

**CORNWALL SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT
EXAMINATION
Hearing Session**

Thursday 22 March 2018
Penventon Hotel, Redruth (TR15 3AD)

10.00 am

Presiding Inspector: T Bristow

Matter 3 –Hayle Spatial Strategy and Allocations

Participants:

Cornwall Council (CC)

Montgomery Property Group (MPG)[167](Business Local Services Ltd.)

Progress Land Ltd. (PL)[261](Roy Curnow Planning)

AGENDA

Notes

- i This agenda is provisional and flexible.*
- ii Participants, including the Council, named in [italic square brackets] may be invited to open the item concerned, but this is optional.*
- iii It is not intended to repeat introductory matters covered in the Guidance Notes (INSP.S3-4) or in earlier hearing sessions but to proceed as quickly as possible to the substance of the Agenda.*
- iv As indicated in previous guidance, there will be no discussion of specific alternative or omission sites promoted by Representors.*
- v Participants should note that several documents have been published by the Council since the first week of hearings (available on the examination website).*

General issues

- a. Is the Strategy for Hayle consistent with the LPSP?

(N.B. clarification on level of development proposed relative to LPSP targets)

- i. Allocation H-E2, St Erth, falls within the West Penwith CNA rather than the Hayle and St Ives CNA. Is there appropriate evidence to justify that the development proposed via that allocation should be attributed to Hayle? [CC]*
- ii. How does the proposed delivery of employment space at allocation H-E3, Hayle Harbour, relate to existing consents and the Cornwall Marine Enterprise Zone?[MPG]*

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

(N.B. refer to examination documents CC.S4.4 and F.12)

- i. Is the anticipated yield of the Hayle Harbour redevelopment proposal appropriately evidenced?¹
- c. Is the approach to the selection of sites for allocation consistent with the CSADPD and LPSP strategy?
 - i. Is there a conflict between CSADPD objective 1, which relates to encouraging regeneration, with allocating sites outside the existing built form of the town?²
 - ii. Would the urban focus of allocations around Hayle conflict with LPSP objective 1, i.e. to promote the delivery of new employment in towns and rural areas?
 - iii. Does the absence of retail-focussed allocations conflict with the CSADPD objective of improving retail provision?*[MPG]*

Issues relating to individual sites

- d. Are the individual allocations and proposed land uses suitable, having regard to planning and environmental constraints?
 - i. Is the CSADPD supported by appropriate evidence related to the deliverability of sites with regard to the historic, landscape character or environmental sensitivity of designated areas?
 - ii. Would allocated site H-E2, St Erth, give rise to unacceptable traffic levels?³
 - iii. Would allocated site H-UE1, Trevassack, give rise to unacceptable traffic levels?*[PL]*
 - iv. Are criteria (c)(h) and (k) of allocation H-UE1 sufficiently clear to ensure effectiveness? *[PL, in respect of criterion (c)]*
- e. Is there robust evidence that the allocated sites and infrastructure, including the future direction of growth H-D1, Barview, will be delivered at a sufficient rate and to a suitable timescale to ensure that the minimum numerical development requirements of the Town Strategy and of the LPSP will be met, including with reference to the five year housing land supply required by national policy?
 - i. Is there a sound rationale for including allocation H-D1?⁴
- f. Any other issues not addressed above.
 - i. Is the green buffer adjacent to the Melleanear Stream, as referred to in CSADPD paragraph 4.58, reflected in Figure H3?
 - ii. Are references to neighbourhood plans in site allocation criteria (H-E2 and H-HS1) and to the requirement for a masterplan in respect of H-EM1, necessary?
 - iii. Review of Main Modifications proposed via examination document CC.S4.1.1, version 2, published 9 March 2018.

¹ Raised by Representor 139a (with regard to revisions to original consents and forecast levels of density).

² Raised by Representor 233, in particular.

³ Raised by Representor 73b.

⁴ Noting in particular the representation by Representor 31 related to land ownership.