viewing terrace at Trengwainton and any potential for impacts that might arise on its 'designed view'.

These assessments identified the potential for impacts on the setting of the historic asset being less than substantial harm. In doing so the assessments identified the need for specific mitigation to minimise any potential impacts on Trengwainton. These relate to securing a parcel of land within the site as

public open space with no built development within it; specific measure for planting/screening and controlling street lighting at the main access at Roscadghill, and along Boscathnoe Lane. This will appropriately protect the designed view from the terrace and the wider screening of the land from the approaches to the asset along Boscathnoe lane.

The policy wording for PZ-H8 identifies these main requirements, and also that any future masterplanning of the land is guided by the historic assessments produced by both Cornwall Council and by consultants on behalf of the National Trust. Furthermore, the Council has accepted additional changes to the policy wording suggested by Historic England in their Regulation 20 representations, to ensure appropriate protection and mitigation of the Trengwainton heritage asset (agreement to these changes are set out in the Schedule of Modifications (CC.S4.1: AM12)). By accepting these suggested amendments, Historic England have confirmed in their statement of common ground with the Council (ref: CC.S4.3) that they do not raise any objections to the Councils historic environment evidence base or to the allocation of the land.

Finally, the HIA for Heamoor considered potential for enhancement (Step 4 of the HIA (D3.3)) identified opportunities for interpretation to be provided within the proposed green space, so residents/visitors could better appreciate Trengwainton and other assets within its wider landscape.

k. Is there robust evidence that allocation PZ-H12 could deliver a level of affordable housing exceeding that indicated by LPSP Policy 8 - 'Affordable Housing', as prescribed in the additional Policy Requirements?

The viability assessments undertaken for the LPSP to support the identification of appropriate levels of affordable housing were based upon average sales values/build costs for each community. Within Penzance & Newlyn the average sales prices utilised within the model were: £200,000 for 3-bed detached houses; £220,000 for 4-bed detached houses; and £290,000 for 5-bed detached houses (these property types are prevalent surrounding the Gurnick site). Whilst this represents the best estimate at the current time for almost all allocations, it is recognised that PZ-H12 is located within an area where sales values are significantly higher than these averages. For example, sales values achieved on adjoining roads (Lower Gurnick Road/Restormel Road):

- 3 bed-detached: £295,900
- 4 bed-detached: £345,000

- 5 bed-detached: £373,750¹

With anticipated sales values significantly above the averages used to calculate the affordable housing percentages for Penzance & Newlyn², the Council prepared an outline viability assessment for the Gurnick site, utilising localised sales values. This work indicated approximately 35%-40% affordable housing could be achieved.

¹ Values from Rightmove website

² Sales values came from the Viability Study Refresh – Report to Cornwall Council – Three Dragons (March 2015)