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REPORT ON OBJECTIONS LODGED AT VARIOUS STAGES TO THE CARADON LOCAL PLAN – FIRST ALTERATION

1. As you know, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to adjudicate on all the duly-made objections to the Caradon Local Plan – First Alteration. The Secretary of State also appointed Dr David Robins BA PhD FRPTI as Assistant Inspector to hear the representations made by Mr Christopher Jarvis concerning his land at Hatt and on Policy EM4: Craft Homes. I agree with Dr Robins’ conclusions and recommendations.

2. On Tuesday 31\textsuperscript{st} October 2006 I opened a public local inquiry in the Public Hall, 3 West Street, Liskeard, Cornwall. Most of the Inquiry sessions took place in the Public Hall, with several others taking place in The Guildhall, Fore Street, Liskeard. The last session took place in the Public Hall on the afternoon of Tuesday 26 June 2007 on its 25\textsuperscript{th} day when I closed the Inquiry. As my appointment came after the commencement date of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, I held the Inquiry under the “transitional” arrangements. Hence my Report and its recommendations are binding on the Council.

3. I held a Pre-Inquiry Meeting (PIM) for the Inquiry at 1400 hrs on Tuesday 8\textsuperscript{th} August 2006 at the Public Hall. This was arranged to explain procedural and administrative matters relating to the Inquiry and for ideas on an initial draft programme to be discussed. I also explained the reasons for Dr Robins’ appointment. The Agenda and the Notes of, and arising from, the PIM are at Appendix 1 of my Report. During the mornings, afternoons and evenings while the Inquiry was in session, I undertook a programme of site inspections mainly on an unaccompanied basis. This continued up to the close of the Inquiry and during the reporting period. I now have the honour of presenting to you my Report, of which this letter is an important part.

4. The process of formulating the First Alteration to the Local Plan, and the reasons for reviewing the Local Plan in this way, is set out in your Council’s opening statement (Document CD/71), given orally on the first day of the Inquiry. I note a few points from it. Work began on updating the adopted (1999) Local Plan in November 2000 with the publication for consultation of an Issues Report. In June 2003 the First Deposit of the
First Alteration was published (Document CD/8) and in May 2005 the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration was published. This Re-Deposit contains the Alterations which the Council is currently proposing. The Council proposes that most of the 153 policies in the adopted Local Plan will be unaltered. The Re-Deposit deletes 33 existing policies, replacing them with 29 new policies and alters 10 others. Most of the alterations relate to housing because the adopted Local Plan no longer allocates sufficient land to meet the adopted (2004) Structure Plan requirements up to 2016. Land for employment is allocated in towns where new housing is planned, and this juxtaposition should provide opportunities to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. All the proposed alterations have been subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment to accord the First Alteration with sustainability principles (Document CD/15). When adopted, the First Alteration will be part of the development plan for the District.

5. Both First Deposit and Re-Deposit documents were placed on deposit for the statutory 6 weeks period for objections to be made. These periods were 20 June – 01 August 2003 and 26 June – 05 August 2005 respectively. A Further Deposit period of 6 weeks took place during 24 June – 05 August 2005, extended by 2 weeks due to notice not appearing in the local paper. Outstanding Objections from these 3 periods amounted to 968, 192 and 34 respectively, a total of 1194. There was a further consultation period on Omission Sites from 26 August to 07 October 2005. These are sites which the Objectors concerned say should be allocated or otherwise identified for their stated purposes of development. Relevant dates and events are shown in the Compliance Report (Appendix 2). I was assured at both the Pre-Inquiry Session and on the opening day of the Inquiry that the Council had complied with all the statutory requirements in the preparation of the First Alteration to the Local Plan. That included compliance with the 6-week periods of deposit for the making of representations. There are no representations to the contrary, and I accept the assurance. The Cornwall County Council has issued a Certificate of General Conformity of the First Alteration to the Local Plan with the Structure Plan.

6. Changes to the planning system in this country were introduced in 2004 with, for example, local development schemes and local development documents. The Council decided, however, not to abandon its review of the adopted Local Plan owing to the level of public consultation which had already taken place and what it saw as the very urgent need to update planning policies in Caradon (Document CD/71). It considered that the relevant changes could be secured most quickly by proceeding with the First Alteration to the Local Plan rather than changing direction and embarking on an entirely new process. The Council’s Cabinet has, however, committed the Council to making an early and accelerated start on the Caradon Local Development Framework (LDF) from January 2007 (Document CDCP/5B). I was assured during the Inquiry that this work is progressing well, and no doubt the Council will seek to accord it with the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West, due to be adopted in 2008.
7. On the opening day of the Inquiry, your advocate invited me to adjudicate not only on the duly made objections made at the First and Second Deposit stage, but also those made on the 32 Omission Sites shown in the Omission Sites Document (Document CD/64). I confirm that I have adjudicated on the 361 outstanding objections made at this stage in the process. Subject to the Council’s requested changes to the Skeleton Report (Document ID/040A), I have therefore adjudicated on a total of 1555 objections. There are 245 representations in support of the First Alteration at its various stages and 51 which the Council list as Comments. I seldom refer to them in my Report, but they have been of great help to me in coming to my conclusions and recommendations. Some responses made during the local plan process were not directly related to the First Alteration but were of wider significance to the District. The Council has invited me to suggest how they might be taken into account in its preparation of the Local Development Framework. I am content to make such suggestions.

8. My Report is in the order of the Skeleton Report which sets out the headings for the various policies and proposals to which objections are made, and for main issues, reasoning and conclusions and recommendations. The text under each of these headings is, of course, my own. This order is generally in accordance with that of the Chapters in the Re-Deposit. For each policy and other provision to which objection is made, I start on a new page. This should assist in the copying of extracts for those people who have made representations, for which purpose I enclose an unbound and a disk copy. I list the Objections to each provision of the Plan in the main body of my Report, but where this takes up more than one page, I list them in the Appendices. Some Objections are made to different provisions, but make essentially the same points about the policies, localities and sites concerned. I have tried to limit the amount of repetition in my Report as far as possible but, like the First Alteration to the Local Plan, when adopted, and the Local Plan itself, it should be read as a whole so that each recommendation can be seen in its proper context. I do, however, make frequent reference to national policy in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 concerning the delivery of housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. This is a vital consideration in land use planning in the District.

9. It is unnecessary to repeat at length the cases of either Objectors or the Council, but I identify the main issues arising from them and discuss them in my reasoning and conclusions. The test that I apply in my adjudication on each objection is whether the suggested change would improve the First Alteration and, by implication, the Local Plan itself. I then recommend whether, as a direct consequence of the objection(s) examined, the particular provision in the Re-Deposit Plan should be amended. I use bold, italic text to denote recommended amendments, upper case for POLICIES and lower case for Reasons which I equate with reasoned justification. In an Inquiry with so many proofs of
evidence, written statements and other documents, as well as all that was said at the Round Table and other Sessions, there are bound to be some points less material than others and which, in the interests of conciseness and the submission of my Report to you in reasonable time for the speedy adoption of the First Alteration, cannot be recorded. Nevertheless, I have taken them all into account in my Reasoning, in coming to my Conclusions and in making my Recommendations.

10. In some cases, I recommend that policies be amended, or their contents be relegated to the reasoned justification, because in my judgement their drafting does not sufficiently accord with the advice in Development Plans – A Good Practice Guide. It is good practice for plan policies to say what kind of development will be permitted (subject, if necessary to certain conditions) or permitted only in certain circumstances. A distinction should be made between a policy for the use and development of land and the guidance given to a prospective developer about the way in which that policy might be applied. For example, I suggest that the Council’s seeking to enter into a planning obligation is an administrative act and should be in the supporting text to the policy, the Reasons (reasoned justification).

11. Policies should not describe the degree of harm, damage or danger that a scheme might cause by such words as unacceptable or material. Harm, damage or danger must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission, and I see no need for any such superfluous qualification. At best such qualification, itself subjective, is of no practical help. Any such flexibility is spurious, making the policy longer than it need be. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38(6) suffices in this respect in that if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is thus for the decision-maker to judge the degree of harm in the light of all that is relevant and to determine accordingly. Similarly, normally in a policy is unnecessary. Nor is it necessary in one policy to cross-refer to another. Due weight should be accorded to each one in the determination of a planning application.

12. The Objections to the First Alteration are for the most part to the policies, proposals and to matters which Objectors consider should have been included, e.g. Omission Sites, and consequently my recommendations for the most part apply to them rather than to the lower text reasoned justification. This sometimes means that the unaltered reasoned justification will not always accurately reflect the policy as recommended to be amended. A good deal of the reasoned justification of the First Deposit and of the Revised Deposit is now out of date in that it refers, for example, to superseded Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and outdated data. Owing to the particular circumstances of this case, and especially the urgent need to get the First Alteration adopted, I have not had the time to re-write all those parts of the reasoned justification which
should be brought up to date. I consider that your Council should have the discretion to amend these provisions of the Local Plan, although not in contravention to my binding recommendations.

13. National policy emphasises sustainability, and it is a matter which I have borne in mind throughout my examination of the objections. It should be regarded as a strategy, providing the context for all the provisions of the First Alteration. I consider that the First Alteration, and by implication the Local Plan, is based upon this strategy. Aspects of it are, as Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 puts it, the delivery of housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. This includes a good public transport service. In assessing public transport services, I rely a good deal on Public Transport in Cornwall Winter 2006-07 (Document CD/69). I realise that services change for one reason or another, but I consider that this publication gives a good indication of routes and frequencies for the foreseeable future.

14. A good public transport service is a relative term. In a mainly rural area, like Caradon with its small towns, an hourly or half-hourly bus service throughout most of the day is probably regarded as good. Whether such a frequency will persuade many people to choose not to use their cars is another matter. My concern is that a sporadic distribution of growth to small rural settlements with few community facilities would result in more travelling to the larger centres, especially by car and too often on narrow country lanes ill-suited to accommodate more traffic. Hence I consider that the Structure Plan policy of generally promoting growth in the towns is especially applicable to Caradon. So is national policy on this strategy. That is not to say that there should be no more development in any of the villages. Where appropriate, policies such as Policy HO6 in the First Alteration provide for it. The balance is a difficult one to achieve, but the strategy of promoting most growth in Liskeard, Looe and Callington ensures that for the most part the Council has got it right.

15. The Government is committed to providing high quality housing for people who are unable to access or afford market housing. In providing for affordable housing in rural areas, the aim should be to deliver high quality housing that contributes to the creation and maintenance of sustainable rural communities in market towns and villages. The Council’s top corporate priority is the provision of this type of housing. There is an urgent need for it, and it was a matter discussed in some detail at the Inquiry. The Council has sought to ensure that developers will contribute towards the District’s affordable housing needs in a practical and reasonable fashion, essentially by applying a percentage to schemes of a given minimum number of dwellings. In my judgement, the Council’s policies should result in the delivery of a significant amount of affordable housing, but this is something which the Council should keep closely under review and adapt the planning policies to improve matters if need
be. Your Council may have to consider the compulsory acquisition of suitable land for the purpose, if appropriate.

16. During the course of the Inquiry, Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 was published. My general approach is to take account of it as far as is practicable, always bearing in mind that the First Alteration to the Local Plan is being prepared under the transitional arrangements. It is not a Local Development Framework (LDF) and, as an Alteration to a Local Plan, it must as a matter of law continue to remain in general conformity with the adopted Structure Plan. The need to maintain plan-making programmes is another important consideration, as is the putting into place of an effective policy framework for housing as quickly as possible. This, I consider, accords with PPS paragraphs 6 and 7 and the advice in the letter of 29 November 2006 which accompanied the launch of the PPS (Document CD/80C). The Cornwall County Council’s representative at the Inquiry, Mr S Havers, emphasised the need to get the First Alteration adopted as soon as practicable, and I agree with him. There should be no last minute major amendment to the First Alteration. But in any event I consider that it does reflect the broad aims of this national policy, especially with regard to the location of proposed residential development.

17. The adopted (1997) Cornwall Structure Plan required your Council to provide land for 7,100 dwellings during 1996-2016. The adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan requires a more modest provision for 4000 dwellings during 2001-2016, and this explains the reduction in the amount of land proposed to be allocated at the Re-Deposit stage of the First Alteration compared with that at the First Deposit. Hence many objections to various allocations at the First Deposit stage are, in effect, superseded by events. Good examples of this are lands at Lamellion and an extensive tract of land to the west of Callington. In its letters of 09 October and 07 December 2006, the Highways Agency refers to the reduced scale of growth and withdraws its objections to certain policies on the understanding that it will be involved in the assessment of site specific proposals, the contents of any Transport Assessments and negotiations in respect of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 106 for regulating the development or use of land (Section 106 Agreements). I endorse and support this understanding.

18. I recommend few amendments of substance, simply because I think that the Council has done an excellent job in preparing the First Alteration. The main ones concern the deletion of the phased approach to development on land allocated for housing at Addington, Liskeard. The approach of PPS 3 to phasing was a matter of some debate at the Inquiry, but for reasons which I explain later in my Report, I consider that the development of this land should take place as soon as possible and without any hindrance to a flexible and responsive supply of land. One advantage should be the speedier delivery of affordable homes. No land should be allocated at the southern end of Pelynt, and I therefore recommend the deletion of Policy PEL1. Most other recommendations concern the drafting of policies, making them more exacting, especially
those applying to the protection of the countryside, and according them better with good practice. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and I accord high priority to the protection of the Caradon countryside. Balancing this need with that for development is not an easy task.

19. I am grateful to my colleague, Mr Mike Hale BA (Hons), a Planning Officer from the Planning Inspectorate whose contributions included reporting on the RTSs and initial drafting of some Sections of my Report. On behalf of everybody concerned in any way with the Inquiry, I thank the Programme Officer, Mr Robert Young (Bob) for his superb organisational skills, cheerful assistance to Objectors, Council and me, and his sense of humour. I thank your technical and administrative staff, including those who appeared most at the Inquiry, Mr Colin Cresswell, Mr James Hills and your planning consultant Mr Don Alder. I congratulate them on their total commitment to the Inquiry and their cheerful readiness to provide additional information and to discuss with Objectors any matters where there appeared to be some prospect of agreement. This saved a good deal of time. We are all grateful to the Town Council for accommodating us, and to its staff for their keen attention to detail in setting out the rooms and making everybody feel welcome at The Public Hall and The Guildhall.

20. It was my privilege to meet the Objectors who came to the Inquiry. They were always courteous and good humoured in assisting me. Many were not professionally represented, and perhaps for some it was the first time that they had appeared at a public inquiry. I am grateful to all the Objectors for explaining their points in such a clear and pleasant way, and some of my recommendations are based upon their convincing views.

21. The Appendices include notes of, and arising from, the Pre-Inquiry meeting, lists of representations, core documents and attendances and the final version of the Inquiry programme. The Council holds a record of all the Inquiry documents, and arrangements can be made for inspecting them at all reasonable times by prior appointment with the Council by telephoning 01579 341000.

22. I have arranged for a copy of this letter to be sent today to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, the Government Office for the South West and the Cornwall County Council.

Yours sincerely

Richard E Hollox

RICHARD E HOLLOX BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRTPi FRICS (Inspector).
INTRODUCTION

Throughout the Inquiry there was a considerable amount of discussion about the role of the First Alteration to the adopted (1999) Local Plan and its relationship with the adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan. Also discussed were the plan-led system, the role of the development plan in the determination of planning applications, the importance of material considerations and the need to accord due weight to planning policies according to the circumstances.

The Council will recall my view that, to assist those readers of the First Alteration who may not be fully aware of them, these matters should be acknowledged in the text. The Council agrees with my suggested addition to it, and I now formally make my recommendation on it. It should be included in the adopted First Alteration wherever the Council thinks best.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended by the following addition.

Now that it is adopted, the First Alteration to the Local Plan is part of the statutory development plan for the District of Caradon. Another important part is the adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan. In its determination of planning applications, the Council will have regard to the provisions of the development plan and to any other material considerations, including national planning policy statements. This approach is in accordance with the plan-led system to which the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38(6) refers. Hence the Council will attach due weight to each relevant development plan policy and its clauses and to any material consideration(s) according to the nature of the proposed development, its design, siting and location.
1. CHAPTER 4: EMPLOYMENT

1.1 POLICY EM3: VILLAGE WORKSHOPS

Objection

Further Deposit

E27/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue
a. Whether the Policy pays sufficient attention to the adopted Structure Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

1.1.1 The First Alteration to the Local Plan proposes no change to this Policy.

1.1.2 When adopted, the First Alteration to the Caradon Local Plan will be part of the development plan for the District. The development plan will also include the adopted Structure Plan and, as the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 S38 (6) provides, planning applications will be determined in accordance with it unless material considerations indicate otherwise. These can include national policies as set out in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) Notes and Planning Policy Statements (PPS). Provided that the Council continues to proceed on that basis, giving due weight in its determination of applications to all material considerations, I see no difficulty. The Policy, amended as I recommend, should provide a suitable basis for the determination of applications for planning permission for village workshops.

1.1.3 The Cornwall County Council indicates that this objection can be dealt with through the preparation of the Local Development Framework. Again, I see no difficulty, but the Policy should make it clear that these workshops would be permitted only within defined settlement limits. To say that they could be permitted at the edge of a village and hence outside those limits, seems to me to be too much of a hostage to fortune. Any permissions on land beyond those limits should be in accordance with other policies or on the basis of material considerations outweighing the provisions of the development plan. I invite the Council to ponder the point as it prepares its Local Development Framework. I make no binding recommendation, but a policy along the following lines might be suitable:

POLICY EM3

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR SMALL VILLAGE WORKSHOPS COMPRISING UNITS WITH A FLOORSPACE NOT EXCEEDING 250 SQ M (2,700 SQ FT) WITHIN THE DEFINED LIMITS OF THE FOLLOWING VILLAGES:

And then as in the adopted Local Plan.
1.2 POLICY EM4: CRAFT HOMES

Objections

First Deposit
F271/236 W Gubbins Objection
F759/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection

Re-Deposit
R/12594 Mr and Mrs Jarvis Objection

Main Issue
a. Whether the Policy should be re-instated.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1.2.1 The Council states that the “craft homes” policy has not been useful, and there is no evidence to gainsay that judgement. Whilst in principle the promotion of economic diversity is to be applauded, as is the reduction in the need to travel resulting from people living at or near their place of work, existing policies in the development plan like Policy EM3 Village Workshops should be sufficient. Policy HO7 allows for new dwellings in the countryside to meet the needs of agricultural and other workers with a compelling need to live outside the settlements with defined limits. Moreover, it is possible to work from home without the need for planning permission.

1.2.2 The objection which Mr and Mrs Jarvis make to the Policy EM4 at the Re-Deposit stage is considered by my colleague Dr D Robins. He comes to the same conclusion as I do that there is no need to re-instate it. He concludes, and I quote, that this Policy relates to live/work developments but is stated by the Council to have been applied to only 3 developments, of which 2 have not been implemented. Though I accept the Objectors’ conjecture that such developments are likely to increase in number, I consider they can be satisfactorily controlled under Policies HO7 and EM3. I consequently find no compelling justification to restore Policy EM4.

-0-

1.2.3 On another matter, there is no need to revise the village development limit at East Taphouse. As the Council says, such re-drawing is beyond the scope of the First Alteration.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
1.3 POLICY EM10: WATERSIDE BUSINESS LOCATIONS

Objection

Further Deposit

E28/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether economic considerations should be balanced with environmental ones.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

1.3.1 The short answer to this issue is that they should be, and the provisions of the development plan allow the Council to weigh this and other policies, together with other material considerations, in the balance in coming to a judgement. This Policy in the adopted Local Plan remains unchanged in both the First Deposit and Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan, and there is no call for any amendment to it.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2. CHAPTER 5: HOUSING

2.1 HOUSING CHAPTER

Objection

First Deposit

F1100/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Local Plan, as proposed to be altered, pays sufficient attention to an overall spatial strategy.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.1.1 Although I accept that an overall spatial strategy should go beyond considerations solely of housing, the Re-Deposit Plan does in my judgement meet this objection. It suitably distinguishes between that part of the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA) which lies within Caradon District and the rest of the District, with targets for each area concerning the number of dwellings required to conform generally with the adopted Structure Plan. Proposed allocations of land for residential development amplify the strategy. Whilst I comment later in my Report on these allocations and on other provisions of the Local Plan, there is no need for any modification in the light of this objection.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.2 POLICIES HO4, HO10 & HO12: PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS15 - LAND AT SOUTHERN EDGE OF HARROWBARROW

Objections

First Deposit

F406a/353 Reginald Rowe Objection
F406b/353 Reginald Rowe Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether Policy HO4 is a land use policy;
   b. Whether this Omission Site should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.2.1 Policy HO4 is not a land use policy but a statement setting out the Council’s intention concerning monitoring. There is nothing wrong in principle with that intention, but this provision of the Local Plan should be in the form of reasoned justification. I deal in more detail later with the matter of phasing.

2.2.2 Secondly, I consider that following the adoption of its First Alteration the Local Plan will allocate sufficient land for housing to conform generally with the adopted Structure Plan with its reduced housing requirements for the District. That land should generally be provided in those settlements offering a good, and the best, range of community facilities and services. This approach should reduce the need to travel, especially by car. At my site inspection, I noted the primary school, public house and a village hall. Maybe there are some less obvious community facilities in the village.

2.2.3 The bus service, mainly Nos 79 and X79, is infrequent, being generally about one every 2 hours to and from Callington and Tavistock. It does not operate on Sundays. A once a month service, No 259 Plymouth-Tavistock, is operated by the Tavistock Community Transport with a similar service between Tavistock and Truro (No 260). The Tamar Valley Community Bus provides a once a week service to Callington (No 265). I have no doubt that these services are important to the people who use them, but they are unlikely to attract many more people from their cars. There is no rail service.

2.2.4 The land includes an existing building, planning permission for which was granted in 1964 for use as an agricultural workshop. Opposite it are several dwellings and beyond it to the south are a small number of greenhouses. It is at the edge of the main built up part of the village and to some extent detached from it. Irrespective of the availability of water and electricity, the erection of just one dwelling on the site as is proposed, together with the usual paraphernalia of a residential curtilage, would be a consolidation of development and an erosion of the countryside. There is no justification for it.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that, apart from relegating the contents of Policy HO4 to the reasoned justification, no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.3 PARAGRAPH 5.04

Objections

First Deposit

F689/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F1097/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the fourth bullet point satisfactorily reflects national policy concerning a better choice in the size, type and tenure of housing to meet the requirements of the whole community;

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.3.1 I can see nothing wrong with this provision of the Plan. As an aim it is rightly wide-ranging in its intent and in my view suitably accords with Government policy, particularly Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3.

2.3.2 On another matter, the reference in the First Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan to the Structure Plan housing requirement of 7,100 new dwellings in the District during 1996-2016 is deleted at the Re-Deposit stage. This meets the Government Office’s reasonable objection. The figures for this period are superseded by the provisions of the adopted Structure Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.4 PARAGRAPH 5.05

Objections

First Deposit

F1098/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R197/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the findings of the Joint Structure Plan Panel and the urban capacity of Plymouth are acknowledged.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.4.1 Subject to my comments later in this Report, I consider that these matters are adequately covered in the Re-Deposit Plan. The reference in this paragraph to the adopted Structure Plan, its overall housing requirement in the District (4,000) and its plan period (2001-2016) is useful.

2.4.2 Objection is made to the disadvantages of a dispersed pattern of development and the advantages, including the greater certainty, of allocating land for development and in the most sustainable locations. As my later recommendations show, I enthusiastically support this approach. There is no need to amend this paragraph.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.5 PARAGRAPHS 5.06 – 5.10

Objection

First Deposit

F652/523  House Builders Federation  Objection
F1099/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R249/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether windfall development is correctly defined.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.5.1 In paragraph 5.06 of the First Deposit of the First Alteration, the term is wrongly defined as residential planning permissions that arise on sites not specifically allocated for housing in the Local Plan. The definition in paragraph 5.07 of the Re-Deposit is better, referring to completions instead of permissions. That should be the Council’s approach in its examination of past trends and the contribution which this source of supply has made to housing requirements. Solely for the purpose of definition, however, it would be better to base it on the one set out in the footnote at Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 page 19. I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that paragraph 5.07 of the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan be amended as follows:

Windfall sites are those which have not been specifically identified as available in the Local Plan process. They comprise previously-developed sites which have unexpectedly become available. Examples include........
2.6 PARAGRAPH 5.09

Objections

First Deposit

F18a/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F636/520 Tamar Valley AONB Service Objection
F651/523 House Builders Federation Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the likely future contribution of rural windfall developments to housing supply has been exaggerated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.6.1 The estimate at paragraph 5.09 in the First Deposit of the First Alteration is that there would be 967 dwellings in the rural areas as a result of windfalls during 2001-2016. Its Re-Deposit notes at paragraph 5.10 that the Housing Windfall Study estimates that an additional 1,003 dwellings would arise outside the development limits of the 5 main towns in the period up to 2016. I consider that both estimates are over-optimistic, for reasons which I set out in my examination of the components of housing supply.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that paragraph 5.10 of the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan be amended in accordance with my recommendations concerning Housing Supply.
2.7 PARAGRAPH 5.10

Objections

Re-Deposit

R130/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
R182/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether too many villages have been taken into account in the estimate of future windfall development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.7.1 It is true that the Council has taken into account at least 70 small to medium sized villages in its estimate of windfalls. Of itself, however, I do not consider that this has much inflated the estimate. This is because their limits are generally tightly drawn and most villages are closely developed with, it would appear, few opportunities for the redevelopment of previously-developed land resulting in a net increase in dwellings. I do, however, look at this matter in greater detail in my consideration of housing supply and the Council’s proposed distribution of future development opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.8 PARAGRAPH 5.11

Objection

First Deposit

F650/523  House Builders Federation

Main Issue

a. Whether a discount for non-implementation should be applied to the number of dwellings with planning permission.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.8.1 The emphasis in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 is on the planning system delivering a flexible, responsive supply of land for housing. Reflecting the principles of “plan, monitor and manage”, local planning authorities should develop policies and implementation strategies to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is available to achieve their housing and previously-developed land objectives. This approach seems to me to rule out discounts for non-implementation, be they at 5% or 10%, as was generally agreed at the Round Table Session (RTS) on Housing Supply. I recommend later in this Report that there should be no phasing of development on the Council’s land allocations at Liskeard, or for that matter at Callington should it ever be suggested. This substantial increase in the amount of land made available for residential development also makes any such discount unnecessary. Rightly, the Re-Deposit makes no such allowance, and I commend this change from the First Deposit.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.9 PARAGRAPHS 5.11 - 5.14

Objection

Re-Deposit

R123/523  House Builders Federation  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether too much reliance is being placed on windfall sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.9.1 This is a matter which I consider in some detail in my examination of Tables One and Two and of Policy HO1. I conclude there that too much reliance is being placed upon this component of supply and, like other figures in these paragraphs, a re-assessment is required.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that, subject to my recommendations elsewhere and particularly with regard to Tables One and Two, no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.10 PARAGRAPH 5.12

Objections

First Deposit

F649/523 House Builders Federation Objection

Re-Deposit

R183/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the figures in this paragraph are sufficiently realistic.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.10.1 Paragraph 5.12 in the First Deposit has been substantially changed in the Re-Deposit, mainly to bring it more into line with the adopted Structure Plan. The various figures in paragraph 5.12 of the First Deposit are superseded by those in the Re-Deposit which will have to be changed in line with my recommendations concerning Tables One and Two. I trust that those recommendations, framed in the light of the Round Table Session (RTS) on Housing Supply, will result in a more realistic basis for the location of new development and the amount of land allocated to meet housing requirements in the District.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that, subject to my recommendations elsewhere and particularly with regard to Tables One and Two, no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.11 TABLES ONE & TWO AND POLICY HO1: HOUSING REQUIREMENT

Objections

First Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F210/215</td>
<td>Duloe Parish Council Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F240/228</td>
<td>Colin Breed MP Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F575a/488</td>
<td>Sport England Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F648/523</td>
<td>House Builders Federation Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F688/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F767/570</td>
<td>Midas Homes Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F806/594</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C Jarvis Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1101/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4/594</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs C Jarvis Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R89/888</td>
<td>Teresa Patterson Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/131/377</td>
<td>Rosemullion Homes Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R184/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R217/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R218/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R216/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R250/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether, having taken account of the various components of the calculation, the estimated requirement for housing in the District (comprising the Caradon Sub-Area and Plymouth Principal Urban Area), is realistic;

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.11.1 On Wednesday 01 November 2006 I held a Round Table Session (RTS) on Housing Supply. Further matters were discussed at the second RTS held on Thursday 09 November 2006, and again on Friday 26 January 2007 in the light of the publication of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3. These Sessions enabled participants to amplify their objections to the above provisions of the Local Plan and for the Council to respond. The matters discussed included those raised by other objectors in their written representations. I deal with each component in turn, noting that the figures in Tables One & Two in both stages of the Alteration are superseded by tables which the Council submitted at the RTS, particularly in its Document CDCP/1D.

Structure Plan Requirements

2.11.2 The recently adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan allocates a total of 4000 dwellings to the District during 2001-2016. This includes 1000 for the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA). It would be unrealistic to insist on precision, and it is reasonable for this requirement to be applied with some flexibility. The
County Council considers that an actual provision of 10% either way would be acceptable, and hence ensure the continued general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan. In my view, the starting point for the calculation of the number of dwellings to be provided following certain assumptions (the residual requirement) should be 4000. That is the figure in the Structure Plan. It is not 4000 plus or minus 10%. I do not agree, therefore, that the District’s housing requirement should be set at 4,000-4,400 as Mr Stacey suggests on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd. Instead of introducing this measure of flexibility at the outset, it would be better to apply it as a check on general conformity when all the components of the calculation have been assessed. I accept that rates of completion have varied since 2001 and before then, but the same Structure Plan and Local Plan periods should be considered in their entirety. The annual variations do not justify any changes to the Structure Plan or any greater flexibility to compensate for any years when there has been a low number of completions.

2.11.3 The consensus at the RTS was that national and regional guidance is for a general direction of travel towards the delivery of more housing and an increasing urgency for its provision. I accept that interpretation, but the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South West (RSSSW) is still at a draft stage and limited weight should be applied to it. Provided that the allocated sites are, in the terms of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3, available, suitable and achievable, I consider that a flexibility of up to 10% would suitably accommodate this direction of travel, general conformity with the Structure Plan and compensation for the non-implementation of any proposal, either wholly or in part. To repeat, therefore, my starting point is 4000 new dwellings in the District during the plan period.

2.11.4 In its preparation of its Local Development Framework (LDF), the Council will be able to take greater account of, for example, Regional policies which at present are not yet adopted. In the meantime, the statutory requirement for the Local Plan to be in general conformity with the recently adopted (2004) Structure Plan remains. Irrespective of rulings made elsewhere, I see no reason in this case why it should be prejudiced.

**Dwelling completions**

2.11.5 Objectors accept, as I do, the Council’s corrected figures in its Document CDCP/1D concerning dwelling completions during March 2001-2006. In the Caradon Sub-Area, 1194 dwellings were completed, this being nearly 40% of the Structure Plan requirement of 3000. For that part of the Plymouth PUA which lies within Caradon District, 742 dwellings were completed, this being just over 74% of requirements. For the District as a whole, therefore, 1936 dwellings were completed, this being nearly 50% of the Structure Plan requirement during the first 5 years of the 15 year plan period. On this basis, another 1806 + 258 = 2064 are required.

**Remaining Local Plan allocations**

2.11.6 Table One in the Council’s Amended Housing Supply Table (CDCP/1D) shows that in March 2006 there was allocated land sufficient for 54 dwellings in the Caradon Sub-Area and for 87 dwellings in the Plymouth PUA. There is concern, expressed for example by Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd, about undue reliance being placed upon these allocations in that not all the dwellings expected from them may be completed during the plan period. There is, however, another 9 or so years to its end. For example, even though lands at Church Road, Saltash (estimated capacity of 40) and at Pillmere were allocated to meet housing
requirements up to 2001, I am not convinced that they will not be developed by 2016. I understand that the land at Pillmere is the subject of a current planning permission for 58 dwellings. There is no evidence of any insuperable constraint applying throughout the plan period to prevent their development. Similarly, but for my recommendation against its being allocated, I see no reason why the land at Pelynt (PEL1) would not have been developed by the end of the plan period in view of its owner’s interest in, and promotion of, it.

2.11.7 During 1986-2001 there were 5,393 completions in the District compared with the Structure Plan target of 6,600, and the County Council took this deficit into account in preparing its housing completion targets for 2001-2016. Bearing in mind the steady stream of house completions during 2001-2006, I take the view that a substantial number of the expected dwellings will be built on lands already allocated to meet the evident demand for them and that they will make a significant contribution towards the District’s housing requirements.

Outstanding permissions

2.11.8 The above mentioned Table One shows that in March 2006 greenfield sites with planning permission could provide 297 dwellings in the Caradon Sub-Area and 58 dwellings in the Plymouth PUA. This former figure, the outcome of revisions during the course of the Inquiry, derives from the land adjoining the Liskeard Eastern Relief Road and which has yet to be developed. Detailed planning applications have been approved or are under consideration for all this land following the grant of outline planning permission. Bearing in mind the need for housing in the District and the length of the rest of the Local Plan period, I see no good reason why this indicative number of dwellings should not be provided. They, too, should be counted towards the Structure Plan requirement.

Windfall Sites

2.11.9 During the earlier stages of the preparation of the First Alteration, Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3 was extant and the Council rightly paid due regard to it. It advised local planning authorities to make specific allowances for all the different types of windfalls in their plans...on the basis of examining past trends and on the likely future windfall potential as assessed in a capacity study. The advice in PPS3, however, is that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless local planning authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites from being identified. As mentioned at the RTS, an obvious example of such circumstances might be a local authority area which is already substantially developed with little or no opportunities for allocations of a significant extent.

2.11.10 National policy must often be tempered in the light of local circumstances. Nothing has prevented the Council from identifying specific sites but, given the high quality of the District’s countryside which never fails to impress me and the limited number of settlements with what PPS 3 calls a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure, I am not convinced that any further suitable sites should be identified under current adopted planning policies. Indeed, this is a consideration which has led me to reject all the Omission Sites which lie outside the defined development limits. Windfall sites, and the number of dwellings upon them, have come forward in the past, although not surprisingly at different annual rates. There is no reason to doubt that they will continue to do so, and in all these circumstances I consider it reasonable for some allowance to be made for them. Depending upon the extent of any further consultation which the Council might otherwise have deemed
appropriate, acceptance of the principle of inclusion of windfalls within the calculations may also serve to speed the Alteration on its way to adoption, and sooner achieve the certainty which that will confer on the allocations, urgently needed to provide for the District’s housing needs.

2.11.11 In principle, I consider that windfall development can take place in urban and rural surroundings, and I see no justification in limiting it, or indeed all development, to the former. Landowners may be reluctant to develop windfall sites for a number of reasons, including in my experience the seeking of planning permission solely to establish the value of land. Some sites which might, at first sight, be thought likely to come forward as windfalls can flounder when more detailed investigations reveal problems like inadequate access and/or the constraints to which Mr & Mrs Jarvis refer in their Document P007B concerning Pillatton and Menheniot. Maybe schemes have already come to fruition on most of the more easily developed windfall sites in the District, and for this reason also there can be no guarantee that windfall development will continue to take place at the same rate as in previous years. I am therefore reluctant to place too much reliance on past trends in dwelling completions for particular areas within Caradon District in order to estimate the windfall assumption for the District as a whole (Entec Housing Windfall Study Executive Summary CD/19). In view also of national policy in PPS3 about windfalls, I have adopted an especially critical and exacting approach to the Council’s estimates of this source of supply. The Council says that the Study’s prediction of windfalls is conservative, and if the number of dwellings arising from this source proves to be larger than I have assumed, the surplus can be regarded as consistent with the general direction of travel to which I refer in paragraph 2.11.3.

2.11.12 All parties must accept that prediction is an inexact science, and that an estimate of future windfalls is no exception. For the Caradon Sub-Area, the Council estimates a predicted urban windfall completion rate of 340 during the plan period, an annual average of 34 dwellings during the plan period. Owing to the size of Liskeard, Looe and Callington and the presumed opportunities for redevelopment and conversion, this is reasonable. I note here particularly Omission Site OS11 which is within the defined development limits for Callington and which the Council estimates the potential for 40 dwellings. The same reasonableness applies to the 230, or 23 dwellings annually, on previously-developed village land. The planning permission for 84 dwellings at Kelly Bray, where construction has recently started, will make a significant inroad into this estimate. For windfalls on village infills and vacant non previously-developed land, the Council estimates 380, or 38 dwellings annually. I am doubtful about these last 2 figures. My inspections of the many villages in the District persuade me that their limits are tightly defined and that there is generally not much opportunity for suitable schemes within them. I agree with Mr and Mrs Jarvis in particular on this matter. In terms of a settlement strategy, that is no bad thing, but it serves to preclude windfall development. I propose to reduce it by nearly half, to 220 or 22 dwellings annually.

2.11.13 The Council sees agricultural and non-agricultural buildings in the countryside as further potential for windfall development. Estimates of 180 and 45, or 18 and 4-5 dwellings annually, respectively, are put forward for the Caradon Sub-Area. I suspect that these are also over-estimates. There must be a limit to the number of redundant barns, chapels, school buildings, fog signal stations and saw mills and other land in the District which have yet to be converted to residential use, or existing dwellings sub-divided to provide more homes. And I take note of policy in PPS7 that the re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential
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conversions may be more appropriate in some circumstances. It would therefore be prudent, and more in line with recent Government policy concerning windfalls, to reduce the Council’s estimates by about one half. I therefore assume 100 (10 dwellings annually) from agricultural, and 20 (2 dwellings annually) from non-agricultural, buildings.

2.11.14 The Council estimates that there could be 50 dwellings on windfall sites in the Plymouth PUA during 2006-2016. This is an annual average of only 5. In view of the significant size of several settlements in this Area, particularly Saltash, and the likely potential for redevelopment and conversions resulting in higher densities, I think that this is a reasonable figure. Additionally, the Council estimates that 23 dwellings could be built on the site of the Saltash Methodist Church and 30 at Saltmill Road, Saltash. These, too, appear to me to be reasonable estimates and I am not persuaded that there are better ones. I therefore endorse the Council’s windfall assumption for the Plymouth PUA of 50 + 23 + 30 = 103.

2.11.15 For the avoidance of any doubt, my estimates are of completions of dwellings on windfall sites, not the potential capacity of windfall land becoming available for development.

Residual Housing Requirement

2.11.16 I now come to the remaining number of dwellings to be provided in the District to meet Structure Plan requirements. This residual requirement is irrespective at present of where they might best be located. In terms of numbers, the situation in the Caradon Sub-Area is somewhat less straightforward than in the Plymouth PUA, mainly because of the extent of my reservations about the Council’s assumptions about windfall sites in the Sub-Area. The Structure Plan requirement here is 3000 dwellings. From that must be deducted the 1194 dwellings completed, the 54 dwellings from remaining Local Plan locations and the 297 permitted dwellings at the Liskeard Eastern Relief Road site. As explained above, I accept the estimate of 340 dwellings from predicted urban windfalls and of 230 from village windfalls on previously-developed land. I have, however, reduced the 380, 180 and 45 from the other categories of windfall set out in the Council’s Table 1 in CDCP/1D to 220, 100 and 20 respectively. This conservative total of 910 windfall dwellings compares with the Council’s estimate of 1,175 and, for example, Mr Stacey’s on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd of 1030 in his Document P/010. The residual requirement for this part of the District is therefore 3000 – (1194 + 54 + 297 + 340 + 230 + 220 + 100 + 20) = 545. To this should be added an allowance of 50 to compensate for my recommendation that land at Pelynt, subject to Policy PEL1, should not be allocated. This brings the residual requirement up to 595. This estimate is 310 more than the Council’s estimate of 285 (See Table 1 in Document CDCP/1D).

2.11.17 As explained, the Structure Plan requirement for the Plymouth PUA is 1000 dwellings. So far, 742 have been completed. A further 87 and 58 are likely to be provided on remaining Local Plan allocations and on greenfield sites with planning permission respectively. I accept the Council’s estimate of 103 (50 + 23 + 50) dwellings from windfall sites. This leaves a total of 990 dwellings, only 10 short of the Structure Plan requirement for this part of the District. To all intents and purposes, the Structure Plan requirement has been met, with another 10 or so years to go to the end of the plan period. In this regard, I note the Secretary of State’s conclusions on housing land supply concerning land at Southview, Trowbridge, Wiltshire (APP/F3925/V/05/1189181). Unlike adjudications on objections to a Local Plan, this was a decision which she made following a direction.
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issued in pursuance of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 Section 77. Interestingly, however, she concluded that the proposal would not conflict with the rate of housing growth in Trowbridge allowed for in the development plan. In my judgement, any proposal in the First Alteration for significant growth in the Plymouth PUA would, indeed, conflict with the adopted Structure Plan which is, of course, part of the development plan.

Other Matters

2.11.18 There are a few other related matters. The Government Office for the South West considers that Policy HO1 should be re-worded to clarify PUA and to show how this Policy links with Policy HO3 concerning the location of the proposed residential allocations. This is a useful comment which the Council partially accepts. The Plan should, however, be read as a whole and the point appears to me to be adequately covered in Paragraph 5.06 which explains the abbreviation and correctly defines the PUA Sub-area, i.e. that part of the PUA which lies within Caradon District, as Saltash and Torpoint. There is no need for duplication in the Policy.

2.11.19 Mr Packham, on behalf of Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd, suggests that the Local Plan should provide for residential development after 2016. Bearing in mind, he says, the letter of 04 August 2004 from the Government Office for the South East to the Winchester City Council (Document P/013), this approach would not necessarily take it out of general conformity with the Structure Plan. I am not convinced that circumstances in Winchester and Caradon are identical or even broadly similar, but as a matter of principle I consider that the 2 end-dates of 2016 should remain. Any allocation for an additional 266 or so dwellings to ensure a 10 year supply from the expected year of adoption, 2007, could prejudice planning policies which are still at the draft stage. The Council will, in any event, prepare its LDF during the present plan period and it makes more sense for this document to take account from its inception of emerging policies and to have a greater regard to PPS3. The emphasis now should be on hastening the Local Plan Alteration towards its adoption.

2.11.20 Mr & Mrs Jarvis consider that village limits should be re-assessed as part of the First Alteration. The Council has decided, however, not to do so. The only instances where I have to adjudicate on revised limits, therefore, are where objections are made to the Council’s proposed allocations and where Objectors are proposing Omission Sites whose endorsement would result in extensions to the limits concerned. Hence I agree with the Council that settlement limits in general should be re-assessed as part of the LDF process. That is not to say, of course, that any limits to villages without a good range of community facilities should be extended to embrace additional land for development.

2.11.21 I deal with Rosemullion Homes’ objection concerning land at Greenbank, Polruan, later in my Report in my conclusions and recommendations concerning Omission Sites. Some objections, mainly at the First Deposit stage and including the one made by the Duloe Parish Council, refer to named settlements and, by implication, the Council’s proposed strategy for the distribution of the housing requirement in the District. I deal with them in my conclusions and recommendations concerning particular towns and villages. Others refer to housing requirements prior to the adoption in 2004 of the Structure Plan and to that extent are superseded by the more recent requirement.
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RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that Tables One and Two in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended in accordance with the above Conclusions, thereby showing that the Remaining Local Plan housing requirement, 2001-2016, for the Caradon Sub-Area is 595 and for the Plymouth PUA it is 10.
2.12 PARAGRAPHS 5.16 & 5.17

Objections

First Deposit
F241/228 Colin Breed MP Objection

Re-Deposit
R163/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the target of 30% of new dwellings to be built on previously-developed land should be increased.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.12.1 Following the lesser amount of housing required in the District since the First Deposit stage (June 2003) as a result of the reduced requirements of the adopted (2004) Structure Plan, this target has been revised in the Re-Deposit Plan from 20% to 30%. Ideally it should be more, as Mr Colin Breed MP suggests, but previously-developed land is not suitable for development simply because it is previously-developed. Much depends upon its location. In my experience, a greater proportion of previously-developed land suitably located with respect to community facilities and services is more often found in large urban areas than in the more rural areas like Caradon. From what I have seen of the District, and bearing in mind the amount of development likely to take place in it during the plan period, and its location, I consider that 30% is a reasonable target. A higher percentage may be attainable in other, more urban, parts of Cornwall to bring the target for the whole County up to the 40% to which the Structure Plan refers.

2.12.2 For the purposes of housing, previously-developed land should be in, or perhaps in some cases close to, settlements which, as Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 puts it, offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Hence the land should be well-located, and the Local Plan should make this point clearer. As I indicate, by no means all of it in the District meets this criterion.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that Paragraph 5.16 in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan, and elsewhere in it as the Council thinks appropriate, refers to well-located previously-developed land.
2.13 POLICY HO2: THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

Objections

First Deposit

F440a/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
F440b/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
F546a/475 Ocean Housing (Mr Phil Smith) Objection
F561/487 South West RSL Planning Consortium Objection
F647/523 House Builders Federation Objection
F687/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F766/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
F854/634 Grenville Estates (Mr J Taylor) Objection conditionally withdrawn

Re-Deposit

R132/177 Rosemullion Homes Objection
R215/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
R116/894 Cornwall Wildlife Trust Objection
R292/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy should refer to the sequence in which land will be released, rather than allocated, for development;

b. Whether the priority given to the re-use of previously-developed land within town development limits would frustrate the meeting of Structure Plan requirements and the provision of affordable housing;

c. Whether the Policy should set out a hierarchy of settlements, thereby indicating the scale of development to be promoted and expected at each level.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.13.1 Some of these Objections refer more to the Council’s proposed distribution of the Structure Plan’s housing requirement for the District rather than to the sequence which development should follow. Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd, for example, promotes Tencreek Farm as a mixed use sustainable urban extension to Liskeard. Rosemullion Homes draws attention to the claims of Polruan for more development, suggesting that it be identified as a local service centre, and Mr and Mrs Jarvis say that the Policy fails to allow for realistic rural windfalls and for development with greater merit than greenfield sites which are identified in the Local Plan. I appreciate that there is a relationship between the 2 concepts of distribution and sequence, but I focus my attention in these first 3 paragraphs upon the sequential approach.

2.13.2 The first and second issues are closely related, and on both I do find the Policy a little unclear. The Council says that the intention of the Policy is to minimise the amount of future development on greenfield land, and I agree that that is a worthy objective. As a very general proposition, previously-developed
land should be re-used before development takes place on greenfield land, but such an objective should by no means be the only consideration. Presumably the land concerned is already proposed to be allocated by virtue of Policy HO3, in which case it is difficult to see what, apart from phasing, Policy HO2 achieves. If, as is inferred, the Policy is setting out the order in which land will be allocated, it would seem to be suggesting that land on the edge of a town will not be allocated or released for development, either in principle or as phased, unless and until every previously-developed or undeveloped site within all the town development limits has been re-used or used.

2.13.3 In other words, it would seem that no work could start on the Addington site (Policy ALT11) until building works have been completed, or at least started, on every suitable site within Callington, Liskeard, Looe, Saltash and Torpoint. The Policy could thus completely undermine the urgent need for more housing in the District and the policies of the Structure Plan which seek its provision. It would also frustrate the speedy delivery of the significant amount of affordable housing that should be expected from a site of the size of ALT11. Significantly, the Structure Plan states that *a sequential approach to the release of sites will be necessary to ensure that brownfield sites are used first to meet housing requirements where they are available. It is, however, important that a continuous supply of land is available for housing.* The Policy should be re-drafted, taking account of my conclusion later in my Report that Policy HO3 should not include phasing. *Released* is an improvement on *allocated*, but it does not go far enough.

2.13.4 On the third issue, I agree with Mr Stacey on behalf of **Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd** that the Policy should set out a hierarchy of settlements. As a general principle, and as Mr Packham on behalf of **Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd** well puts it, *development should be at a scale which reflects the role and function of the settlement and its place in the hierarchy.* For reasons which I give in my examination of the Council’s settlement strategy in my discussion of Policy HO3, it should make clear that the bulk of planned growth will be at Liskeard, the main settlement in the Caradon Sub-Area, with some additional growth at Callington and Looe. It should include Saltash and Torpoint as the main settlements in the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA), but this should be on the understanding that this Area has already almost entirely met its Structure Plan requirement. As Mr Stacey succinctly says, *Saltash/Torpoint...have essentially been “parked” as growth options until post 2016.* The Policy should indicate that limited development may be permitted within defined village limits, as Policy HO6 allows. I accept Mr Stacey’s point that the redevelopment of previously-developed land at sustainable village locations, however that might be defined, may be given higher priority in certain circumstances but I consider that this source of supply will be negligible in the context of District-wide housing requirements. There should be no fourth category of *Elsewhere, Other Settlements*, or similar, as this would imply too scattered a distribution of growth in places insufficiently serviced.

2.13.5 I agree with the **Cornwall County Council** that a policy which sets out the process for the allocation of land is of limited use. It is not a land use policy and it duplicates other provisions of the Local Plan including Policy HO3 and the Proposals Map. I take the point that the Council makes housing allocations outside urban areas only as a last resort in meeting the Structure Plan’s housing requirement, and that is clear from the provisions of the First Alteration. The Council says that the Policy is *simply a basis for justifying the housing allocations made in Policy HO3*. If it were to remain as such, it should be in the form of the
reasoned justification for that Policy. But it would be better to frame it as a basis for the determination of planning applications, thereby more closely following the advice in the Good Practice Guide. It would also reflect advice in The Planning System: General Principles that the statutory development plan will continue to be the starting point in the consideration of planning applications for the development and use of land, unless material considerations imply otherwise. The development plan therefore provides the essential framework for planning decisions.

2.13.6 I have given careful consideration to the helpful comments received on the drafting of this Policy. In my judgement, the form which I am recommending does provide a sound basis for the determination of planning applications. It ensures that the emphasis on new development will be placed on Liskeard, it provides for a proportionate amount of development in Callington and Looe where the range of community facilities is not so wide, and it accepts that in certain circumstances a limited amount of development may be permitted in defined villages. It should assist the Council in refusing planning permission for schemes which are out of scale with small settlements with few community facilities and poor access to those in other places.

2.13.7 Other Local Plan policies, particularly HO3, HO5, HO6 and HO7 will complement and amplify it. And within its general objective of relating scale of growth to role and function of a settlement and its range of services, it allows the Council to have regard to a sequential approach of giving priority to previously-developed and any other suitable land within defined limits. I do not mention Rural Exception Sites because Policy HO13 suitably provides for them, and they should have a priority of their own.

2.13.8 I agree with much of the Council’s re-draft of the reasoned justification for the Policy. It explains its rationale, its objectives and how it would be applied. I refer in this justification to 30%, but this may have to be revised in the light of my recommendations throughout my Report.

2.13.9 There are other matters. The House Builders Federation says that the contribution made by open spaces within the built-up areas should be properly assessed and adequately protected. Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd makes a similar point. I agree, but there is no instance of an allocation in these circumstances, and I am confident that the Council would resist any application for planning permission on such land which, owing to its visual and/or recreational value, should remain open.

2.13.10 The Cornwall Wildlife Trust says that previously-developed land can have wildlife and nature conservation value, in which case it should not be re-developed. There may be occasions where this may be the case, but instead of including this point as a criterion in the Policy it would be better to rely on national and local policies where these outweighed any need to re-use the land for housing or other purposes. The reasoned justification refers to compliance with other policies in this Local Plan, and this is sufficient.

2.13.11 Grenville Estates refers to land at Callington (ALT19). This is a substantial area and, in view of the adopted (2004) Structure Plan’s reduced requirement for residential development in the District and my conclusions and recommendations concerning its distribution, it should not be allocated.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO2: THE SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY AND THE SEQUENTIAL APPROACH

IN GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, THE COUNCIL WILL ENSURE THAT THE SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED IS PROPORTIONATE TO THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE SETTLEMENT CONCERNED, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FOLLOWING HIERARCHY:

CARADON SUB-AREA             PLYMOUTH PUA
1. LISKEARD                   SALTASH AND TORPOINT
2. CALLINGTON AND LOOE
3. VILLAGES WITH DEFINED DEVELOPMENT LIMITS.

IN APPLYING THIS STRATEGY, THE COUNCIL WILL TREAT THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE AS A RELEVANT MATTER:

A) PREVIOUSLY-DEVELOPED URBAN LAND IN THE DEFINED LIMITS OF 1 AND 2;

B) UNDEVELOPED LAND WITHIN THE DEFINED DEVELOPMENT LIMITS OF 1 AND 2, INCLUDING THE ALLOCATIONS MADE IN THIS LOCAL PLAN;

C) LAND WITHIN VILLAGE LIMITS.

In applying this Policy, the Council will seek to achieve, by way of suitable densities, the provision of at least 30% of the District’s housing requirements up to 2016 on well-located previously-developed land. The Local Plan aims to minimise the amount of greenfield housing development taking place outside existing town and village development limits. Policies HO5 and HO6 allow for new housing within existing development limits, and the Council has taken account of the potential contribution from these sources in restricting the amount of land allocated outside existing limits. This approach should serve to promote the early re-development of previously-developed and other suitable land within settlements.

Where it is necessary to allocate greenfield land outside development limits in order to meet Structure Plan housing requirements, it is Government policy that allocations should take the form of sustainable urban extensions. Policy HO3 allocates 3 urban extensions in the Caradon Sub-Area because there is not enough capacity within the limits to accommodate all the additional housing required. The scale of these urban extensions is governed by the adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan which provides that new development outside the Plymouth PUA should be focused mainly on Liskeard.
2.14 POLICIES HO2, HO3, HO4, HO5, HO6 AND HO7 & PARAGRAPHS 5.19-5.42: PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS24 - LANDS NORTH AND SOUTH OF DOBWALLS

Objections

First Deposit

F874a etc/649 Mr G Wherry

Main Issue

a. Whether these 2 Sites should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.14.1 Mr Wherry refers to the extensive allocation of land in the First Deposit of the First Alteration and considers that what he calls strategic villages like Dobwalls could provide for some smaller scale developments which would be visually less intrusive than those on extensive tracts of greenfield land as at Liskeard. Land at Beneathway Farm, Dobwalls, next to the by-pass is proposed as an Omission Site, as is a site adjoining the northern edge of the main built-up area.

2.14.2 I deal with the Council’s settlement strategy in more detail in my examination of such provisions of the Local Plan as Policies HO2 and HO3. In particular, however, Dobwalls has a population of about 1317 which is about 15% of that of Liskeard. It has a roughly proportionate range of community facilities which includes a primary school, post office, petrol filling station and hairdresser.

2.14.3 The Objector refers to a daily bus service, but gives no details concerning routes and frequencies. From CD/69, however, I see that the main service is the Western Greyhound 593 between Newquay, Liskeard and Plymouth with buses to and from these 3 towns at generally one hour intervals from about 0730 to 1815/1835 hrs. There is an occasional bus on Sundays and Public Holidays, and as provided by Tavistock Community Transport (No 260) and Roselyn Coaches (No 293). There is no rail service. This combination of a narrow range of community services and limited public transport in terms of both frequency and hourly spread would be all too likely to result in an increased use of the private car as residents travelled to other places for various purposes including jobs, education, leisure and main shopping. This is contrary to Government policy to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The village is not sufficiently sustainable to justify the scale of development envisaged.

2.14.4 Neither site is subject to a special landscape designation of national or local significance, but that is no good reason for allocating it for development. The local countryside is attractive and provides pleasant, rural surroundings for the village. The visual impact might be much reduced by existing features like trees, hedges and, to the south, by the railway. A good landscaping scheme would also assist. Nevertheless, development on either site would be a substantial intrusion into the landscape and in all the circumstances this is a case where the countryside should be protected for its own sake. For a host of reasons, there is better located land elsewhere in the District which has a better claim for development to take place upon it. These 2 Omission Sites should not be allocated.
RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.15 POLICY HO3: HOUSING ALLOCATIONS AND PARAGRAPHS 5.24 & 5.25

Objections

First Deposit

F18b/31  Steve & Vanessa Killops  Objection
F222a/222 Mrs M Solomon  Objection
F224a/223 Mr T Mitchell  Objection
F355/303 Wainhomes (South West) Holdings Ltd  Objection
F430/372 M A R Weatherhead  Objection
F437/377 Rosemullion Homes  Objection
F438/377 Rosemullion Homes  Objection
F439a/377 Rosemullion Homes  Objection
F412/359 Mr P Keefe  Objection
F441b/378 M & Mrs Howe  Objection
F513a/448 TTR Developments Ltd  Objection
F543/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd  Objection
F546b/475 Phil Smith  Objection
F562/487 South West RSL  Objection
F575b/488 Sport England  Objection
F602/3 Cornwall County Council  Objection
F646/523 House Builders Federation  Objection
F686/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection
F736/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd  Objection
F765/570 Midas Homes Ltd  Objection
F804/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis  Objection conditionally withdrawn
F855/634 J Taylor  Objection
F1083/855 Landrake with St Erney Parish Council  Objection
F1103/1 Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R109/487 South West RSL  Objection
R124/523 House Builders Federation  Objection
R133/177 Rosemullion Homes  Objection
R185/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection
R211/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd  Objection
R213/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd  Objection
R214/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd  Objection
R252/1 Government Office for the South West  Objection
R293/3 Cornwall County Council  Objection

Further Deposit

E16/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the amount of development proposed at Liskeard, Callington and Looe generally accords with the provisions of the Structure Plan and is proportionate to the population, role and functions of these towns;

b. Whether the phasing of development on the allocated lands can be justified;
c. Whether the rural settlements beyond these towns have, in the terms of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3, a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure;

d. Whether, in the light of conclusions on c., all development likely to take place in the District during the plan period should be concentrated on these 3 towns and, if not, the general level of development which should be promoted in other settlements.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

The provisions of the Structure Plan

2.15.1 The Council’s proposed allocations at these 3 towns, amounting to 695 dwellings, reflect its strategy for the distribution of future housing growth in the District. It is therefore in this part of my Report that I examine that strategy, taking into account the views expressed by those parties who participated in the Round Table Sessions (RTS) held on Thursday 9th November 2006 and Friday 26th January 2007 concerning Housing Distribution and Sustainability. Also of assistance are the written representations of these and other parties.

2.15.2 On the first issue, the Structure Plan identifies 7 Strategic Urban Centres in Cornwall. They are Bodmin, Camborne-Pool-Redruth, Falmouth-Penryn, Newquay, Penzance, St Austell and Truro. Its Policy 25, however, refers to Other Main Towns and Local Centres, the former with a population of over about 5,000 and the latter with an approximate population of 2,000-5,000. There is no doubt in my mind that Liskeard, with its population of 8,652 and established roles and function serving an identifiable hinterland and having well developed transport nodes, should be regarded as a main town. Looe has a population of 5,280 and, like Callington with its population of 4,137, should be regarded as a local centre, providing basic shopping needs and serving a smaller hinterland.

2.15.3 The Structure Plan refers to Liskeard and notes that it plays an important role as a local centre for shopping, employment, community facilities and as a leisure and tourist destination. The Structure Plan’s main policy drive is to reinforce their existing roles and strengthen their economic, social and transport infrastructure. Of special note is its intention at paragraph 137 that development in the District outside the Plymouth PUA be focused primarily on Liskeard where it can strengthen the role of the town (in line with Policy 25) and avoid undue dependency on Plymouth for jobs and services. Regional Planning Guidance for the South West Policy SS3 for the Western Sub-Region is to encourage appropriate housing, employment, retail and social facilities in sustainable locations to reduce social exclusion and rural need. These approaches accord with the Government’s objective, expressed in PPS3, of creating mixed and sustainable communities and of delivering housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.

2.15.4 PPS3 is a recent expression of Government policy, being issued in November 2006 during the course of the Inquiry. But, as it says, it complements and should be read together with other relevant statements of national planning and housing policy including PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development. One aspect of this complementary approach is the policy in the latter that planning authorities should provide improved access for all to jobs, health, education, shops, leisure and community facilities, open space, sport and recreation by ensuring that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on
foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car, while 
recognising that this may be more difficult in rural areas. Similarly, 2 objectives of 
Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 Transport are to promote accessibility to jobs, 
shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling, 
and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car.

2.15.5 I deal with particular allocations and omission sites later in my Report. Here I am concerned mainly with scale of proposed development and the role and 
function of settlements in which it is proposed to be located. Liskeard has a good 
range of community facilities which the Council outlines in its Topic Paper Two: 
Housing Distribution – Table One. They include a secondary school and hospital. 
Also to be noted are its range of shops, good I would say for a town of its size in 
terms of both their trade and floorspace, and the number of buses which serve its 
hinterland. There are local and intercity rail services to Plymouth and beyond this 
City to all parts of the country. All these facilities confirm the importance of its role 
as a local service centre. Its attractiveness and distinct local character are further 
assets of great value. In my judgement, the Council’s promotion of a significant 
scale of housing development in this town much accords with the County, Regional 
and national policies which I have summarised. This scale is proportionate to its 
role and function, both of which would be reinforced in line with relevant policies. 
With careful account being paid to such considerations as design, landscaping and 
materials throughout the development process, this scale of growth should not 
dermine its distinctiveness.

2.15.6 In planning policy terms, Looe and Callington are similar to each other in 
terms of their role and function which is related to their size and range of 
community facilities. Despite their similarities as local service centres, however, 
they do have different identities, with a greater emphasis on tourism at Looe and 
on other industries at Callington. There is a railway station at Looe, albeit at the 
end of a branch line and no doubt of especial importance to the town as a 
destination for tourists, but there is no supermarket. Callington has a 
supermarket, but no railway station. Neither has a hospital. I accept that, in 
principle, a limited amount of development should be promoted in both towns 
commensurate with their size and range of community facilities. This would serve 
to reinforce their roles and functions as Local Centres, as Structure Plan Policy 25 
intends. It is difficult to be precise about the amount of land which should be 
allocated and the number of dwellings that should be provided. Much will depend 
upon the extent, nature and location of the land and the appropriate densities. All 
I would say at this stage is that the scale which the Council is proposing for both 
towns is reasonable. I have concluded above on the extent to which development 
at Saltash/Torpoint, as part of the Plymouth PUA, has already substantially met 
Structure Plan housing requirements.

2.15.7 Existing completions and the allowances which I have assumed from 
previous Local Plan allocations, extant planning permissions and windfalls, would 
result in 2455 dwellings in the Caradon Sub-Area and 990 in the Plymouth PUA, 
making a total for the whole District of 3445 (or 3395 with the deletion of Policy 
PEL1). Another 555 (or rather 605 when account is taken of the deletion of Policy 
PEL1), or about 60 dwellings a year during 2006-2016, are needed to meet the 
Structure Plan requirement of 4000 dwellings. The Council proposes about 695 
dwellings on the 3 allocated lands at Liskeard, Callington and Looe which, at a 
steady rate of development, would provide for close on 70 dwellings annually. The 
grand total of 4090, based on these figures, would be an over-provision of 2.25%. 
Owing to my conservative approach to windfalls and the significant amounts of 
land within the development limits of Callington and St Cleer and suitable in
principle for housing, there is every chance that there will be a greater over-
provision. A 5-year supply of housing is achievable.

2.15.8 This scale and general location of development generally conforms with
the provisions of the Structure Plan and this conclusion is part of the context in
which I consider proposals for residential development in the rural areas beyond
these 3 towns. Essentially, no more land need be allocated for residential
development. Inevitably the housing market will continue to be influenced by
Plymouth, and especially in the eastern parts of the District. The relationship in
this respect between the City and the District and its implications for housing,
employment and other matters are considerations more suitable for assessment at
the strategic level of planning, and in my view the Council’s emphasis on the
present importance of the Structure Plan is the right approach.

2.15.9 I consider affordable housing in my examination of Policies HO11 and
HO13. All I would say here is that the allocations should provide good and early
opportunities as well as some certainty for a significant number of affordable
dwellings to be provided in the central, north-eastern and southern parts of the
District. That is another point in favour of the Council’s proposed distribution of
growth, and appears to me to meet the point made by South West RSL.

2.15.10 On a related point, the Landrake and St Erney Parish Council is
cconcerned about the provision of sufficient infrastructure to support the scale of
development proposed, albeit reduced as a result of the adopted (2004) Structure
Plan. In general terms, developers will be expected to provide it as long as it is
fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to their proposals, as Circular
05/2005 requires. Other providers will have regard to the contents of the Local
Plan as altered as they formulate their capital programmes.

*The phasing of development*

2.15.11 This is the second issue. In its preparation of the Local Plan and its First
Alteration, the Council undoubtedly took account of PPG3 Housing, including its
advice about managing the release of sites over the plan period in order to control
the pattern and speed of urban growth. There is reference to phasing policies, one
possible approach being to manage the release of land for housing by dividing the
plan period into 3 phases, allocating sites for development in accordance with the
presumption in favour of the re-development of previously-developed land before
brining greenfield land into use.

2.15.12 Since then, PPS3 has been published and this brings a new, more
responsive approach to land supply at the local level. Local planning authorities
should continue to apply the principles of "Plan, Monitor and Manage" and develop
policies and implementation strategies to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is
available to achieve their housing and previously-developed land land delivery
objectives. In their Local Development Documents (LDD), they should identify
broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing for
at least 15 years from the date of adoption. Once identified, the supply of land
should be managed in a way that ensures that a continuous 5 year supply of
deliverable sites is maintained, and LDDs should set out the arrangements for
managing the release of land.

2.15.13 The PPS does not refer to the word phasing and the inference might be
drawn, as by certain Objectors at RTS5, that there is now less emphasis on such
an approach. Nevertheless, in my view this national policy can be construed as not
precluding the phasing of land for development. There is nothing which says that phasing is unacceptable. But whatever the conclusion on this matter, I consider that there are good local reasons for not phasing the release of certain land to which Policy HO3 refers. As a general principle, I consider that it is more practicable to phase the release of sites in a given sequence than to develop a particular site in stages. I agree with Mr Stacey, on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd, who succinctly states that construction on a site should not normally be turned on and off like a tap. That is especially true in the case of Policy ALT11 (Addington, Liskeard) where the site, though large in the local context, is not so extensive as to justify an initial stage of development to be followed by another one at some time in the future. And I agree with him that a sequence in the release of sites is more likely to be appropriate where it gives priority to the re-use of a large tract of previously-developed land with greenfield land being held back until such time as the re-development has either started or is nearing or has reached completion. That is not the case in the District. Different circumstances apply at the smaller town of Looe where there appears to be less pressure for development. There I consider that supply and development should be subject to a greater degree of control and management and I recommend accordingly (See Policy ALT16 a).

2.15.14 I conclude elsewhere that no Omission Site beyond development limits, nor the proposed allocation at Pelynt, should be allocated for housing. The emphasis on development will therefore be on no more than 3 sites (one each at Liskeard, Looe and Callington) in the entire District, and this implies that they should not have any unnecessary constraint imposed upon them. The removal of the particular constraint of phasing at Liskeard (Addington) would better enable the Council to meet the Structure Plan’s requirements and allow for a continuous supply of adequate housing land during the next 5 years and afterwards. Any significant excess in annual completions during that period could be regarded as following the general direction of travel already mentioned.

2.15.15 Policy HO3 provides for the second phase to begin on 1st April 2008. That date may be no more than 6 months or so after the adoption of the First Alteration, and so it would not fall far short of being overtaken by events. From that point of view, the identification of this date of the start of a second phase would not achieve a great deal. I accept that a later date might be set for it, perhaps 2011/2012 as Mr Packham suggests on behalf of Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd, but presumably the Council would have adopted its Local Development Framework well before then, and the whole concept of phasing would have been re-assessed in the light of Regional guidance concerning the amount and location of land identified for residential development.

2.15.16 Mr Stacey on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited says that there is no large previously-developed site in Liskeard. There is no evidence to the contrary, and I would expand this by saying that I have come across no substantial area of well-located previously-developed land suitable for housing in the entire District. That reinforces my conclusion that development of allocated lands at Liskeard and for that matter at Callington should not be held back, in principle or by way of phasing expressed by a date, until all or most of the previously-developed, small sites in Caradon have been all or mostly re-used.

2.15.17 I therefore conclude on this second issue that the phasing of development on the lands at Liskeard and Callington is not justified. Different local circumstances apply at Looe, where a phased approach should be adopted.

*
Community facilities etc

2.15.18 On the third issue, the Council provides a useful summary of the facilities in various villages in its Topic Paper Two (CD/50) and in its representations concerning other settlements. I bear in mind, however, that certain facilities are more important to some people than to others, and that one particular facility can vary a great deal from one village to another. Perhaps that is especially the case with a shop or shops, with or without a post office, where size and the range of goods and services sold can be very different. Circumstances can change over time and not always as a result of planning policies and decisions, with a wider or narrower range becoming available, and changes in choice and quality. The capacity of schools may also differ from one village to another. It is therefore important to note not just the type of facilities availability, but their number, quality and capacity. Circumspection is vital in concluding whether there is, or is not, a good range of community facilities. I suspect that every settlement is unique in this respect.

2.15.19 Similar points can be made about access. Trains, coaches and buses can contribute to the sustainability of a settlement, but much will depend upon routes, the frequency of services and those parts of the 24 hour day when they are available. The fact that there is a main road between a small settlement and a larger centre does not, of itself, mean that access is good from the former to a wider range of facilities in the latter, as Mr Packham points out on behalf of Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd. And in coming to my conclusions on the degree of sustainability of a settlement, I have borne in mind national policy in PPS3 concerning the contribution to be made to cutting carbon emissions from focusing new development in locations with good public transport accessibility and/or by means other than the private car. In my view, public transport is good when it means people from their cars for a significant proportion of their journeys, or has the potential for doing so. That implies matters like convenience, reliability, frequency and good information. No doubt the various hourly bus services are vitally important to those who use them but it is unlikely that this sort of frequency will have much effect in attracting people from their cars. I say this even when departure and arrival times allow for getting to and from work, which is not always the case. And the fact that a settlement has a bus service to a larger centre where more community facilities and jobs are available is more reason to promote growth not in that settlement but in the larger centre. Significantly, the Cornwall County Council subsidises as many as 60% of the bus services in the County, defraying up to 100% of the costs in some cases. Mr Havers, on behalf of the County Council, says it is reasonable to assume that these subsidies will continue, but there can be no guarantee that this level of subsidy, or for particular routes, will continue.

2.15.20 At its paragraph 5.41, the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration says that the Council will pay regard to the proximity of services such as schools, shops, medical facilities and the frequency of bus links to towns. This is a useful start in the assessment of sustainability. In my view, and despite some views to the contrary given at the Inquiry, the presence of a primary school in a village is an especially important criterion. Ideally it should be within safe and convenient walking distance from the children’s homes. Despite their small furniture, the buildings may in certain circumstances provide some opportunities for community activities, complementing any village hall, church or public house with which the village might be blessed. Secondary schools are, of course, usually more suited to this role and so their presence in a town or other settlement can be a double advantage. There should also be some provision for sport and recreation, as Sport England states.
I think it must be accepted, however, that the majority of those in employment will continue to commute to the larger centres, and this consideration will continue to place a limit on the sustainability of rural settlements. I agree with Mr and Mrs Jarvis that villages that are close to towns and employment, and on public transport routes, will...have better sustainability in terms of travel than remote villages, but that is not to say that such villages are sufficiently sustainable to justify the promotion of a significant amount of development within or adjoining them. In my judgement, a settlement with a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure should have a good deal more than, say, a 1-2 hourly bus service, a shop/post office, recreation area or village hall and a public house.

2.15.21 The settlement pattern is essentially of 5 main towns which, in descending order of population, are Saltash, Liskeard, Torpoint, Looe and Callington, beyond which is a host of villages, hamlets and small groups of dwellings. The largest 11 villages each have a population of no more than 1,000-2,000 or so. This gives an indication of their range of services which, with their roles and functions, is of more importance than a mere population figure. Elsewhere, I look in some detail at each village for which a proposal is made, bearing in mind the policy in PPS3 about the need to provide housing in rural areas, not only in market towns and local service centres but also in villages in order to maintain or enhance their sustainability. This should include, particularly in small rural settlements, a consideration of the relationship between settlements so as to ensure that growth is distributed in a way that supports informal social support networks, assists people to live near their work and benefit from key services, minimise environmental impact and, where possible, encourage environmental benefits. But in general I conclude that settlements outside the towns have a limited range of services and do not have good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.

* The balance to be determined between the towns and other settlements

2.15.22 On this, the fourth issue, it is my view that the limitations concerning the range of community services in these other settlements and their less than good access to jobs and other key aspects of modern living results in a limited degree of sustainability. Structure Plan Policy 26 says that the scale of housing in villages should be well related to the availability of jobs and facilities locally. Development in villages likely to increase commuting by car, it says, should be avoided. Allocating land for housing in these settlements would seldom, if ever, improve matters to any significant degree. It would be unlikely to facilitate the creation of a community of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain, community facilities, infrastructure and services, and so would not render these places significantly more self-contained and hence appreciably more sustainable.

2.15.23 It is more likely that a wider distribution of growth than the Council proposes would result in more commuting to work and additional trips mainly by car to larger settlements where a wider range of community facilities are available. In the case of the more remote settlements, these journeys would too often be along narrow country roads ill-suited to take more traffic. Their widening would reduce their charm and their contribution to the character and beauty of the District. In its promotion of sustainable development, PPS1 seeks to ensure that new development is located where everyone can access services or facilities on foot, bicycle or public transport rather than having to rely on access by car. It acknowledges that this may be more difficult in rural areas, but there is little merit
in aggravating existing problems by dispersing development in such a way as to increase dependence upon the car.

2.15.24 As a general principle it would be better to concentrate most growth on the towns where the opportunities for people to avail themselves of public transport, or be encouraged to walk short distances along safe and convenient routes, are greater. That is the thrust of both Government policy and the Structure Plan on this matter and, in focusing most development on the 5 towns, the Council has followed it and is continuing to do so. This is not to say that there should be no development whatsoever in the rural areas, including small rural settlements, beyond these towns. It should, however, be restricted, in acknowledgement of their limited size and more modest roles and functions. Hence my support in principle for Policies HO6 Housing Development in Village and HO13 Rural Exceptions Housing.

2.15.25 And so I do not support those Objectors who call for the expansion of village limits, although I presume that the Council will assess each village and any potential for expansion which it might have in its preparation of the LDF. At the same time, the Council should take a close look at all 72 villages for which limits are defined and decide whether each one has sufficient community facilities and good enough access to others to justify any additional housing.

2.15.26 My conclusion on this issue, therefore, is that the Local Plan rightly promotes most development in the main towns, but that an appropriately limited amount of development is likely to take place in some of those 72 villages where limits are defined provided that there are sufficient community facilities to justify it. This approach acknowledges that about 50% of the District’s population live outside the main towns and presumably therefore rely to a large extent upon the wider range of services and employment which the towns, and Plymouth, provide. That implies a good number of journeys, no doubt to a large extent by car. Whilst I accept that in some cases development in a village can help to retain a facility or make it more viable, as a general principle I can see no good reason for promoting a substantial amount of development outside the towns and thereby increasing the need to travel.

2.15.27 There are other matters relating mainly to particular settlements and sites. I deal with them in my consideration of various policies, for example PEL1, SN1 and SA2, and of Omission Sites etc. I accept the point made by Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd of the advantages of an applicant having control of land if a masterplan is to be prepared for a site of the size of, for example, Addington at Liskeard.

Continued overleaf
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO3

*LAND IS ALLOCATED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT THE TOWNS LISTED BELOW IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR ROLE AND FUNCTIONS:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
<th>SCALE OF DEVELOPMENT/DWELLINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liskeard</td>
<td>ALT11</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looe</td>
<td>ALT16</td>
<td>100 70 (in Phase 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callington</td>
<td>ALT21</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 625 695

*Chapter 5: Housing*
2.16 POLICY HO3: OMISSION SITE OS31 - LAND ADJACENT TO JACKS LANE, ST JOHN

Objection

First Deposit

F412/359 Mr P Keefe Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether, bearing in mind its location and character, this land is needed for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.16.1 This is an open site, formerly in horticultural use, adjoining the main built-up part of this small village. Both site and village are approached by narrow country lanes ill-suited for any additional traffic. Village facilities comprise mainly a public house, church, village hall, travelling shop, community bus and local taxis. There is no evidence of any other public transport service. Tesco Stores deliver, as is no doubt the case elsewhere in the District. There is not, therefore, a good range of community facilities. I am told that people would tend to work in Plymouth, Liskeard and Torpoint, a consideration which is hardly surprising. Development here would in all probability result in more trips by car to larger centres for more and better attractions, including employment. There is more than enough land likely to come forward during the plan period to meet Structure Plan requirements, and this Omission Site is not needed for housing for whatever number or type of dwellings. There are no material considerations which outweigh that conclusion.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.17 POLICY HO4: PHASING STRATEGY AND PARAGRAPH 5.26

Objections

First Deposit

F563/487 South West RSL Objection
F564/487 South West RSL Objection
F601/3 Cornwall County Council Objection
F645/523 House Builders Federation Objection
F679/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F803/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection conditionally withdrawn
F856/634 J Taylor Objection
F1104/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R186/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
R212/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
R320/487 South West RSL Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether, in the light of my conclusions and recommendation concerning Policies HO2 and HO3, Policy HO4 should be retained.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.17.1 Most of my conclusions concerning phasing are included in my examination of Policy HO3. There I say that a good deal less reliance than the Council proposes should be placed upon windfalls as a source of housing supply and that development will have to take place on greenfield land to meet Structure Plan requirements. I accept that, in certain circumstances, the re-development of a large, previously-developed site in a suitable location whose availability has been unforeseen might take precedence over a greenfield allocation. Policy HO2 should allow for such an event, and I therefore recommend that it includes such a sequence as a relevant matter. Nevertheless, for the reasons outlined in my examination of that Policy, the emphasis should be on maintaining the steady supply of housing, affordable and market, which the allocations should provide. That objective can better be achieved by their being unencumbered by the constraint of phasing.

2.17.2 To take account of that relevant matter and to undertake survey work for the preparation of its Local Development Framework, the Council should continue to monitor the level of previously-developed land coming forward for re-development and the number of dwelling completions upon it. For a variety of reasons which include exercises in valuation, availability and potential are not the same as actual dwellings built, and that should be acknowledged.

2.17.3 This provision of the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan is not a policy which relates to the use or development of land. It is more a statement of an intention to monitor decisions or actions which have already taken place. It would be better for it to appear as reasoned justification, amended as I recommend, and included within the text where the Council deems appropriate.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan be amended by the deletion of Policy HO4 and its contents replaced by the following reasoned justification:

The Council will continue to monitor the amount of previously-developed land becoming available for development and the number of dwellings completed upon it. This data will inform the Council in its reference to development plan policies, particularly Local Plan Policies HO2 and HO3, in its determination of applications for planning permission.
2.18  PARAGRAPH 5.28

Objection

Re-Deposit

R187/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this paragraph is superfluous.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.18.1 The Company says that this paragraph does seem somewhat superfluous, in view of the fact that the Council is effectively allocating only one site, phased over 2 time periods. I have no strong feelings on the matter, but I think the paragraph is better retained in the Local Plan than excised from it. I agree that development should take place in accordance with a comprehensive plan for the whole site rather than being developed in a piecemeal fashion. In this way, more use can be made of the opportunities and constraints that the site provides, and better account can be taken of the wider community need for social infrastructure provision related to the development. This is a good reason not to phase the development, a constraint which could delay the provision of much needed affordable housing. These sites should be developed, and continue to be developed, in a comprehensive fashion from the start and thereby ensure a steady increase in the number of dwellings which the District needs.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.

Chapter 5: Housing
2.19  PARAGRAPH 5.29

Objections

First Deposit

F1105/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the matter of design should be the subject of a policy.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusion

2.19.1  The Government attaches great importance to good design. As Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 puts it, *good design is indivisible from good planning*. This paragraph should stay, but the Council rightly retains an amended policy concerning design (Policy ALT2) in the Re-Deposit Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.20 PARAGRAPHS 5.32 & 5.34

Objections

First Deposit
F643/523 House Builders Federation Objection
F644/523 House Builders Federation Objection

Main Issue
a. Whether developers should be expected to bear the entire cost of the preparation of a masterplan.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.20.1 Masterplans, the procedures for their preparation and the allocation of the costs involved should be considered on a case-by-case basis. I think that it is always useful for a developer, a local planning authority and other interested parties to work together with the objective of producing a masterplan that all can support. Inevitably that means calling on the resources of all concerned. The Re-Deposit Plan paragraph 5.31 well makes these points, especially its reference to "partnership and the development team."

2.20.2 To say that the Council will require developers to fund a masterplan implies that the developer will have to pay for the Council’s time and everybody else’s, and I am a little uneasy about that. Any arrangements for funding would be better made, and hopefully agreed, by the parties. It would be better for the Local Plan to be silent on the matter rather than possibly prejudice the negotiations. Even so, some minor changes are required to the text, and I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

Paragraph 5.29
Prior to any planning permission being granted, the Council will require the preparation of a Masterplan for the sites listed above. The Masterplan should progress the broad list of requirements……..

Paragraph 5.31
Developers will be required to prepare a masterplan in partnership with the local planning authority. The Council will establish a “development team” to advance the proposals…….
2.21 POLICY ALT2: GENERAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES

Objections

First Deposit

F230a/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F381b/329 Ms NJ Ammar Objection
F673a/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F751a/10 Environment Agency Objection
F851/634 J Taylor Objection
F1126/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R73/27 Mr J Phare Objection
R254/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether, and if so to what extent, the Policy could be improved.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.21.1 In the Re-Deposit Plan, the Council has taken account of most of the valid points made at the First Deposit stage. Whilst the Policy applies primarily to proposals for residential development, I would expect it to be a relevant matter in respect of other schemes, including those for mixed uses. To that extent, it meets the objection which Mr J Taylor makes.

2.21.2 The CPRE makes a number of points about trees and landscaping. It would be unwise, however, to make the Policy too detailed or prescriptive in its requirements because every site is unique and will need its own special treatment. For example, it may not be practicable or desirable to screen every site with mature trees, nor to insist that no new development will be allowed on or close to the skyline. In my judgement, the policy in the Re-Deposit Plan provides a sound foundation for the Council in its promotion of good quality development and, as Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd rightly says, its principles should be amplified in the preparation of masterplans.

2.21.3 The Environment Agency refers to habitat creation and contribution to public transport and infrastructure. These are important matters, but the development plan should be read as a whole and national and other local policies can be brought to bear on them. Circular 5/2005, for example, sets out tests concerning planning obligations where contributions are sought from developers towards schools, playing fields, road improvements and other aspects of social infrastructure. The policy in the Re-Deposit Plan goes as far as it should in these respects.

2.21.4 The Government Office for the South West says that the Policy should include a criterion about optimising the potential of a site to accommodate development. I agree that this worthy objective has implications for design, but I consider that Policy ALT24 and its reasoned justification suitably cover the point. Mr Phare is concerned about the application of Criterion iii) of the Policy to Policy
ALT23 – Land West of Carkeel Services. There is nothing wrong, however, with this Criterion concerning suitable access arrangements, and I deal with the objections to Policy ALT23 later in my Report.

2.21.5 My main concern with the Policy is that I think that it should be more rigorously drafted. Applicants should be in no doubt about the importance which the Council, and the Government, attaches to good design. It is part of the concept of sustainable development, and the thrust of the Policy should be that planning permission will not be granted unless the proposal meets exacting criteria and hence is of sufficiently high quality. The proposal should accord with its surroundings, rather than the locality which would probably be more diverse in character. The Environment Agency’s reference to style is, I consider, covered in my recommended Criterion i).

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT2

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR A PROPOSAL UNLESS THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD:

I) BE COMPATIBLE IN ITS DESIGN WITH THE SURROUNDINGS IN TERMS OF SCALE, DENSITY, MASSING, HEIGHT AND MATERIALS OF CONSTRUCTION;

II) MAKE THE BEST USE OF LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND/OR TOPOGRAPHICAL FEATURES THAT MAKE A MATERIAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE CHARACTER OF THE AREA;

III) PROVIDE A SAFE AND CONVENIENT ACCESS FOR PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS AND THOSE WITH IMPAIRED MOBILITY OR SENSORY DIFFICULTIES;

IV) INCORPORATE HARD AND SOFT LANDSCAPING AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE DESIGN;

V) PROVIDE A SECURE ENVIRONMENT DESIGNED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE NEED FOR CRIME PREVENTION.
2.22 POLICY ALT3: SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

Objections

First Deposit

F18i/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F230b/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F595/3 Cornwall County Council Objection
F673b/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F751b/10 Environment Agency Objection
F757/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
F850/634 J Taylor Objection
F1127/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R125/523 House Builders Federation Objection
R164/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
R189/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
R255/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy could be improved and, if so, in which ways.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.22.1 The Council has revised this Policy in the light of objections made at the First Deposit stage, and I think that there is now very little scope for improvement to it. Some Objectors express concern about the meaning of Principles of Sustainability, but I would expect that most of us in the world of planning and development would be aware of them, as explained in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1. Nevertheless, maybe the Council will wish to include somewhere in the Local Plan the widely used definition of sustainable development drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987: development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

2.22.2 My recommended negative stance of the Policy does not accord with the general presumption in favour of development but, as PPS1 says, sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning. It is difficult to over-emphasise the importance of this Policy in promoting environmentally sustainable measures. For that reason I consider that its thrust should be that planning permission will not be granted for a proposal unless it accords with that core principle as expressed in the exacting and laudable criteria of the Policy. The Council agrees with this approach, as confirmed in its e-mail to the Programme Officer of 21 March 2007 (Document ID029A). In the Council’s determination of planning applications, some criteria will be more important than others. For example, not every scheme will have an area exposed to wind where shelter belt planting will be required. I am confident, however, that the Council will exercise its good judgement in according due weight to each clause of the Policy in the
circumstances of the case.

2.22.3 There may, of course, be additional ways of benefiting from renewable energy resources and the Policy should allow for them by indicating that the criteria are not exhaustive. Also, I think that the second introductory sentence of the Policy could be put in more positive terms. In more detail, I do not see that buildings must necessarily be in the vernacular as an Objector suggests, and so any reference to it would be misleading. Nor do I accept the points made by Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd that the criteria could be unduly prescriptive and inhibit innovative design or compromise higher densities. In the unlikely event that they did, presumably the Policy or any part of it could be outweighed by material considerations. Higher densities and the full and effective use of land should be part of the drive towards sustainability, and should therefore complement the criteria of Policy ALT3.

2.22.4 I agree with the Council that, in principle, occupiers should have the option of adapting and/or extending their homes. Some explanation of Criterion iii) would, however, be useful. I therefore endorse, with a few minor changes, the Council’s suggested addition to the reasoned justification as set out in the above-mentioned e-mail. The Council also accepts my suggestion that the contents of Criteria iv) and v) are not appropriate as criteria in a land use policy. They would be better placed in the reasoned justification.

2.22.5 As with Policy ALT2, I would expect that the intentions of the Policy would be amplified in masterplans for the larger, or more difficult, sites. I agree with the Council that it would be going beyond the scope of a land use policy to insist on making new housing as near zero energy input as possible and include solar panels, but the Council could certainly take these topics into account as material considerations.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT3

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR A PROPOSAL UNLESS IT IS CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT PROPER ACCOUNT HAS BEEN TAKEN OF THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABILITY IN THE CONSTRUCTION, DESIGN, ORIENTATION, LAYOUT AND SITING OF THE DEVELOPMENT. IN SEEKING TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABILITY, THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE REGARD TO SUCH MATTERS AS:

And then Criteria i), ii), iii) and vii) (should be vi!) in the Policy.

Reason. Developments should be designed with the potential to meet the changing needs of people and families over time. Masterplans, for example, should promote layouts which recognise that homes may need to be adapted for use in the future by the elderly and/or by people with disabilities. The need for some families to extend their homes should also be a consideration when submitting proposed layouts.

Where practicable, the Council will encourage the retention and refurbishment of existing buildings, the re-use of demolition waste for construction purposes and provision for the re-cycling and re-use of rainwater and/or grey water.
2.23 POLICY ALT24: DENSITY

Objections

Re-Deposit

R162/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
R190/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether a net residential density of 30-50 dwellings per hectare is appropriate.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.23.1 This standard accorded with national policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3 paragraph 58. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 states that local planning authorities may wish to set a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range although 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local density policies are in place. Policy ALT24 accords with the thrust of that policy, and it is appropriate in the local context.

2.23.2 It should be remembered, however, that density is but one consideration in the determination of a planning application. Also of relevance are policies on the efficient use of land which may call for a density higher than 50 dph, and those on design which may call for a lower one. These policies should complement, not conflict with, each other. I have no doubt that the Council will exercise its judgement as it attaches due weight to each of these policies and to any other material consideration according to the circumstances of the case. In other words, it will seek to make the best use of available housing land whilst still achieving high standards of layout and design, and that is exactly what paragraph 5.36 says.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.24 PARAGRAPH 5.38 AND POLICY HO5: HOUSING IN TOWNS

Objections

First Deposit

F245/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F270/236 W Gubbins Objection
F802/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection
F1106/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R8/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection
R257/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the development limits are too tightly drawn.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.24.1 There are as many as 72 villages for which development limits are drawn, and Objectors make the point that they are drawn too tightly and hence are strangling small villages. From what I have seen of many of the villages in the District, I agree that there is not a great deal of opportunity for new housing to take place in them. Bearing in mind national policy that housing developments should be promoted in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure, this is not necessarily a disadvantage for the reasons which I outline in my examination of Policy HO2.

2.24.2 I have considered extending village limits in my assessment of the Omission Sites but, owing to matters which include the limited range of facilities available and the less than good access to jobs etc, I conclude that at present the village limits concerned should stay as they are. Nevertheless, I suggest that in its preparation of the Local Development Framework the Council examines every village in the District, taking account of all relevant considerations like facilities, access and national and Regional policies, with a view to deciding whether any limits should be extended to accommodate additional housing.

2.24.3 The Government Office for the South West suggests that the box on page 20 in the First Deposit and page 23 in the Re-Deposit be part of an upper case policy related to Policies HO5 and HO6. I do not think that this would improve the clarity of either Policy or improve the Local Plan in any other way. It is a statement of fact that development limits are defined for the identified settlements, they are clearly shown on the Insets to the Proposals Map and I can see little point in presenting the list in any other way.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.25 POLICY HO12: SMALL DWELLINGS AND TOWN CENTRES

Objections

First Deposit

F228b/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F248/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F1119/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R210/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
R258/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy promotes sufficiently high densities;
b. Whether the Policy should specify the suitability of the small dwellings for first-time buyers, the elderly and other small households;
c. Whether there should be a restriction of permitted development rights on the type and size of dwellings which the Policy envisages.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.25.1 This Policy is unaltered, and so remains as it is in the adopted Local Plan apart from it being changed from H11 to HO12.

2.25.2 In the determination of planning applications, the development plan must be read as a whole along with statements of national policy and any other material considerations. Whilst at first sight and read in isolation, this Policy may imply insufficient weight being given to the need for higher densities, the Re-Deposit plan introduces a new policy, Policy ALT24 which suitably covers the point. Where circumstances and practicality allow, Policy HO12 would not prevent densities even higher than the 30-50 dwellings per hectare (dph) to which Policy ALT24 refers.

2.25.3 I accept the point made by the Government Office for the South West that higher densities should generally be sought everywhere, and it seems to me that that is the purpose of the District-wide Policy ALT24. In view of the often compact nature of development within and at the edge of town centres, it is reasonable for Policy HO12 to draw particular attention to the opportunities likely to be available there for complementary or higher densities.

* 

2.25.4 On the second issue, I do not consider that the attention given to these prospective occupiers adds a great deal to the thrust of the Policy. Small dwellings are usually suitable, by definition, for first time buyers, the elderly and other small households. But the Policy is not preventing their occupation by other persons, whoever they might be. These references draw attention to the size and type of dwellings likely to be suitable in high density town centre and similar locations and, on balance, I think that they should stay.
2.25.5 Thirdly, the Policy is silent on this point about restrictions, and I think correctly so. I agree with Mr Colin Breed MP about the costs of moving home and the not infrequent desire of occupiers to extend their homes as a result of, for example, a growing family. In a high density development, extensions may be unacceptable for a variety of reasons including appearance and disturbance to neighbours owing to overlooking, loss of privacy and dominance. Each case should be treated on its merits, with the Council basing its decision on policies concerning design, residential amenity and any other material consideration. The First Deposit paragraph 5.81 states that the Council may restrict permitted development rights to extend a dwelling. Presumably, and in line with my comments above, that is still the case.

2.25.6 On other matters, I note the point made by CPRE about the need for dwellings which first time buyers on average salaries can afford. I deal with this matter in more detail in my examination of Policy HO11 Affordable Housing. All I would say here is that the Council is well aware of this problem in the District, hence its encouragement of all types of affordable homes including Intermediate Dwellings which involves part ownership of a dwelling.

2.25.7 As I say, the development plan should be read as a whole, and there is no need for the Policy to cross-refer to others. Policies set out elsewhere for the protection of amenity and the environment will apply in any event. The last part of the Policy should be deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended by the deletion of the last paragraph of Policy HO12.
2.26 POLICY HO6: HOUSING IN VILLAGES

Objections

First Deposit

- F18c/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
- F209/215 Duloe Parish Council Objection
- F296/251a Mr Bray Objection
- F429/372 Mr A R Weatherhead Objection
- F600b/3 Cornwall County Council Objection
- F642/523 House Builders Federation Objection
- F677/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
- F764/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
- F774/575 J P Pascoe Objection
- F792/586 Country Land and Business Association - South Objection
- F801/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection
- F1107/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

- R9/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection
- R83/885 Catchfrench Design Objection
- R134/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
- R209/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
- R259/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
- R294/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether infill development should be limited to a small number, instead of to one or 2 dwellings, or whether it should allow a greater scale and thereby reduce pressure on greenfield land;

b. Whether limits are defined for too many villages with too few community facilities and poor access to facilities elsewhere;

c. Whether Criteria (a) - (d) in the First Deposit Plan should be deleted;

d. Whether the Policy state that any development which is permitted should not have an adverse effect on road conditions, and whether it should include a criterion to protect the rural character of villages and their historic and architectural value;

e. Whether there has been an adequate assessment of employment land in villages to ascertain its suitability for the purpose.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.26.1 Much of what I say here stems from my examination of Policy HO2 where I assess the Council’s proposed strategy for the distribution of growth in the District. As I explain in that part of my Report, a key consideration of national importance is the policy in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 that housing developments should be in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. I can see little point in encouraging a wide dispersal of development in settlements
with few facilities which will inevitably lead to yet more journeys by car, contrary to Government policy, as people travel to larger centres which offer a greater range of facilities and jobs. That is not to say that there should never be any additional development in villages, but in general it should be proportionate to the number and quality of facilities available. A balance has to be found.

2.26.2 It is difficult, if not impossible, to frame a policy which will anticipate every planning application in every village, but in my judgement the Council has got that balance about right in so far as this Policy is concerned. Bearing in mind the modest size of even the District’s larger rural settlements, their limited number of community facilities and the often infrequent public transport services, I consider that infill developments of no more than one or 2 dwellings would be acceptable in principle. Anything greater, specified or not, in this part of the Policy would give too much encouragement for too great a dispersal of development in this mainly rural District. There may, however, be instances where some of the largest villages could physically accommodate more dwellings which would be proportionate to its wider range of community facilities and services and its better access to larger settlements. St Cleer is a case in point, a village which includes within its defined development limits 2 parcels of land, both subject to representations at this Inquiry, where a larger scale of development would appear to be acceptable. The Policy allows for those circumstances, and it is a good basis for the determination of planning applications in villages. Reducing the pressure on greenfield land surrounding these villages would be better served by allocating land within and at the edge of the main towns.

2.26.3 Mr Wilks, on behalf of Catchfrench Design, makes good points about the need to secure an efficient and economic use of land. As a general proposition, this has much to commend it and national and local policies support it in principle. But again I see little prospect in encouraging a substantial amount of development in settlements with few community facilities and with poor access to larger service centres like the main towns in the District. To leave part of a developed site as available for future infilling seems to me to be a way of securing that substantial amount of development in stages, and I do not support that approach. On a related point, it would be unwise to specify a maximum plot size for individual dwellings even when related to plots available on surrounding land. This would too much fetter the Council’s discretion in its deliberations of particular proposals. Suitable plot size is more likely to depend upon the size, design and aspect of the proposed dwellings, its proximity to nearby development of whatever type, massing and the more general character and appearance of the surroundings.

2.26.4 On the second issue, the Alteration to the Local Plan does not propose any changes to village limits, and this would happen only as a result of land being allocated for development. The prospect of changes to them was discussed at the RTSs, but I consider that it would be wrong for the Council to assess all or most village limits in the District now, if only because that would delay adoption of the Alteration. The urgent need to adopt, and to give certainty to the housing allocations and other provisions, should take precedence. Mr and Mrs Jarvis say that the Policy should be changed to allow for proposals for residential development within village limits or adjacent vacant land. But this type of land might be at villages ill-suited to take such additional growth, and it could be taken as an invitation to owners to neglect their land as justification for its development. This would be too much of a hostage to fortune.

2.26.5 I urge the Council to assess existing village limits as part of its
preparation of the Local Development Framework. From what I have seen of the District’s villages and their community facilities etc, however, I suspect that there may be some scope for reducing the number of villages with these limits, but I am sure that the Council will proceed on more substantial evidence and in the light of such Government policy as PPS3 paragraph 10 concerning the need for housing developments to be in suitable locations. Any such reduced number of defined villages may, however, have to be further reviewed in the light of changing circumstances like the closure of a primary school or village shop or post office. Land use planning policies are not the only considerations taken into account when such decisions are made.

2.26.6 I consider the Omission Sites at, for example, Bray Shop, East Taphouse, Hatt and Polruan elsewhere in my Report.

2.26.7 On the third issue, the criteria are deleted in the Re-Deposit Plan. This is welcome. When considering community facilities and access to jobs etc, the Council should be concerned not only with their existence and number, but with their quality which can include frequency. A daily public transport link, for example, is of limited attraction where there is only one or 2 buses to a far away town. These criteria were a useful start, but all relevant matters should be considered “in the round”, rather than by ticking the proverbial boxes. This is the approach for which the Policy allows and is more in line with more recent Government policy in PPS3.

2.26.8 Fourthly, the Policy is essentially about settlement policy and it should stay that way. Other development plan and national policies relate to the matters indicated, and I am in no doubt that the Council will rely on them and any other material considerations as appropriate. Rather than adding clauses or criteria to the Policy, the cross-references should be excised. I recommend accordingly, and I have also brought the Policy more into line with PPS3 paragraph 10 and Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 paragraph 4.

2.26.9 On the last issue, the Council says that there is a quantifiable and continuing demand for employment land in the District, and that it is not aware of any significant employment sites within village boundaries that should be used for housing. I have not been provided with any compelling evidence to the contrary, and as a matter of principle it seems reasonable to me for the Council to protect land allocated for employment uses. This should assist in the generation of local jobs for local people, reduce commuting to work elsewhere and result in a more balanced, self-contained and sustainable community.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

**POLICY HO6**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHIN VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT LIMITS IN THE FORM OF INFILLING. SUCH DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LIMITED TO ONE OR TWO DWELLINGS UNLESS IT ACCORDS WITH POLICY HO13 OR THE VILLAGE**
HAS A GOOD RANGE OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND WITH GOOD ACCESS TO JOBS, KEY SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE THEREBY AVOIDING UNDUE RELIANCE ON THE NEED TO TRAVEL TO OTHER CENTRES, ESPECIALLY BY CAR.
2.27 POLICY HO6: PROPOSED OMISSION SITES OS17 & OS18 - LAND WEST OF ST MELLION & LANDS AT HATT

Objections

First Deposit

F427/370 Mr & Mrs I Shovell Objection
F769/571 Mr E Andreae-Jones Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether any of these 3 sites should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.27.1 Mr Andreae-Jones suggests the allocation for development of a large greenfield site to the west of the main built-up part of St Mellion. There is little that I can add to the Council’s appraisal of this land in Document CD/17, especially the comment that any development may have a substantial negative visual impact on the local rural environment. I would say that it certainly would have this impact and, irrespective of any screening provided by landscaping, it would be the actual presence of the development which would damage this attractive countryside.

2.27.2 St Mellion is a small settlement with few community facilities. Public transport comprises Services Nos 76 (Plymouth-Callington) and X8 (Plymouth-Bude). Combined, they offer a very generally hourly service to and from the 2 nearest towns, Saltash and Callington. As with all these buses serving a rural area, I have no doubt that they are highly valued by those people who rely on them, but I do not consider that they are sufficiently frequent to tempt many people from their cars. In all probability, further development in this small village would result in more people using their cars to avail themselves of the more extensive range of services, and employment in Plymouth and the District’s larger towns. This is not a suitable location for housing development and its allocation for that purpose would fly in the face of Government’s housing policy objectives and the Council’s settlement strategy, which for the most part I support.

2.27.3 Similar considerations apply to the 2 sites at Hatt. Mr and Mrs Shovell suggest the allocation of land fronting the A388 road lying to the south of the main built-up part of this settlement. It is used at present as a recreation ground, an amenity which would be lost, or presumably lost to a significant extent, as a result of any development upon it. I note, however, the statement on behalf of Mr and Mrs Shovell that it is envisaged that the recreation facilities on the site would be retained, and I am willing to accept that this would be so. As the adopted Local Plan states, Hatt is almost entirely a post-war creation. It has few immediate community facilities. They comprise mainly a shop/post office, admittedly with a good range of everyday shopping needs and services, and the recreation ground. There appear to be few local jobs, being mainly in the shop/post office and at the garage/petrol filling station/repair business. These facilities, within the main built-up part of the settlement, are within safe and convenient walking distance of the main residential areas.

2.27.4 There is no primary school, and so children have to be taken by school
bus to Botus Fleming, just over one kilometre away, where a village hall, church and public house are to be found. There is a public house/restaurant (Holland Inn Hotel) on the A388 road which, like the Tamar View complex with its garden centre, aquacentre and shops etc, is physically within walking distance of Hatt. Other community facilities in the general locality are as Mr and Mrs Jarvis describe. Owing to the location of these facilities and/or the approach to them along a busy road with few dedicated crossing points and often with fast moving traffic, access to them by foot or cycle is not good. Those parts of the carriageway of the A388 road between the white lines and the grass verge, as well as the verge, are available for use by pedestrians, but the lack of a properly separated, dedicated and well marked footway and the presence of street lights only at, and at the approaches to, the roundabout, do not encourage this form of sustainable transport. Whilst trips under 2 km for walking and 5 km for cycling have the potential to replace the car, I consider that the uninviting nature of the A388 road to the pedestrian and the dispersed nature of many of the facilities would almost certainly lead to a greater use of the private car. In that regard I note the Secretary of State’s comments concerning land at East Taphouse that there is a reasonable range of local facilities close together (CD/75). That is not the case at Hatt.

2.27.5 The A388 road provides quick and convenient access by car to Callington, Saltash and thence to Plymouth. I agree with the point made on behalf of Mr and Mrs Shovell that it offers good commuter links with Plymouth and major conurbations in north-east Cornwall. But, as with St Mellion, I do not consider that the bus service is sufficiently frequent to tempt people from their cars to any great extent. The Services 76/X8 Plymouth-Callington and Plymouth-Bude respectively stops at the Post Office about once an hour or so in each direction during weekdays and there is a reduced service at week-ends. Buses to Plymouth pass employment sites at Tamar View, Carkeel and the industrial estates on the northern edge of Saltash, as well as Saltash itself with its good range of shops and a Health Centre. Service 259 (Tavistock-Plymouth) operates between these 2 destinations every third Saturday in the month. It is provided by Tavistock Community Transport and calls at the Post Office only by request to the driver. The Waitrose free bus service for Hatt runs once on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and twice on Thursdays. The paucity of immediately accessible community services at Hatt and the infrequent buses which serve it would inevitably result in yet more journeys being made by car to the larger centres. Furthermore, a development on this land would be visually intrusive in the rural surroundings and is not justified. There is no case for the allocation of this land for housing.

2.27.6 At the Inquiry, my colleague Dr D Robins heard the objections lodged by Mr and Mrs Jarvis concerning their land at Cross Farmhouse, Hatt. This arrangement was made for reasons explained at the Pre-Inquiry Meeting held on Tuesday 8th August 2006 at the Public Hall, Liskeard. I set out below in full his Report to me. I entirely agree with it. I have changed only the paragraph numbers so that they accord with mine.

Continued overleaf
Land at Hatt

Objectors

Mr and Mrs C Jarvis

Issues

Whether the village development boundary of Hatt should be redrawn to include the omission site and allocate it for residential development.

Inspector’s note

2.27.7 This land was considered in the context of a duly-made objection to Policy HO6.

Inspector’s appraisal and conclusions

2.27.8 The site was formerly an authorised caravan site but that use was abandoned as uneconomic. It is now used for recycling demolition waste and activity ancillary to the objectors’ nearby dwelling, Cross Farmhouse, and could accommodate about 8 dwellings.

2.27.9 The recently reviewed Cornwall Structure Plan requires a substantial reduction in the rate of house building in the County. Far from encouraging opportunities for expanding housing growth in villages, that objective is reflected in the Local Plan Alteration in the fewer sites now allocated in Table HO3 and changes in the planning strategy for residential development. The Plan makes a sharp distinction between development in towns and that in villages, the latter being confined to infilling and windfall plots within village development limits.

2.27.10 The settlement of Hatt enclosed by the Local Plan development limit line consists almost entirely of adventitious modern residential growth in an open rural area, together with a petrol filling station with repair garage and village store and post office adjoining the A388 road which skirts the village. There are dwellings dating from the pre-1939, 1968-85, and post-1985 periods to the north-east, north, and west respectively of the objection site and the open land of the village recreation ground lies to the south. The general issue of the distinction between country and town in respect of housing distribution in the District as a whole is considered elsewhere in this Report in relation to Policies HO1, HO2, HO3, HO6, and HO11.

2.27.11 Whereas the Plan Alteration has not included a review of village development limits the objectors submit that an adjustment of it would be appropriate in the case of Hatt on the ground of the sustainability of the settlement as a location for residential development. In support of that the nexus of activity alongside the A388 road is cited. Other sources of employment near Hatt, such as the landfill site to the south, the main road hotel outside the settlement and a bakery are dispersed in the open countryside in a way typical of rural areas. On the other hand I note that such traditional village facilities as a village hall, parish church, and primary school are located about a kilometre distant at Botus Fleming and accessible from Hatt by a typically narrow minor rural road. The character of Hatt, by contrast and notwithstanding its good main road communications with
Saltash and onward to Plymouth, is more that of a detached suburb in open country.

2.27.12 I attach no material weight to the fact that Hatt is readily adjacent to the facilities of Saltash and also falls within the penumbra of Plymouth, the regional service centre. To accept that as a reason for the expansion of the village would in my view open the way to the suburbanisation of any village at a similar distance on a main road from one of the District’s towns. Rather do I regard it important that the re-deposited First Alteration’s policy limits to residential development in the rural areas of the District be supported.

2.27.13 While on a year by year basis windfall development in Caradon District may be unpredictably volatile it appears to me that there is minimum opportunity for it within the Hatt village boundary. However, I do not regard that as a justification to change the boundary to permit the allocation of the objection site for housing. While, in common with other villages generally, people may want to live in Hatt I have seen no convincing evidence that they need to live there. In the context of the Policies cited above I find no reason to recommend the adjustment of the development limit sought by the objectors.

2.27.14 If the village development limit be not changed, proposals for residential development will fall to be determined under Policy HO7. Section (i) of that Policy allows consideration of the objection land as a site for affordable housing consistent also with paragraph 5.38 and Policy HO13 of the Plan. However, Section (ii) sets rigorous criteria making the siting of any single dwelling reliant on the distinctive local employment needs of the occupant’s workplace and not to housing for the general market.

Recommendations

(i) That the village development boundary of Hatt be not changed to include this objection site;

(ii) That this objection site be not allocated for residential development.
2.28 POLICY HO6: PROPOSED OMISSION SITES - LAND WEST OF ST CLEER (OS20) AND AT THE REAR OF THE STAG HOTEL (OS21) AND LAND AT THE REAR OF LODDONVILLE, ST CLEER

Objection

First Deposit

F363/311  Mrs H L Lawrence  Objection
F702/537a  Mr C & Mrs J Bolitho  Objection

Further Deposit

E10/911  Southern Properties  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether St Cleer is a sufficiently sustainable settlement to justify the allocation of land in it for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.28.1 St Cleer is one of the larger settlements in the District with a population of just over 2000. Not surprisingly, however, its range and number of community facilities are limited when compared with those in the towns. They include a conveniently located primary school within the main built up area which I consider to be an especially important aspect of sustainability, a church, shop and post office, 2 public houses and a village hall. There is a bus every hour or so to and from Liskeard and Callington via Pensilva (Service 574) on Mondays to Saturdays, the first one leaving St Cleer Church at 0657 hrs bound for Liskeard. The last bus leaves Liskeard at 1835 hrs. This frequency, available during only a limited part of the day, would be unlikely to tempt many people from their cars. There appears to be few local jobs, and those residents in employment presumably travel mainly to larger centres which include Liskeard, Callington and Plymouth. There is no secondary school or supermarket. Further development in the village would almost inevitably result in more journeys to them, especially by car.

2.28.2 There are, however, special considerations which apply to the land at the rear of The Stag public house and that at the rear of Loddonville. They are both logically contained within the village development limits and this, together with the community facilities which do exist and the concept of proportionality which Policy HO6 rightly includes, qualify these 2 sites for consideration in the context of that Policy. That being the case, I agree with Southern Properties that paragraph 19.02 of the Local Plan Liskeard Area Statements is misleading. This says that development on the remaining larger sites will be limited to schemes designed to meet the needs of those unable to compete in the local housing market, through the application of the Council’s Affordable Housing Policy. This seems to me to imply that schemes which accorded with Policy HO13 Rural Exception Housing would be the only ones which would be acceptable. Welcome though that would be to those in need of affordable housing, it would be unreasonable to insist on such an approach for land located almost entirely within the built up area and within the defined village development limits. As the Council agrees with the Company, that

Chapter 5: Housing 68
sentence should be deleted from the Local Plan.

2.28.3 In my judgement, the Council is suggesting the best way forward. Rightly, it has no objection in principle to residential development on either of these 2 sites. Key considerations in the determination of any planning applications for them would be their location within the village development limits, the sufficiency of community facilities in the particular circumstances which I have outlined and Policy HO11 with its minimum requirement of 40% affordable homes. There is no need to allocate either of these sites in that their location and mainly residential surroundings establishes, in principle, their suitability for housing.

2.28.4 Different considerations apply to the small site which lies to the west of the main built up part of the village and adjacent to Hockings House. This is essentially because it lies outside the village development limits. This is the Omission Site to which Mrs H L Lawrence’s Objection refers. It is part of an area of open countryside which flows between 2 built up parts of the village and there is no justification for the intrusion of sporadic development into it.

2.28.5 My conclusion on this issue is that residential development of land within the defined village limits is justified in proportion to the number and quality of community facilities in the village, in accordance with Policy HO6. There is, however, no need to allocate the 2 sites concerned. The allocation, or any other identification of OS20, for development is unjustified.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Local Plan Liskeard Area Statements be amended by the deletion in its paragraph 19.02 of the sentence italicised in the above paragraph 2.28.2 of my Report, and that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.29 POLICY HO6: PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS25 - LAND EAST OF EAST TAPHOUSE

Objection

First Deposit

F272/236 Mr W Gubbins Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the village limits should be extended to include this site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.29.1 There is little evidence in the representations about community facilities, but I noted at my inspection that they include a community hall and a petrol filling station. Buses are infrequent, being no more than the occasional No 293 St Austell-Truro service provided by Roselyn Coaches and the No 593 Bodmin-Truro Connections provided by Western Greyhound. I see from Document CD/69 that every effort will be made to make connections but they cannot always be guaranteed. This does not amount to the good range of community facilities to which Planning Policy Statement (PPS) refers. The almost inevitable result would be more journeys being made from this rural location to larger centres like Liskeard for jobs, shopping, education, leisure and other purposes, especially by car.

2.29.2 The Omission Site is almost twice the size of the previously-developed land which is the subject of the planning permission granted by the Secretary of State on 30 August 2006 for the construction of 31 dwellings and garages, including 21 affordable dwellings, and a new vehicle/pedestrian access (APP/K0805/V/05/1175951). The point is illustrated by the plans in Document ID040A Appendix 2. In granting this permission, the Secretary of State accepted that while there was no Regional Spatial Stategy (RSS) policy justification for 10 open market houses the provision of 21 affordable dwellings would accord with RSS Policy SS6. She agreed that there was no Structure Plan support for open market housing in rural locations, but that the affordable housing part of the development would meet the needs of the local population and would generally accord with the sustainability objectives of Structure Plan Policy 1. The urgency of the local need for affordable housing contributed, she states, to a strong justification for the acceptability in principle of the proposed development.

2.29.3 On behalf of Mr Gubbins, Mr Graham Savage says that the Secretary of State’s decision was granted under exceptional circumstances. The Council agrees, and in view of the emphasis which the Secretary of State placed upon the affordable housing part of the proposal, that is fair comment. The circumstances which apply in the determination of a particular planning application are not the same as those in the adjudication on an Objection concerning a larger Omission Site. It would be wrong to re-define the village limits to include either the application site or the Omission Site. If that change were made and the extant permission lapsed or was not fully implemented, any future alternative proposal for residential development would be determined with reference to Policies HO6 and
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HO13 and the latter’s requirement for the provision of a minimum contribution of 40% affordable housing. The extant permission is for a good deal more, 68%. Maybe this permission will be exercised, but that is no reason to allocate the larger Omission Site.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no modification be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.30 POLICY HO6: PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS30 - LAND ADJACENT TO LOWER HOUNSTER, MILLBROOK

Objection

First Deposit

F426/376  Peter West  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.30.1 This land is located to the west of the main built-up area of the village and includes part of a disused quarry. From such evidence as is provided, I conclude that there is not a wide range of community facilities in the village. The Council’s evidence is that there is a primary school, post office, surgery, pharmacy and petrol filling station, but no secondary school, bank, dentist, leisure centre, library, supermarket or hospital. The bus service between Polperro and Plymouth is infrequent, being generally about once an hour to each of these destinations during the main part of the day (Service 80). Another service (Service 270) is offered by A Line Travel, one bus a day Monday-Friday, to and from Liskeard and Trago Mills. This does not constitute good access by public transport to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Residential development of the scale proposed in this village would be bound to result in more journeys by car to larger centres, contrary to national policy.

2.30.2 Access to the land is poor, being a narrow road with no proper footways. Bearing in mind also the sufficiency of the land supply in the District, including proposed allocations at Liskeard, Looe and Callington, there is no need to extend the built up part of the village into its attractive rural setting which is designated an Area of Great Landscape Value. The land should not be allocated for development.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.31 POLICY HO7: HOUSING IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

Objections

First Deposit

F5/18 Mark Simon Objection
F432/372 Mr A R Weatherhead Objection
F451/388 Mr William John Knight Objection
F452/389 Mr O Wright Objection
F453/390 Mr B Rake Objection
F454/391 Gareth Price Objection
F455/392 Margarita Mentis Objection
F629/513 Miss L Mentis Objection
F749/567 Jim Morton Objection
F783/580 Mr Anthony H Waters Objection
F792/586 Country Land and Business Association - South Objection
F841/626 Tim Young Objection
F1108/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R98/890 CB Ellis Objection
R135/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
R260/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
R295/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy should take into account applications for affordable housing associated with small-scale agriculture or other sustainable land projects;

b. Whether Criterion c) which stipulates that the dwelling must be adjacent to the associated business or existing buildings where practicable is appropriate;

c. Whether the reference to another activity besides agriculture should be deleted.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.31.1 The main context for this Policy is national policy expressed in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 which is that new building development in open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled. The Government’s overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all. In similar vein, Structure Plan Policy 26 Rural Areas says that development outside villages should be controlled to protect the countryside and requires special justification. In few places can those policies be more apt than in Caradon, with its stunning rural scenery and for the most part lovely settings of the built-up areas. Put another way, any development in the countryside beyond the defined limits of settlements, which would include allocated land, should take place only in very rare
circumstances.

2.31.2 The matter in the first issue has an beguiling attraction about it, but planning permission should not be granted for residential development, affordable or otherwise, in open countryside solely on the basis that the proposed project is for small-scale agriculture or similar. Any such criterion would not be sufficiently exacting, would be a hostage to fortune and could result in a proliferation of development in the rural areas, contrary to national, Regional and County policies. As Policy HO7 rightly states, there should be a functional need for the intending occupier to live on site rather than in a settlement and the business must be viable and sustainable in the long run. In my experience, it is not unusual for a local planning authority to include criteria of this nature in policies for the protection of the countryside, and with good reason.

2.31.3 I do not dispute Mr Simon’s and Mr Wright’s point that small scale farming enterprises have shown themselves to be profitable, often selling produce direct to the public, and that they contribute to the local economy and provide a useful outlet for fresh vegetables etc. Provided that the reasonable criteria of the Policy and those which complement it are met, I do not see that such ventures, including associated residential accommodation, would necessarily be prevented.

2.31.4 Any dilution of the Policy or any distinctions within it concerning sustainable and unsustainable development would weaken the Council’s hand in its worthy objective of protecting the countryside. There is nothing to stop the Council having regard to the 15 criteria to which these 2 gentlemen refer, but it is better for the Policy to be soundly based based upon the long established principles in PPS7, as it is. The Council and prospective developers could, of course, have regard to various criteria set out in the quoted Milton Keynes Local Plan Policy H11 in the construction and appearance of any new dwellings which are built in the countryside, but only in the exceptional circumstances which must continue to apply.

2.31.5 Mr C B Ellis says that the Policy is much more restrictive than PPS7 which is Government policy to support the rural economy. The Policy is designed, however, to apply to that limited number of occasions when an application is made for planning permission for a new dwelling in the countryside. Its thrust is to strike a balance between the demand for suitable, acceptable and justifiable development in the countryside and the need to protect this vital aspect of Cornwall’s heritage. In my judgement, the Policy is well in line with the Government’s key principles in promoting sustainable development in rural areas and, in principle, I support it. It does not undermine the general intention set out in PPS7 that local planning authorities should support a wide range of economic activity in rural areas by, for example, identifying suitable sites for future economic development.

*  

2.31.6 On the second issue, I think the drafting would benefit from a minor change. A dwelling that is adjacent to the associated business might not necessarily be well-related to it, this being the term used in PPS7 Annex A. I see no reason to stray from national policy in this case, and I recommend accordingly. This is perhaps one of the few policies, and perhaps the only policy, where I consider that a cross-reference to another Policy, Policy HO13, is useful.

*  

2.31.7 Thirdly, the Government Office for the South West says that the scope of the Policy, extending to activities other than agriculture and forestry,
appears to conflict with guidance in PPS7 Annex A. Its paragraph 15, however, acknowledges that there may be instances where special justification exists for new isolated dwellings associated with other rural-based enterprises, and the Policy rightly allows for them. I do not agree with the Cornwall County Council, however, that the reasoned justification should detail what business activities and evidence of reasons for activities in the countryside. That could make it difficult for the Council to refuse planning permission for a proposal which might be said to accord with the reasoned justification, but did not meet the exacting criteria of the Policy. The Policy goes as far as it should in this respect, and provides the right context for the determination of every application for planning permission on its merits.

2.31.8 There are a few other matters. In so far as Policy HO13 allows for the development of Rural Exception Sites for affordable housing, Mr Weatherhead’s objection is met. These sites should, however, be solely for that purpose. Mr Morton will note the Council’s more modest ambitions for Callington since the First Deposit stage, following the Structure Plan’s reduced housing requirements for the District.

2.31.9 Finally, I consider that the Policy would benefit from some fine tuning to emphasise its restrictive approach to applications for planning permission for each individual dwelling. I say that because I consider that the countryside in the District should be afforded all the protection which the planning system can provide.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO7

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR A NEW DWELLING OUTSIDE A TOWN OR VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT LIMIT DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP UNLESS:

(i) IT PROVIDES AFFORDABLE........

(ii) IT IS REQUIRED FOR A PARTICULAR WORKER TO LIVE WHERE S/HE WORKS........

(a) As stated

(b) As stated

(c) THE DWELLING IS SITED SO AS TO MEET THE IDENTIFIED FUNCTIONAL NEED AND TO BE WELL-RELATED TO EXISTING BUILDING(S)

(d) As stated

(e) As stated.
2.32 POLICY HO8: CONVERSION OF BUILDINGS

Objections

First Deposit

F18d/31  Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F50a/12  English Nature Objection
F246/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F345/13  English Heritage Objection
F660/524 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
F676/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F1109/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R90/888 Ms Teresa Patterson Objection
R296/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy should allow for the conversion of non-residential buildings to recreational and/or tourism uses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.32.1 In respect of the first issue, I consider that the Policy is drafted for the most part in line with Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 and there is no good reason to stray from it. This states that re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations and for some types of buildings. These purposes are broad enough to include the industrial, recreational and tourism uses to which English Heritage and English Nature refer. Economic development purposes and tourism also includes, I consider, holiday lets. There is no need for any such elaboration in the Policy or its reasoned justification, the PPS will remain a material consideration and the Council can rely on it when need be to supplement development plan policies.

2.32.2 This preference or sequential approach implies, and in my judgement requires, that the Council must first be satisfied that there is no realistic prospect of conversion for economic development purposes before it considers a residential use. For that reason, but subject to my adjudication on the Objection made by English Heritage, I consider that Criterion i) that evidence is given that every reasonable attempt to secure a suitable business use has been made is eminently suitable. Any advertising of the property for economic development purposes should reflect its market value for those purposes, not the more likely higher value if converted to residential use. If that evidence is forthcoming, a live/work development might be considered, as the Cornwall County Council suggests. Indeed, Criterion i) may well already provide for such a use, depending upon the proportion of uses.

2.32.3 If the Policy is to have teeth, the criterion should be regarded as mandatory, the word which Ms Patterson uses. In fact, as I recommend, I would put this clause of the Policy in stronger terms to anticipate and deal with any
suspiciously high asking prices or demanding and/or restrictive terms such as short leases. Ms Patterson refers to previous planning applications and their determination, but it is not for me to review the Council’s decisions, even if I had the complete files before me. She also refers to planning policies in Kerrier District, but it would be wrong for me to comment on its Council’s apparent suggestion that residential proposals should be equally considered. These considerations do not persuade me to set aside national policy and the Council’s amplification of it to its District. I have therefore taken this preference for economic development purposes into account in my estimates of windfalls in the rural areas.

2.32.4 The Policy should not encourage the conversion of these buildings for affordable homes, as Mr Colin Breed MP suggests. I note the Council’s reference to conversations between its Housing Department staff and Registered Social Landlords (RSL) in the area, and the high cost of conversions, but irrespective of that and in land use planning terms the priority should continue to be for economic development purposes, as national policy requires. Dwellings in remote locations are often far from a good range of community facilities and with poor access to them, especially for households without their own means of transport. As PPS7 says, local planning authorities should strictly control new house building (including single dwellings) in the countryside, away from established settlements or from areas allocated for development in development plans. The spirit of this policy complements the preference which national policy requires.

2.32.5 There are other matters. English Heritage prefers economic development purposes, not business re-use as in Criterion i) of the Policy. The preference accords better with national policy in PPS7 paragraph 17 and I am not persuaded by the Council’s arguments that there is any good reason to depart from it.

2.32.6 Criterion iv) is of similar form and intent as Criterion iii) in the adopted Local Plan, and that should meet the point which Steve and Vanessa Killops make. The Council says that the Site has not yet been allocated as having World Heritage status. I am not told which site it is, but I agree that it would be premature to include any such reference.

2.32.7 I would suggest that Criterion vii) be more specific, better to assist the Council in its determination of planning applications.

2.32.8 I very much welcome Criterion viii) with its concern for nature conservation interests. I agree with English Nature that there may be justification in some cases for the Council to insist on the provision of replacement breeding sites, but that would be adequately covered and better effected by way of condition or obligation.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO8

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR THE CHANGE OF USE OR CONVERSION OF NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS TO DWELLINGS OUTSIDE TOWN AND VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT LIMITS UNLESS:
i) **COMPELLING EVIDENCE IS GIVEN THAT EVERY REASONABLE ATTEMPT HAS BEEN MADE, BUT WITHOUT SUCCESS, TO SECURE A SUITABLE RE-USE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES, OR THE RESIDENTIAL CONVERSION WOULD BE A SUBORDINATE PART OF A SCHEME FOR SUCH DEVELOPMENT;**

ii-vi) As stated

vii **A SAFE ACCESS CAN BE PROVIDED, AND THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE AND/OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY.**

viii) As stated.
2.33 PARAGRAPH 5.44 AND POLICY HO9: CONVERSION OF LISTED BUILDINGS

Objections

First Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector/Agency</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F18e/31</td>
<td>Steve &amp; Vanessa Killops</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F344/13</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F814/600</td>
<td>Robert Winter</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1110/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy is necessary.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.33.1 The Government Office for the South West considers the Policy to be an unnecessary duplication/elaboration of Policy EV3 in the adopted Local Plan. I agree. Neither the Paragraph nor the Policy is retained in the Re-Deposit Plan, and rightly so.

2.33.2 I have read with great interest the statement by English Heritage about the conversion of historic farm buildings. No doubt this guidance is already taken into account, but nonetheless I commend it for the Council’s continued attention.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.34 POLICY HO10: REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

Objections

First Deposit

F763/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
F1111/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R154/899 Mrs Sue Daniel Objection
R261/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether Criterion i), which requires that a replacement or rebuilt dwelling would be of a size and scale similar to that being replaced, is reasonable.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.34.1 The reasoned justification admirably explains the purpose of this criterion, and there is little that I can add to it. The replacement of small, or modest sized dwellings, by significantly larger ones can be intrusive in the landscape and the damage can be aggravated as a result of inappropriate design and/or re-siting. The criterion is reasonable and should stay. In this context, I am not sure what the difference is between the size and scale of a new dwelling, but I will leave that point for the Council to ponder.

2.34.2 I agree with the Government Office of the South West that Criterion iii) in the First Deposit Plan appertains to the legal question of whether there is an established dwelling. If there isn’t, there isn’t an "existing dwelling" in the first place. Rightly, the criterion does not appear in the Re-Deposit Plan. The Objector points out that the purpose of the Policy is to ensure that the net effect of a development should not be of harm to the countryside, and that it should not deal with circumstances that arise only occasionally. In principle, I agree, but I suspect that the Council has drafted Criterion iii) in the Re-Deposit Plan on the basis of its experience. On that assumption, it should stay.

2.34.3 The intention of the Policy is to protect the countryside. Owing to the beauty of the District’s countryside, this is a worthy objective and the restrictive nature of the Policy should be emphasised. The second clause and the second sentence of Criterion iii), however, is advice on how the Policy will be applied, not policy itself. I recommend accordingly.

2.34.4 Mrs Daniel’s objection appears to be to Policy HO13 concerning Rural Exception sites for affordable housing. I deal with it in my examination of that Policy.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO10

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR THE REPLACEMENT OR REBUILDING OF A DWELLING OUTSIDE TOWN AND VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT LIMITS UNLESS THE NEW DWELLING WOULD BE:

i) OF A SIZE AND SCALE........

ii) COMPATIBLE WITH........

iii) SITED ON THE FOOTPRINT OF THE EXISTING DWELLING.

Where siting elsewhere within the curtilage would cause less damage to the countryside, an alternative position would be acceptable. In cases where the Council has agreed to a different siting, arrangements must be in place for the demolition of the existing dwelling, and removal of the material, upon completion of the replacement or re-built dwelling.
2.35 PARAGRAPHS 5.46 - 5.72

Objection

First Deposit

F641/523 House Builders Federation Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the contents of Paragraph 5.46 would be better included in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.35.1 These contents are reduced in length in Paragraph 5.47 in the Re-Deposit Plan and give a useful introduction to the subject of Affordable Housing. The Council says that more detailed guidance will be given in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which makes good sense. There is no need to change Paragraph 5.47, hence my recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.36 PARAGRAPH 5.49

Objection

Re-Deposit

R208/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether low-cost market housing can meet any of the District’s affordable housing needs.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.36.1 Although I note the conclusions of the Council’s Housing Needs Survey, I would not rule out the possibility during the plan period of low cost market housing contributing towards housing need in the District. The main point arising from this Objection, however, is that the Government defines affordable housing as including social-rented and intermediate housing. This definition excludes low-cost market housing.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended so that the second sentence of the first part of Paragraph 5.49 is as follows:

The Government defines affordable housing as including social-rented and intermediate housing; this definition excludes low-cost market housing.
2.37  PARAGRAPHS 5.49 - 5.67

Objections

- F269/236 W Gubbins Objection
- F570/487 South West RSL Objection
- F762/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
- F1112/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
- F1114/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
- F1115/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

- R191/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
- R192/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
- R205/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
- R206/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
- R207/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
- R262/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
- R264/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
- R319/487 South West RSL Objection

Main Issue

- a. Whether the Local Plan gives sufficient policy guidance concerning mix and choice of housing;
- b. Whether the importance of Section 106 Agreements should be highlighted in securing the perpetuity of the affordable accommodation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.37.1 Much of the Housing Chapter in the First Deposit Plan has been re-written to take account of the concerns of the Government Office for the South West and of other Objectors. I am therefore focusing my conclusions on the Re-Deposit Plan.

2.37.2 The Re-Deposit Plan does give sufficient policy guidance on these 2 matters. Paragraph 5.32 is useful context for the promotion of 60% open market, and 40%, affordable housing. Of the 40% affordable homes, 65% are intended to be social rented, and 35% intermediate. I comment in more detail later on the reasonableness of these percentages, but I doubt whether any additional policies in the Local Plan would make much difference to the completed residential schemes.

2.37.3 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd says that Paragraph 5.66 is overly prescriptive in terms of the size, location and design of where affordable housing should be provided. I disagree. It gives helpful guidance to prospective developers, as a prelude to their pre-application discussions with the Council, of likely requirements. It accords with Government policy in PPS3 for the creation of mixed and sustainable communities.

2.37.4 Secondly, a Section 106 Agreement is not the only way of securing perpetuity. Both Policies HO11 and HO13 provide for it, although I consider that the relevant criteria in them are more by way of explanation of how the Policies will...
be applied, rather than being part of a land use policy. I deal with this point and with others which Objectors raise, including Housing Corporation rent levels, when I examine these 2 Policies. Mr Gubbins’s point about allowing housing developments to include “affordable development” appears to me to be the main purpose of Policy HO11.

2.37.5 On another matter, South West RSL says that the Local Plan should acknowledge the need for key worker housing in the District, but the Council’s view is that there is no evidence of such a need. I see nothing to stop a key worker being housed in social-rented or intermediate housing, provided relevant criteria are met. There is no need to make the point in the Local Plan.

2.37.6 The Council published a Housing Needs Survey in 2002 and a research paper Affordable Housing in Caradon in 2005. It refers to a new Housing Needs Survey being undertaken in 2006. I am in no doubt that the Council is ensuring that its policies and decisions are being made on the basis of the most recent information. No doubt this will continue to be updated. The reasoned justification should be updated to reflect PPS3 and the 2006 Housing Needs Survey. Paragraph 12 of my letter to the Council’s Chief Executive applies.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
2.38 POLICY HO11: AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TOWNS AND VILLAGES, POLICY HO13: RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING & PARAGRAPHS 5.68, 5.69 AND 5.72

Objections

The Objections are set out in Appendix 3.

Main Issues

a. Whether the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing on relevant sites is justified;

b. Whether the reduction of the threshold from 15 to 10 dwellings in towns, and from 5 to 3 dwellings in villages, would so affect the financial viability of a proposal that it would reduce the likelihood of residential schemes coming forward, and hence reduce the provision of affordable housing;

c. Whether there should be scope for the provision of affordable housing off-site by way of financial contributions and/or for the cross-subsidy of affordable housing by open market housing on sites outside, but adjoining development limits;

d. Whether development limits should be redrawn to allow for residential schemes to comprise or include affordable housing;

e. Whether there is much likelihood of Rural Exception sites (Policy HO13) coming forward and being developed solely for affordable housing, and whether the criterion is justified which relates more than 6 dwellings to sufficient services, including community facilities;

f. Whether the size of affordable housing should be stipulated, and permitted development rights restricted; and whether the Local Plan should specify tenure mix.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

2.38.1 I held a Round Table Session (RTS) on Affordable Housing on Wednesday 29 November 2006 which was reconvened on Friday 26 January 2007. I have taken account of all the points made by participants on those 2 occasions, as well as the written representations made by all the Objectors. The main issues which I identify are inter-related, each one having some effect on one or more of the others. Nevertheless, I deal with them separately as far as is practicable.

2.38.2 One crucial point to bear in mind is that, as Mr Clark convincingly explains on behalf of Sunnybanks Homes, every site is unique in terms of size, location and other physical characteristics, and I agree that the economics of development are bound to vary from one site to another. The availability or otherwise of public subsidy from whatever source is likely to be an important factor. All parties agree that there is an acute shortage of affordable housing in the District which will get worse for the reasons which Mr Clark and others outline unless effective measures are undertaken to remedy it.
2.38.3 There is no dispute about the urgent need for affordable homes. As in all parts of the country including the South West, the price of housing on the open market has risen substantially in recent times due to a variety of factors, including the demand for second homes. The Local Plan refers to an annual shortfall of 556 affordable dwellings, and the Council estimates that 634 are now required every year. Paragraph 5.51 in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration refers to 818 dwellings per year. These estimates give a good idea of the scale of the problem. There is scant prospect of this need being met within the foreseeable future, as the Council accepts, but all reasonable measures should be taken to secure as many affordable homes as possible. This is good reason for more ambition than the element of affordable housing of up to 30% in the adopted Local Plan.

2.38.4 In this context, the aim of the Policies should be to secure a balance between providing certainty as to what can be reasonably required, and at the same time ensuring a degree of flexibility to accommodate site specific circumstances. Flexibility will, of course, continue to be provided by statute whereby material considerations can outweigh the development plan. Thus the emphasis in these Policies should be on negotiations between the Council and developers on the basis of clearly defined objectives and guidance. Mr Packham on behalf of Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd and other Objectors emphasise the importance of negotiations, and I agree with them. That approach accords with the collaborative working to which PPS3 refers, and with working closely...with delivery partners (including Registered Social landlords and private developers) as advocated in Delivering Affordable Housing. I urge the Council to continue in this way.

40% Affordable Housing

2.38.5 On the first issue, Policy HO11 starts by saying that the Council will seek a provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing on relevant sites. Objectors put forward alternative percentages, mainly in the order of 30-40, and examples are given of other local authorities whose policies stipulate 25% and 30%. The Council avers that there are numerous examples in the country of 40% being sought. Some Objectors say that a target, rather than a minimum, percentage should be set. Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd, however, says that the percentage target should be deleted. The South West Regional Spatial Strategy (SWRSS) Policy H1 refers to authorities specifying rates of up to 60% or higher in areas of greatest need, although the draft nature of this document means that limited weight should be accorded it. Sunnybanks Homes says that, as it will not be economic to provide affordable homes on some sites, Policy HO11 should set no minimum. There is thus a wide variety in what is considered to be appropriate. In the context of collaborative working, the achievement of other planning objectives may also be relevant.

2.38.6 In my judgement, there is little practical difference between the Objectors’ stance and the approach of the Council as expressed in this part of Policy HO11. I say that because the minimum of 40% is not being stipulated as a rigid requirement in all circumstances, but as the sort of proportion which the Council will seek to achieve in each case. This implies flexibility. Sometimes, owing to site characteristics and/or the economics of provision, the Council may be disappointed and will expect to be so where something less than 40% is shown to be a realistic outcome. That should not, however, stop the Council from seeking this percentage which goes some way towards reflecting the scale of the problem in the District. The reasoned justification well makes the point at its paragraph
5.56. The ability, it says, to achieve 40% on individual sites will be affected by any abnormal site development costs, the value and mix of the housing provided, the type of affordable housing sought and the availability of public subsidy. The more neutral the economics of development would, however, be better than the somewhat strident and subjective any abnormal site development costs.

2.38.7 The Council’s point is well made that viability should be assessed on a site by site basis. That assessment should acknowledge any funding which may be available to deliver the affordable housing within a reasonable period. It should also take account of any relevant planning objectives having regard to what Mr Stacey on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd describes as the overall package of obligations/contributions and the wider planning gains to the community being proposed. And, as the Inspector noted in his Report on the First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan, flexibility in both the proportion and mix of affordable housing in a residential scheme and in the nature of the subsidy which the developer provides may be required to ensure that the intended affordable housing is delivered. Policy HO11 acknowledges that the viability of development can be a constraint. Some Objectors say that the 40% is not based upon robust evidence of its effectiveness in achieving the desired objective. To some extent that is true, but there is no compelling evidence to show that the minimum of 40% would be a significant constraint, inhibiting either affordable housing or residential schemes encompassing it. Although overall viability in the second part of the Policy is probably all-embracing in terms of the economics of development, I recommend a minor change to it to emphasise that the matters to which the Council refers may not be the only ones.

2.38.8 Some owners will be disappointed with the start to negotiations of a minimum of 40% affordable housing, and may be inclined to hold on to their land and not apply for planning permission in the hope of obtaining something better in the future. Much the same applies with regard to the thresholds which I examine later. But they should bear in mind that the Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF), under preparation, may require a higher percentage in line with the increasing need and the final edition of the SWRSS in seeking to meet it. Indeed, had certain information been available when the Re-Deposit Plan was being prepared, the Council would have been considering a target of 50%. The drafting of this part of the Policy gives as much certainty as is possible in the start to negotiations where the eventual outcome may depend upon many considerations. Circumstances in other local authorities’ areas are unlikely to be identical with those in Caradon, and they should not determine a particular percentage in this Local Plan. I am not convinced by the evidence that a different percentage, or the absence of one, would improve the Local Plan. The actual percentage achieved will result from the negotiations, but it is reasonable for the Policy to include a starting point for those negotiations. Owing to the flexibility and caveats that obtain on the one hand, and the urgent need for affordable housing on the other, I am persuaded that the minimum of 40% in Policy HO11 is justified and should stay.

2.38.9 There are related matters. At the RTSs, the “3 Dragons’ Model Toolkit” was discussed. This can assist in assessing the viability of a scheme, but at the time of the RTS it was still being refined and unlikely to be adopted before Spring 2007. It is suggested that Policy HO11 includes a reference to it. There is, of course, no reason as far as I can see why a developer or the Council should not use the toolkit for its stated purpose if they see fit. Even when in its final and agreed form, however, its inclusion in a policy would elevate it to the status of an adopted Local Plan policy, and the suggestion should be resisted. Paragraph 5.56,
modified as I recommend, would be adequate. I can see little point at present in the identification of individual sites’ ability to meet such a requirement (40%), as the House Builders Federation suggests. It would be better for the matter to be discussed by the parties concerned in the negotiations leading up to the submission of an application for planning permission.

2.38.10 There is no need to refer to the number of affordable dwellings in the second paragraph of Policy HO11 as Mr and Mrs Jarvis suggest. This part of the Policy deals with the type of affordable housing; the actual number achieved will be the outcome of negotiations in the context of the Council’s seeking of a minimum of 40% on qualifying sites.

* The Thresholds

2.38.11 On the second issue, Policy HO11 applies the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing to schemes of 10 dwellings (or for 0.3 ha) or more in towns, and to schemes of 3 dwellings (or for 0.10 ha) or more in villages. National policy in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 is of an indicative minimum site size threshold of 15 dwellings, but local planning authorities can set lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable, including in rural areas. In principle, therefore, the Council’s thresholds do not conflict with national policy.

2.38.12 The viability, or economics of development, of these sites as providers of affordable housing is affected by considerations similar to those outlined above with regard to the minimum of 40%. For example, and as discussed at the RTSS, set-up costs in relation to health and safety are likely to be the same or similar whatever the number of dwellings proposed. Small schemes do not benefit from economies of scale which serve to reduce average costs. Travel times, the delivery of materials to the more remote sites and the provision of infrastructure like drainage are likely to result in disproportionate costs per dwelling for the smaller schemes. Thus, while small schemes in general are at a disadvantage in these respects, the problem is particularly apparent in the more remote rural locations. The same would be likely to apply with the management of single, or small numbers of dwellings in small, dispersed villages in the rural areas.

2.38.13 There is nothing wrong with a threshold in towns of 10 dwellings or 0.3 ha, and owing to the urgent need for affordable housing it is perfectly reasonable for the Council to seek to achieve a minimum of 40% affordable housing on schemes of this scale. I have already commented on the limited development potential in the villages with defined limits, an especially relevant consideration when it comes to sites capable of accommodating 3 or more dwellings. The need is no less urgent in the rural areas and, depending upon viability, it is reasonable for the Council to seek some affordable housing in such cases. Despite the admitted problems associated with small scale schemes, there is no compelling evidence to show that its ambitions could never be realised. The Council should move forward on the presumption that Policy HO11 will be instrumental in securing more affordable housing than equivalent provisions in the adopted Local Plan. Again, material considerations can outweigh the development plan, but as much certainty as is practicable should be sought. The thresholds should be retained.

2.38.14 My one concern about this part of Policy HO11 is that it could result in developers coming forward with schemes in towns for up to 9 dwellings and for one or 2 dwellings in villages as a way of avoiding the obligation to provide affordable homes. This apprehension could, however, arise regardless of the threshold selected. Maybe the Council could justify refusals of planning permission on the
basis that a full and effective use of land was not being achieved, but the Policy could be made more exacting in this respect. I recommend accordingly.

* 

**Off-site provision**

2.38.15 There is little that I can add to national policy in PPS3. When the Council is seeking developer contributions, the presumption is that affordable housing will be provided on the application site so that it contributes towards creating a mix of housing. Where it can be justified, however, off-site provision or a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision (of broadly equivalent value) may be accepted as long as the agreed approach contributes to the creation of mixed communities in the local authority area. This might apply in cases of the 3 or more dwellings to which Policy HO11 refers.

2.38.16 In my observations on village limits, I conclude that they should not be extended to accommodate additional development, and so any off-site provision in the circumstances to which this national policy describes should be within those limits, or possibly on a Rural Exception site outside the limits. Similarly, I would expect affordable housing in the towns to be promoted on sites allocated for housing in the Local Plan and on other sites, unallocated, coming forward for residential development as Policy HO11 provides. This part of national policy is expressed in exacting terms, and I am not convinced that the presumption should be so often set aside in Caradon that the Policy should provide for it. It would be better to rely on PPS3 as a material consideration where off-site provision could be robustly justified.

2.38.17 On 30 August 2006, the Secretary of State granted planning permission for the construction of 31 dwellings and garages (to include 21 affordable) and new vehicular/pedestrian access on land at East Taphouse. The site adjoins, but is outside, the defined limits for the village. Mr M Kerton, on behalf of Rosemullion Homes, says that the need for affordable homes in the locality was a major consideration in the Secretary of State’s decision. Certainly she agreed that the affordable housing element of the scheme would meet a clearly established housing need, and that this need was a material consideration which weighed strongly in favour of the proposal. The urgency of the need contributed to a strong justification for the acceptability in principle of the proposed development.

2.38.18 She stated that, overall, the proposal was not in accordance with the development plan although it complied with it in some important respects. Significantly, however, she considered the case on its merits as previously-developed land and as a windfall site, not as a rural exception site. It would therefore be rash to conclude, on the basis of just one decision and with the particular circumstances that applied to it, that schemes with a mix of market and affordable homes should be treated as acceptable in principle on land just outside these limits. As the Council observes, the decision might have been different had the site not been previously-developed land and I agree that this decision does not create a precedent to change the fundamental principle of affordable housing only on rural exception sites. No modification is required in this respect.

* 

**Development limits**

2.38.19 The fourth issue concerns the redrawing of any development limits to allow for schemes to comprise or include affordable housing. A number of Objectors advocate this approach as a means of meeting some of the need for
affordable homes in the District. The Council points out, however that apart from those cases where it is proposing to allocate land for development, this is not a matter with which the Alteration is concerned. Nevertheless, the Council had no objection to its being discussed at several RTSSs and I will make some observations on it. Indeed, I have already considered it in some detail in my examination of the Council’s settlement strategy, particularly with regard to Policies HO3 and HO6.

2.38.20 My general conclusion is that villages in the District are generally not suitable locations for housing developments in that they do not offer a good range of community facilities and/or have good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Those considerations are likely to be especially important to those people who are unable to access or afford market housing. Hence I do not support the general proposition that limits should be extended to accommodate residential development. Thus any schemes which these villages do take should be confined to within those limits. There might be cases in the rural areas where a particularly urgent need for affordable housing might outweigh matters of settlement policy, location and environmental constraints, but they should be candidates for the application of Policy HO13 as Rural Exception sites. Those circumstances do not require changes to defined development limits.

*Rural Exception Sites*

2.38.21 National policy in PPS3 acknowledges that opportunities for providing for affordable housing in rural communities tend to be more limited. That is much the case in Caradon with its small rural settlements and their generally limited range of services. Where viable and practicable, the policy says, local planning authorities should consider allocating and releasing sites solely for affordable housing, including using a Rural Exception Sites Policy. As an exception to its Policy HO7 and national and local policies for the protection of the countryside, the Council therefore proposes Policy HO13 which provides for small residential developments solely for affordable housing. Policy HO13 thus accords with national policy and I can see no good reason to adopt a different approach. Furthermore, to allow market housing within these exception sites, presumably as a form of cross-subsidy, would make the rural settlements even less sustainable as more people would rely on jobs and services elsewhere and increase the need to travel, especially by car.

2.38.22 Whilst according with national policy, Policy HO13 should be applied selectively because not every settlement has enough community facilities to make it suitable for affordable housing. A scattering of a few dwellings in a large number of small settlements in unlikely to result in sustainable development in the rural areas, and the expansion of unsustainable settlements should be resisted. I agree in principle with the Cornwall County Council’s point that suitable facilities are important for all affordable housing, and I recommend an addition to the reasoned justification to meet its valid point. A balance must be found between the scale of development envisaged and the range of services available or likely to become so. Circumstances will vary from one village to another and it is difficult to set out precise requirements in the Policy to cover them, but I consider that the Council has got that balance about right at the Re-Deposit stage.

2.38.23 Services and facilities vary in quality, but it is reasonable to ensure that they are adequate where 6 or more affordable dwellings are to be permitted as an exception to the general policies of restraint in the countryside. It is unlikely that a settlement with no defined development limits will have adequate community
facilities to justify an affordable housing scheme, and so I support Criterion (i) of Policy HO13. The Policy should not specify precisely those amenities as the Council attempted to do in Policy HO13 (a-d) at the First Deposit stage. It would serve little purpose and, although rightly restrictive, is unduly subjective. For example, a daily public transport link to a town is vague to the point of being almost meaningless. One bus a day to and from a town, however distant it is and however circuitous the route, would accord with the Policy, but its contribution to sustainability would be likely to be negligible. It would be far better for the Council to rely on its good judgement in deciding whether services and facilities were sufficient in number and quality to justify the scale of development to which the Policy refers. It is suggested that 10 would be more appropriate, but this could result in too much development taking place in settlements with too few community facilities. With no convincing evidence to the contrary, I think that the reference to 6 or more dwellings is reasonable and gives as much guidance and certainty as is practicable. It should stay.

2.38.24 The main considerations in this issue are whether this type of policy has been effective in the past and the prospects of its being so in the future. The Objectors’ general point is that a rural exception policy has not provided anywhere near enough affordable homes, and there is no disputing the fact that the need for them is becoming increasingly urgent. The scale of the problem is so acute in the District that it is unrealistic to believe that it will be solved in the foreseeable future. Past experience is not impressive, the Council’s evidence being that 14 affordable homes were provided in 2002/2003, none in 2003/2004, 8 in 2004/2005 and 13 in 2005/2006, a total of 35 in a 4 year period and an annual average of no more than 9 or so. At the time of the RTS, 2 further schemes, each of more than 6 dwellings, were being promoted at Drakewalls and St Ann’s Chapel. The Council’s e-mail of 30 April 2007, however, notes that work has commenced on 2 Rural Exception Sites, at Millbrook for 12 social rented and 8 shared ownership homes and at St Anne’s Chapel for 9 social rented and 10 shared ownership homes. The Council’s expectation is that a scheme for 8 affordable homes at Lanreath will start in June 2007.

2.38.25 There are good reasons to think that progress will further improve in the future, and I am in no doubt about the Council’s commitment to the provision of affordable homes for those in need. Most of these dwellings will be in the main towns on land allocated for housing and in accordance with Policy HO11, but Policy HO13 should play an important part in the provision of affordable housing in the rural areas. By way of its Local Plan and any other relevant instrument of policy, the Council must continue to make it clear that the only way in which affordable housing will be provided outside village limits will be in accordance with Policy HO13. That should remove any hope value that landowners may attach to sites adjoining those limits, and make them more willing to release the land as rural exception sites. This is what the Policy does and, although I think it could be made a little more definite, I support it.

2.38.26 So far, the Council has not resorted to the compulsory acquisition of land to provide affordable housing. This can be a time-consuming process, but the Council may wish to bear in mind the possibility of using these powers in the future if considered necessary and if circumstances are appropriate. I was advised at one RTS that the 6 Cornish District Councils and the County Council are considering the setting up of a Local Area Agreement for their use, including for the purchase of land for Rural Exception Sites. This may assist. There is no doubt, however, that the Council must closely monitor the provision of affordable homes on these Sites with a view to changing its approach in the LDF should that be necessary.
Nevertheless, as I say, the bulk of these homes should be provided in the main towns.

2.38.27 Several Objectors query the term identified local housing need within the local community in Policy HO13. Paragraph 5.70 gives some assistance on the matter, and I think that it would be unwise to be more precise. Once again, the Council should rely on its good judgement in the light of the circumstances presented to it. Where there is some difficulty in letting a dwelling, however, it might be reasonable for the Council to look further away than the parish which includes the Rural Exception Site, or adjoining ones. Bearing in mind the urgent need for affordable housing throughout the District, however, such circumstances are likely to be so uncommon as to make it unnecessary for the Local Plan to acknowledge them.

The size of affordable homes, tenure mix and permitted development rights

2.38.28 Paragraph 5.65 in the Re-Deposit Plan states that single people and couples without children are the largest group in housing need, but that evidence suggests that families in housing need are a more immediate problem for RSLs. The Council, it continues, will require that half of new affordable provision should cater for single people and childless couples (one or 2 bedroom units) and half for families. Policy HO11 states that affordable dwellings for sale should be limited to a gross floorspace of 90 sq m (internal measurement) of living accommodation. Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd says that dwelling sizes should not be stipulated as this is contrary to national policy set out in the now cancelled Circular 6/98.

2.38.29 Current national policy in PPS3 is that local planning authorities should specify in their Local Development Documents (LDD) the size and type of affordable housing which, in their judgement, is likely to be needed in particular locations and, where appropriate, on specific sites. In my view, the Council has applied the spirit of this requirement to its Local Plan. I accept that the 90 sq m is based upon the Council’s experience, and there is no compelling evidence to justify a different floorspace. The Council may have to be flexible in applying it, as housing needs may change, there may be particular circumstances of housing need at any one time and it could have implications for the economics of development of a particular site. Like the minimum 40% which I discuss in the first issue, it should provide a good start in the Council’s negotiations with developers and it will have to be closely monitored.

2.38.30 The removal of permitted development rights as a matter of policy (Policy HO11) is, I consider, too sweeping. It is not unusual for certain permitted development rights to be removed in a residential scheme for reasons which may include the cramped appearance that would result from, say, extensions being built in a high density development. It is more likely, however, to be justified in the course of the Council’s determination of a particular proposal. I recommend a note in the reasoned justification of both Policies which draws attention to the possibility of such restrictions. That should suffice.

2.38.31 Concerning tenure mix and type of affordable housing, the District-wide need for affordable housing is estimated to be approximately 65% social rented and 35% intermediate housing. The research upon which these percentages are based is comprehensive and convincing, and I accept it. They may, of course, change in the future, and indeed the latest Housing Needs data suggests that it should be 60% and 40% respectively. The Council should take account of any
updated figures and any further published assessments of need in its negotiations with developers on individual sites. But the main point here is that the percentages appear in the reasoned justification, and the relevant part of the Policy rightly says no more than that the type of dwellings proposed will meet (wholly or in part) the identified local housing need. The Council points out that key workers, eg those to whom Mr J Hall refers on behalf of the NHS Estates, are identified within the Housing Needs Survey. Presumably Intermediate Housing would provide the most suitable affordable homes for them.

2.38.32 It is, of course, vital that the benefit of affordable homes will be enjoyed by their successive as well as their initial occupiers. I consider, however, that this stipulation is more of an explanation of how the Policies will be applied, rather than being part of a land use policy. It should be in the reasoned justification. In particular, Policy HO11 as drafted is a combination of land use policy considerations and an explanation of how they will be applied. A better distinction should be made between upper case policy and reasoned justification, as I recommend.
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2.38.33 On other matters, I do not consider that the allocations for residential development should be increased by, say, 20% to provide for more affordable housing. This would in all probability take the Local Plan out of general conformity with the Structure Plan.

2.38.34 All participants will note that the new definition of affordable housing in PPS3 excludes low-cost market housing. The Local Plan should reflect this policy. The Council should, however, take account of the need to deliver this type of housing as part of the overall housing mix.

2.38.35 I accept the Council’s point that social rented housing at rent levels above those set by RSLs is, in effect, intermediate housing. This is irrespective of any grant subsidy available. Paragraphs 5.52 and 5.53 provide useful information on affordability in the District, correctly noting the various matters which must be kept under review. There is no need to modify these provisions of the Local Plan.

2.38.36 I agree that the reference in Policy HO11 to Registered Social Housing Body should be replaced by a more embracing term. As agreed at RTS3, Regulated Affordable Housing Provider would be better. I recommend accordingly. The House Builders Federation points out that RSLs can provide 100% affordable housing schemes and that the Council should actively promote such development to meet the needs identified. As far as I can see, there is nothing in the Local Plan which prevents it from doing so.

2.38.37 I welcome the fourth part of Policy HO11 which states that planning permission will not be granted for schemes that fragment a site below the thresholds necessary to secure an element of affordable housing. I recommend a modification to the first part of this Policy to meet the complementary objective of securing the full and effective use of land.

2.38.38 I accept the Council’s point that Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) or Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) amplify provisions in a development plan where such amplification is useful. The provisions are thus the context for the Guidance. No modification is needed on this score.

2.38.39 I agree that the re-use of well-located previously-developed land is an important aspect of sustainability. I am doubtful, however, about according much weight to the development of under-used or degraded land simply because it is in such a state. Such an approach might encourage owners to neglect their land as a
way of persuading the Council to approve schemes for it.

Conclusions

2.38.40 My overall conclusion on these Policies, and particularly Policy HO11, is that they should be applied with more flexibility than is the case with most other development plan policies. This is mainly because of the many factors, especially viability, which affect the number, type and tenure of affordable housing in a residential scheme. In assessing these matters on each site, the Council’s watchwords should be collaborative working and negotiation. Nevertheless, the numbers, percentages and amount of floorspace noted in the Policies should provide a useful start in those negotiations. I consider that, given the careful assessment of site viability, they provide ambitious but realistic affordable housing targets and thresholds. The Council must also continue to monitor progress in the delivery of affordable housing coming forward on allocated and other sites. It will note Mr Colin Breed MP’s point about targets for each year.

2.38.41 Introductory paragraphs in the Re-Deposit Plan should be amended to reflect, for example, the fact that amended Policy HO11 bases thresholds on the total number of dwellings, not the site area. Paragraph 12 in my covering letter to the Council’s Chief Executive applies.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY HO11

WHERE THERE ARE DEMONSTRABLE LOCAL NEEDS, THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK THE PROVISION OF A MINIMUM OF 40% AFFORDABLE HOUSING ON SITES ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING IN THE LOCAL PLAN AND ON OTHER SITES COMING FORWARD FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WHICH HAVE A CAPACITY OF 10 OR MORE DWELLINGS IN TOWNS, OR 3 OR MORE DWELLINGS IN VILLAGES.

THE TYPE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING SOUGHT WILL DEPEND UPON SUCH CONSIDERATIONS AS THE NATURE OF LOCAL NEEDS, SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND THE OVERALL VIABILITY OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME.

THE POLICY APPLIES TO ENTIRE SITES, AND PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR SCHEMES THAT FRAGMENT AND/OR REDUCE A SITE BELOW THE THRESHOLDS NECESSARY TO SECURE AN ELEMENT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS FOR SALE WILL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM GROSS FLOORSPACE OF 90 SQ M (INTERNAL MEASUREMENT) OF LIVING ACCOMMODATION. THE COUNCIL WILL ALLOW ONE SINGLE GARAGE OF NOT MORE THAN 17 SQ M (INTERNAL MEASUREMENT) OF GROSS FLOORSPACE.

The Council is determined to secure the efficient and effective use of land for housing. In assessing the capacity of a site, it will have regard to such matters as its size and shape, its other physical attributes, its surroundings and the viability of the proposed scheme for which planning permission is being, or will be, sought.
Planning permission will not be granted for a scheme where affordable housing is required unless arrangements are already in place, either through the committed involvement of a regulated affordable housing provider or through a legal agreement, or can be secured by a planning condition, to ensure that the benefit of the of the affordable housing will be enjoyed by successive as well as by the initial occupiers.

There may be occasions when, for reasons which might include appearance, the protection of private open space and the retention of parking space, the Council will remove permitted development rights for the conversion of an integral garage into living space and/or for the erection of extensions and detached buildings within the residential curtilage.

And in Paragraph 5.56 replace any abnormal site development costs with the economics of provision

POLICY HO13

AS AN EXCEPTION TO POLICIES HO6 (HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN VILLAGES) AND HO7 (HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE COUNTRYSIDE), SMALL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS SOLELY FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT:

i – iii & v as in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration;

vi THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT REDUCE AN ALREADY NARROW RURAL GAP BETWEEN SETTLEMENTS OR HARM THE LANDSCAPE SETTING OF A VILLAGE;

IF MORE THAN 6 AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS ARE TO BE PERMITTED DURING THE PLAN PERIOD, THE SETTLEMENT MUST HAVE SUFFICIENT COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES TO AVOID UNDUE DEPENDENCE ON THE NEED TO TRAVEL, ESPECIALLY BY CAR.

AFFORDABLE DWELLINGS FOR SALE WILL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM GROSS FLOORSPACE OF 90 SQ M (INTERNAL MEASUREMENT) OF LIVING ACCOMMODATION. THE COUNCIL WILL ALLOW ONE SINGLE GARAGE OF NOT MORE THAN 17 SQ M (INTERNAL MEASUREMENT) OF GROSS FLOORSPACE.

As with Policy HO11, planning permission will not be granted for a scheme where affordable housing is required unless the dwellings are to be subject to secure arrangements to ensure that their initial and subsequent occupation is restricted to members of the local community in housing need. There may be occasions when, for reasons which might include appearance, the protection of private open space and the retention of parking space, the Council will remove permitted development rights for the conversion of an integral garage into living space and/or for the erection of extensions and detached buildings within the residential curtilage.

Exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated to justify the provision of affordable housing under Policy HO13 for schemes of up to 6 dwellings in villages with few or poor community facilities and services.

And the deletion of all references throughout to low cost market housing as a form of affordable housing.
2.39 POLICY HO14: WHEELCHAIR HOUSING

Objections

First Deposit

- F250/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
- F572/487 South West RSL Planning Consortium Objection
- F658/524 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
- F858/634 J Taylor Objection
- F1121/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

- R267/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy should require the provision of wheelchair housing on schemes of 50 dwellings and more;

b. Whether the requirement of up to 20% of such housing is excessive.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

2.39.1 The First Alteration to the Local Plan proposes no alteration to this Policy.

2.39.2 Mr Colin Breed MP suggests that the Policy should apply to any proposal of 50 or more dwellings. The Council envisages that 50 or more dwellings will be provided on its 3 main allocations, these being at Liskeard, Looe and Callington. To that extent, the Objection is met. The Policy also applies to other sites of more than 1.5 ha in towns and 1 ha elsewhere which may come forward for residential development. Assuming that they would be developed at the national indicative minimum of 30 dwellings per hectare to which Planning Policy Guidance (PPS) refers, they would accommodate schemes of 45 or 30 dwellings respectively. On this basis, there is little difference between the parties, but I prefer the Council’s approach because it would be likely to result in more housing for people with physical disabilities.

2.39.3 On the second issue, I consider that much will depend upon the outcome of discussions between the Council and the intending developer. Up to 20% gives a good deal of flexibility. In other words, the maximum requirement would be that one dwelling in 5 should be suitable or readily adaptable for occupation by those persons in special need. I do not see how this can be excessive. It should stay.

2.39.4 The South West RSL Planning Consortium requests a wider definition of special needs and supported housing to include those with learning difficulties, the young homeless and ex-offenders. The purpose of the Policy, however, is to cater for those people who fall within the category of special needs, and its thrust is to help people with disabilities. It goes as far as it should in these matters.

2.39.5 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd considers that the Policy duplicates the Building Regulations. I agree that there is a substantial overlap, but
PPS 3 refers to the Government’s key housing policy goal of ensuring that everyone has the opportunity of living in a decent home. It seeks such objectives as addressing the requirements of the community, widening opportunities for home ownership and supporting a wide variety of households. In principle, any consideration which relates to the use and development of land is capable of being a planning consideration. I therefore agree with the Council that the Policy is suitable for inclusion in the Local Plan and that its purpose is justified.

2.39.6 I agree with the views of the Government Office for the South West about the mix of rigidity and flexibility in the Policy. I would suggest will be required, rather than may be required. I invite the Council to take this suggestion into account in its preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and so I make no recommendation concerning the Re-Deposit Plan.
2.40 POLICY HO15: GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

Objections

First Deposit

F1122/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R19/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
R268/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
R300/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Local Plan should demonstrate that the Council has taken account of its duty to make adequate provision for gypsies residing in, or resorting to, the District.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

2.40.1 The Council points out that this Policy is unchanged from the adopted (1999) Local Plan and does not therefore constitute a Proposed Alteration. It nevertheless awaits my consideration. It would, in any event, take some time to undertake the necessary survey work and consult on any proposed change to the adopted Policy. This would delay the adoption of the First Alteration which would be unfortunate, to put it mildly. I note the Cornwall County Council’s point that the Policy is being somewhat overtaken by events as a County forum is currently examining these issues. The best way forward is for the District Council to review the Policy in its preparation of its Local Development Framework, as it proposes. Whether no specific allocation for gypsies or travellers should be entertained until such time as the crisis in affordable housing is well on the way to being solved, as Mr Colin Breed MP suggests is a matter that should be considered as part of that preparation.

2.40.2 The Policy states that sites will not be permitted in the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Heritage Coast. Whilst national policy gives the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty to AONBs, I agree with the Cornwall County Council that there is no need to duplicate it in the Local Plan and that it is inappropriate to give additional constraint against any social/cultural group or use. I think that the last part of the Policy which refers to AONBs and the Heritage Coast should be deleted.

2.40.3 I invite the Council to take account of my comments in its preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and I make no recommendation concerning the Re-Deposit Plan.
3. CHAPTER 6: TRANSPORT

3.1 POLICY T3: CAR PARKING & POLICY T6: HIGHWAY LANDSCAPING

Objection

Further Deposit

E34/3 Cornwall County Council Objection
E35/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the number of parking spaces should be at least 5% of the total in relevant schemes;

b. Whether Policy T6 should be more explicit with regard to features of the natural environment.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

3.1.1 No change has been made to these Policies in the adopted Local Plan. The Cornwall County Council says that these Objections can be considered as part of the District Council’s preparation of its Local Development Framework, and I agree that this is the best way forward.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
3.2 POLICY ALT1: PROTECTION OF RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

Objections

First Deposit

F239/227   Network Rail   Objection
F1124/1    Government Office for the South West   Objection

Re-Deposit

R270/1    Government Office for the South West   Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy would frustrate the reasonable use of surplus railway land for suitable development.

b. Whether land which the Policy seeks to protect should be identified on the Proposals Map.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

3.2.1 I am not convinced that the Policy would frustrate suitable development on this type of land. If it can be shown that there is no reasonable prospect of any land concerned contributing towards the greater use of the rail network, it could genuinely be regarded as surplus and hence due for consideration for suitable re-use. In other words, there would be little point in protecting land which had no potential for improving rail services. Surplus, previously-developed land near railway stations might be suitable in principle for alternative uses. There seems to me to be little difference between the Council and Network Rail in this regard. I see no need to amend the Policy, which is much in accord with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 paragraph 6 which urges local planning authorities to protect sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choices for both passenger and freight movements.

3.2.2 On the second issue, I agree with the Government Office for the South West that critical sites and routes should be identified on the Proposals Map. This would accord with the above mentioned paragraph 6. But in view of the short span of life of this Local Plan between the adoption of its First Alteration and the advanced preparation of the Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF), I consider that in the meantime this Policy is sufficiently exacting for its purpose. I support the Council in its intention to identify land subject to this, or an equivalent, policy in its LDF.

3.2.3 My main concern is that the Policy should be drafted more in line with the Good Practice Guide, and I recommend accordingly.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT1

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE SUITABLE RE-USE OF EXISTING RAILWAY INFRASTRUCTURE, PASSENGER AND FREIGHT FACILITIES AND OTHER LAND, AND OF THE MEANS OF ACCESS THERETO, PROVIDED THAT IT WOULD NOT FRUSTRATE THE WIDENING OF TRANSPORT CHOICES FOR BOTH PASSENGER AND FREIGHT MOVEMENTS.
4. CHAPTER 7: COUNTRYSIDE AND LANDSCAPE

4.1 POLICY CL1: PROTECTION OF VALUED SITES

Objection

Further Deposit

E19/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether any modification to the Policy is required at present.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

4.1.1 The First Alteration proposes no change to this Policy and the Cornwall County Council considers that its Objection can be considered during the preparation of the District Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF). I have no reason to disagree.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
4.2 POLICY CL4: REMOVAL OF OCCUPANCY CONDITIONS

Objections

First Deposit

F252/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F410/357 Mr J A Flashman Objection
F550/478 National Farmers’ Union Objection
F792/586 Country Land and Business Association - South Objection
F1125/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R18/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
R271/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
R290/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether agricultural occupancy conditions should be attached to planning permissions for a specified period of, for example, 20 years or until such time as the original occupier dies;

b. Whether an agricultural occupancy condition should be removed or varied and the occupation of the dwelling restricted to those in need of affordable housing.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

4.2.1 Planning permissions for dwellings for agricultural workers are granted as exceptions to policies for the protection of the countryside. But with that exceptional treatment goes a restriction to ensure that the dwellings remain exceptional developments and to prevent the undermining of the normally applicable policies which protect the countryside. As Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 states, isolated new dwellings in the countryside will require special justification for planning permission to be granted. This type of accommodation should therefore be retained for as long as there is a need for it. That may be for a longer or shorter period than 20, 25 or any other specified number of years. That need may also last longer than the life of the original occupier(s). I do not, therefore, support Mr Flashman’s suggested redrafting of the Policy along the lines which he suggests.

4.2.2 Any approach different from that which the Council follows could lead to the premature lifting of occupancy conditions and pressure for more dwellings in the countryside to meet a continuing need, frustrated by the loss of a dwelling that could have continued to meet it. The stock of these dwellings, and each one, should be retained unless there is good reason not to do so. Thus the Council should lift, or possibly vary, an occupancy condition only when it is convincingly demonstrated that the dwelling is no longer needed for its original and exceptional purpose.

* 

4.2.3 On the second issue, there is a widespread need for affordable homes in...
the rural, as well as in the urban, parts of the District. Should an occupancy condition no longer be justified, it would be reasonable in principle for the dwelling to be made available to a person or household in need of affordable accommodation. Suitable restrictions should then apply including, where appropriate, a Section 106 Agreement. If, surprisingly, there was no need for this type of accommodation in the locality, or of people coming into it from further afield, consideration could be given to the removal of the condition and for the dwelling to become part of the open market stock of housing in the District.

4.2.4 There are other matters. The above PPS refers to accommodation being required to enable agricultural, forestry and certain other full-time workers to live at, or in the immediate vicinity of, their place of work. The Policy rightly takes this national guidance into account.

4.2.5 An occupancy condition may have been attached to a planning permission other than in accordance with Policy HO7. There might have been an equivalent policy in a previous development plan or it might have been the subject of a legal agreement under current or superseded legislation.

4.2.6 Criterion iii) could be a hostage to fortune should development abut an encumbered dwelling, but where there is still a need in the locality for an agricultural or similar worker’s dwelling. This criterion appears to be an alternative way of getting a condition or agreement discharged, irrespective of any continuing need for the dwelling.

4.2.7 Criterion iv) appears to be more in the form of guidance on how a land use policy will be applied, rather than being part of that policy. My recommendation reflects these concerns.

4.2.8 There is nothing to stop the Council considering the re-use of these rural buildings for employment purposes, as the Cornwall County Council suggests. In view of the likely continuing need for rural housing, affordable or otherwise, I am not persuaded that the occasions and opportunities for such re-use would be so numerous and justified that any such clause should be introduced into the Policy.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

**POLICY CL4**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR THE REMOVAL OF AN OCCUPANCY CONDITION ON AN AGRICULTURAL WORKER’S, OR ANY OTHER RURAL WORKER’S, DWELLING PROVIDED THAT:**

**I)** IT IS CONVINCINGLY DEMONSTRATED THAT THERE IS NO LONGER ANY NEED FOR THIS TYPE OF DWELLING BY SUCH A WORKER OR BY A KEY WORKER COMING INTO THE DISTRICT; AND

**II)** A THOROUGH AND SUSTAINED ATTEMPT HAS BEEN MADE WITHOUT SUCCESS TO SELL THE PROPERTY AT A PRICE WHICH REFLECTS THE CONDITION OR AGREEMENT.

*In some cases where the removal of the occupancy condition is justified there may be compelling evidence of a need for affordable housing. In these circumstances the Council may vary the condition to restrict the*
occupation of the dwelling to local people, or to persons coming into the area, who need affordable housing.

Permission will not normally be given to remove an occupancy condition on an agricultural worker’s dwelling, or any other rural dwelling, attached in accordance with Policy HO7 or similar provision. This is to help.......
4.3 POLICY CL5: AGRICULTURAL LAND

Objections

Further Deposit

E15/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
E20/3 Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy should be modified to reflect national policy in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

4.3.1 The First Alteration proposes no change to this Local Plan policy.

4.3.2 The PPS states that local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations. The PPS was published 5 years after the adoption of the Local Plan, but there is nothing in the Policy to prevent the Council from taking into account this particular aspect of national policy if need be. Indeed, the Policy refers to the possibility of over-riding the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. The Cornwall County Council states that its Objection can be considered during the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and I endorse that advice.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
4.4 POLICY CL8: LANDSCAPES OF COUNTY IMPORTANCE & POLICY CL9: DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AGLVS

Objections

Further Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection No.</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E14/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14a/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether the references to Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and proposed development within them should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.4.1 The First Alteration proposes no changes to these Local Plan policies.

4.4.2 As Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 explains, an AGLV is not a nationally designated area as is, for example, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Having travelled extensively throughout the District, I am in no doubt about the high landscape value of much of its countryside. The PPS states that carefully drafted, criteria-based policies in Local Development Documents (LDD), utilising such tools as landscape character assessment, should provide sufficient protection for these areas. I suspect that the necessary survey work needed for a proper assessment would too much delay the adoption of the First Alteration, and I agree with the Cornwall County Council that its Objection would be better considered as part of the District Council’s preparation of its Local Development Framework (LDF). The same applies to the Objections lodged by Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd. In the meantime, the Council can continue to accord due weight to the Policies, the designation of the AGLVs on the Proposals Map and national policy concerning the protection of special landscapes.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
4.5 POLICY CL12: DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING SSSI's (PARA 7.53)

Objection

Further Deposit

E1/12 English Nature Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether reference should be made to the Polruan to Polperro Special Area of Conservation (SAC).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.5.1 No alteration is proposed to this Policy. The Council notes the absence of a reference to this SAC and will no doubt put the matter right in its preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF). In the meantime, the presence of this SAC between these 2 settlements can be taken into account in the determination of any planning application for any land within it.

4.5.2 On another matter, the Policy refers to the control of any development permitted through the use of planning conditions or planning obligations. English Nature's objection concerning the need for measures to mitigate the harmful effects of development is thereby met.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.

Objections

Further Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E22/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E23/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E24/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether the reasoned justification should assess the criteria for development which would outweigh damage.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

4.6.1 These are further policies unchanged by the First Alteration. The Council should review these policies as part of its preparation of the Local Development framework, as the Cornwall County Council suggests with regard to its Objections. The same applies to English Nature’s Objections concerning surveys, measures of mitigation and aged or veteran trees. In the meantime, these policies and their reasoned justification will suffice.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
5. CHAPTER 8: TOWN AND VILLAGE ENVIRONMENT

5.1 POLICY EV6: OPEN AREAS OF LOCAL SIGNIFICANCE (PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS16) - FORMER SALTASH SEWAGE WORKS

Objection

Proposers

Further Deposit

EV6 (Proposed Omission Site OS16)
E8/909 Red Earth Saltash Ltd Objection

Objections

O16/12 English Nature Omission Site Objection
O393/900 Cllr Brian Carter Omission Site Objection
O396/171 Saltash Town Council Omission Site Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development and/or included within extended development limits.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.1.1 This land includes the various structures of the former Saltash Sewage Works. Its allocation or inclusion within the development limits defined on the Proposals Map of the adopted Local Plan would result in an extension of those limits. As I saw at my inspection it would bring more, but not all, of those former works within those limits. The Council accepts, as I do, that this Omission Site is previously-developed land in that it has not blended into the landscape in the process of time to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings. This is a strong point in favour of its more efficient re-use but it is not, of course, the only consideration. Location and visual effect of the proposed development must also be accorded due weight.

5.1.2 The Council maintains that there is no need to identify more land for housing in the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA), essentially because existing commitments and windfalls should provide for the 1000 dwellings which the adopted Structure Plan requires to be provided in this part of the District. This, too, I accept, but I do not place great emphasis on it because of the modest extent of the land, its potential to accommodate only up to 9 or so dwellings, the limited effect which they would have on overall Structure Plan requirements and the general direction of travel in national and Regional policies for more housing. Maybe better located land could be found in Saltash for residential development, but the Omission Site is not far from the town centre with its good range of community facilities and it should not be rejected on these grounds.

5.1.3 To the east of the former works and up to the water’s edge, land is designated an Area of Great Scientific Value (AGSV); to its west and south is an

Chapter 8: Town and Village Environment  111
Open Area of Local Significance (OALS). The Omission Site itself carries the latter designation as does the remainder of the southern part of the works. A little further to the south, and abutting the southern extent of the works and extending further southwards along the Hamoaze (Tamar Estuary), is the Tamar Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The extent and boundaries of these designations and the relationship of the Omission Site with them are well shown in the Company’s Document P035A Appendix 2. In March 2004 full planning permission was granted for the erection of 4 dwellings on that part of the works which is in the defined limits. But the Company considers that in landscape terms it would be preferable for a scheme of up to 10 smaller dwellings to extend beyond the present limits so that it could be interspersed with planting instead of being contained as with the approved plans within what is described as the arbitrary limits.

5.1.4 Generally, the Omission Site is well screened in close views. But it can be easily seen from elsewhere, especially from the car park on the Devon side of the River Tamar and from the train as it crosses the Royal Albert Bridge. This bridge, like the Tamar Bridge, is an important entrance point to both the town of Saltash and the County of Cornwall. I say easily seen, rather than prominent, owing to the low rise nature of the works, its horizontal profile and the appreciable distance of up to about 1 km between it and these particular viewpoints. As the previous Inspector noted in his appeal decision of 09 November 2006 (APP/K0805/A/06/2013922) concerning 9 dwellings, the former works takes on a subdued presence within a wider green framework that is established by the trees and shrubs along the water’s edge, the rising slope to the west of the (appeal) site, the open land to the south and the vegetated areas within the site itself. In my opinion, they merge in with the surroundings which form part of the green foreground and attractive setting of Saltash.

5.1.5 From the evidence I see that, despite recommendations of approval, members of the Council have more than once resisted the erection of any proposed dwellings beyond the development limits defined for this part of Saltash. I agree that the southern part of those limits is somewhat arbitrary in that it reflects a previous physical extent of the works and that it now separates one part of it from the remainder. Nevertheless, I consider that the members’ judgement is soundly based and is so irrespective of any concerns which they might have had about access and traffic. Dwellings would be a good deal more substantial and prominent in these surroundings than are the existing structures, hardstandings and access. The extension of a residential scheme and the consequent consolidation of development into and along the OALS should continue to be opposed. Certainly existing trees and more landscaping would serve to screen and soften the visual effect, especially during the summer months when there is more leaf cover. I am not persuaded, however, that this would outweigh the harm caused by the actual presence of dwellings and the paraphernalia usually associated with their curtilages, albeit in this case mainly at their western sides. The development would be neither in, nor well-integrated with, the existing built up area of the town.

5.1.6 I have taken all the other matters into account, including the proposed removal of the redundant large tanks and the re-profiling of the ground around the proposed dwellings to more natural slopes. They do not, however, outweigh my conclusion that the Local Plan would not be improved by the allocation of the Omission Site for development or by extending the development limits to include it.
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RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
5.2 POLICY EV13: CAR PARKING & POLICY EV16: OPEN SPACE AND PLAY AREAS

Objections

Further Deposit

E30/3    Cornwall County Council  Objection
E31/3    Cornwall County Council  Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Council should seek the provision of green travel arrangements;

b. Whether wider consideration should be given to matters which should be funded through planning gain.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

5.2.1 These are more policies which remain unaltered since the adopted Local Plan.

5.2.2 On the first issue, the Council should seek these arrangements where appropriate. It should rely upon national policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG13) concerning travel plans as a material consideration.

* *

5.2.3 Until such time as the Local Development Framework (LDF) is adopted, Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations with its 5 tests of reasonableness should provide sufficient guidance for the Council as it seeks to enter into agreements with developers.

-0-

5.2.4 The Cornwall County Council says that its Objections can be dealt with through the preparation of the LDF, and I endorse that advice. Presumably part of that preparation will be the application of national policies in the light of local circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
6. CHAPTER 9: TOURISM

6.1 POLICY TM5: CONVERSION FOR HOLIDAY LETS & POLICY TM9: HOTELS AND HOTEL CONVERSIONS

Objections

Further Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E36/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E37/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether these 2 Policies should include more exacting criteria for the assessment of proposals for hotel development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

6.1.1 These 2 Policies are unaltered, and so remain as in the adopted Local Plan. The Cornwall County Council says that its Objections can be dealt with through the preparation of the Local Development Framework. I endorse this advice, noting that in the meantime national and local policies should provide the Council with adequate guidance in its determination of the planning applications concerned.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
7. CHAPTER 10: RECREATION AND LEISURE

7.1 POLICY R2: PLAYING PITCH PROVISION

Objections

First Deposit
F254/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F672/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F1128/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit
R126/523 Home Builders Federation Objection
R203/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited Objection
R272/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issues
a. Whether additional playing pitches should be provided in Callington;
b. Whether the Policy suitably accords with national policy in Circular 05/2005.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

7.1.1 As a result of the Structure Plan’s reduced requirements for housing in the District, the Council proposes considerably less land for this purpose in Callington. The requirement for pitches is thus a good deal less than before. Even so, in its determination of planning applications for residential development, the Council should consider the appropriateness of seeking contributions for sport, leisure and other aspects of social infrastructure.

7.1.2 On the second issue, I agree with the Council that local planning authorities should set locally derived figures for the provision of open space. The reasoned justification in the Re-Deposit Plan is a useful summary of the assessment to which the Government Office for the South West refers. In my view, this explanation is sufficient. At the same time, however, I agree with Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd that the emphasis should be on the Council seeking to enter into agreements instead of requiring contributions. As Mr Packham writes on the Company’s behalf, the Council should justify on a site by site basis the requirement for contributions based upon an assessment of the impact of a particular proposal. The House Builders Federation and Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited make similar points.

7.1.3 The drafting of this Policy as a land use policy was discussed at the Inquiry, and my recommendation takes account of the additional points made. On reflection, however, I consider that this provision of the Plan is more an explanation of the way in which the Council will carry out an administrative act than it is a land use policy. Hence Policy R2 should be deleted from the Re-Deposit Plan and its contents included in the form of reasoned justification. This text could
probably best be placed somewhere in the Housing Chapter.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

The Council will seek to enter into planning agreements with the developers of residential schemes to secure contributions towards the provision of sports pitches. These contributions would be directly related to the proposed development, would be in scale and kind with the need arising from it and would be reasonable in all other respects.

In order to promote the effective planning for future sports pitch provision, it is important that the needs of the local communities are known. The Council’s 2016 target for new provision in each Local Plan is as follows:

- Torpoint area 4.2 ha
- Saltash area 5.0 ha
- Looe area 4.5 ha
- Liskeard area 9.0 ha
- Callington area 2.3 ha

The figures quoted are based upon........
7.2 POLICY R7: PUBLIC ART & PARAGRAPH 10.34

Objection

Further Deposit
E13/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection

Main Issue
  a. Whether there is any connection between public art and new housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions
7.2.1 This Policy in the adopted Local Plan has not been altered.
7.2.2 The paragraph is somewhat dismissive of the quality of modern buildings in the District, and I have to accept that seldom do they contribute a great deal to their surroundings as, for example, do some of the elegant and impressive Victorian buildings in Liskeard. I would not rule out the inclusion of features of public art in new residential schemes, but the emphasis should be on high quality design in layouts and dwellings. As Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 1 says, good design is indivisible from good planning and, as PPS3 explains, it is fundamental to the development of high quality new housing.

7.2.3 I see no need at present to amend the Policy or its reasoned justification in response to the Objection. If, however, the intent of the Policy is to be carried forward into a Local Development Document (LDD), the Council may wish to reconsider the drafting in the light of Development Plans: A Good Practice Guide. This advises that policies should be clear and precise and that phrases like the Council will encourage should be avoided.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
8. CHAPTER 11: COMMUNITY SERVICES

8.1 POLICY CO1: DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

Objection

Further Deposit

E12/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy sufficiently accords with Circular 05/2005.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.1.1 This is another unaltered Policy.

8.1.2 Circular 05/2005 refers to planning obligations being sought, and in my view this is a crucial point in making acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Arguably the Policy should be structured on this basis, but its reasoned justification explains this correct approach and rightly says that the Council will try to achieve the objectives of the Policy through the imposition of planning conditions.

8.1.3 The Circular will remain a material consideration and the Council may well rely on such of its contents as the 5 tests of reasonableness as it considers the seeking of an obligation in any particular case. Although I think that the third paragraph of the Policy would be better as explanation in the reasoned justification, I consider that these provisions of the Local Plan sufficiently accord with the Circular. There is no need to amend the Local Plan in this regard, but the Council may wish to bear in mind my comments in its preparation of a Local Development Document (LDD).

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
8.2 POLICY CO5: TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

Objections

First Deposit

F18j/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F77/89 T-Mobile (UK) Ltd Objection
F164/172 Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd Objection
F231/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F1129/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R92/89 Government Office for the South West Objection
R273/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether the Policy should be altered to refer to proximity of telecommunications equipment to schools and homes;

b. Whether it should be altered in any other way better to accord with Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 8.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.2.1 I presume that Steve & Vanessa Killops are concerned about the health considerations of this type of equipment on schoolchildren and local residents. If so, I can add nothing to national policy as outlined in PPG8 Telecommunications. This includes the statements that health considerations and public concern can in principle be material considerations in determining applications for planning permission and prior approval, and that local planning authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies, e.g. by way of imposing a ban or moratorium on new telecommunications development or insisting on minimum distances between new telecommunications development and existing development. There is no evidence to suggest that local circumstances in the District should outweigh that policy.

8.2.2 On the second issue, other Objectors put forward useful suggestions to improve the Policy, most of which are taken into account at the Re-Deposit stage. I do not, however, support the inclusion of normally in the Policy. This would make it too vague, and flexibility in its application is already provided by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38 (6).

8.2.3 Rightly, the Policy can be applied as appropriate to both applications for planning permission and for prior approval. It would be misleading to specify solely the former, as T-Mobile (UK) Ltd suggests.

8.2.4 The Local Plan includes policies for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) and Conservation Areas, and there are national policies for the protection of environmentally sensitive areas. A development plan should be read as a whole, and I see no need to state that only
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exceptionally will telecommunications equipment be permitted in the areas to which CPRE-Caradon refers.

8.2.5 The Mobile Operators Association suggests the placing of unduly before harm in Criterion ii). There is no need to qualify harm in this, or in any other, way. Harm must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission. In coming to a determination, the decision-maker should judge the degree of harm and compare it to any benefits that might outweigh it. At best, the qualification is superfluous.

8.2.6 Matters of employment and any consequent need for telecommunications equipment could be taken into account in the determination of an application for planning permission. There is no need to draw attention to these, or any other, anticipated circumstances.

8.2.7 The Government’s policy is to facilitate the growth of new and existing telecommunications systems whilst keeping the environmental impact to a minimum. This consideration, and the more general presumption in favour of development, persuades me that the Policy should be couched in positive terms. I recommend accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

**POLICY CO5**

Planning permission will be granted, or prior approval given, for the installation of telecommunications equipment provided that the proposal would:

I) **WHERE PRACTICABLE, COMPRISE THE SHARED USE OF AN EXISTING OR PLANNED INSTALLATION OR BE SITED ON A SUITABLE BUILDING OR STRUCTURE;**

II) **NOT HARM THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE URBAN OR RURAL SURROUNDINGS AND WOULD BE SITED, DESIGNED, PAINTED AND LANDSCAPED SO AS TO MINIMISE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT, SUBJECT TO TECHNICAL AND OPERATIONAL CONSTRAINTS;**

**IN ITS DETERMINATION OF AN APPLICATION, THE COUNCIL WILL HAVE REGARD TO THE AVAILABILITY OF ANY PRACTICABLE ALTERNATIVE, LESS OBFUSCIVE, SITE OR POSITION.**
9. CHAPTER 12: MANAGING THE CONSEQUENCES OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

9.1 POLICY ALT4: MANAGEMENT OF FLOOD RISK

Objections

First Deposit

F671/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F751c/10 Environment Agency Objection
F792/586 Country Land and Business Association - South Objection

Re-Deposit

R127/523 House Builders Federation Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether an addition should be made to the Policy along the lines of unless mitigation measures can be provided which would reduce the risk of flooding.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

9.1.1 As a general principle, both planning conditions and planning obligations can make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable. This principle applies to all types of development, and I see no need to distinguish this particular case. The Environment Agency says that it would object to any suggested alterations to the Policy which would permit development in the floodplain regardless of the need for it or of the supply of lower risk sites simply because some mitigation could be provided. In other words, measures of mitigation would not necessarily make a proposal acceptable. The reasoned justification, in referring to Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 25 Development and Flood Risk, now superseded by Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 25, suitably explains the matter. Subject to updating, these provisions of the Local Plan are satisfactory, but if the Council considers that further explanation is needed it may wish to consider the inclusion in the reasoned justification of the quoted text in the Agency’s letter of 01 April 2004.

9.1.2 The House Builders Federation says that the Policy should allow for the reduction in capacity of one part of a floodplain with a reciprocal increase in capacity elsewhere within the same system. This may be a material consideration to be taken into account in the determination of a planning application, but the unaltered Policy would still be applicable and I see no need for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
9.2 POLICY ALT5: MANAGEMENT OF SURFACE WATER

Objections

First Deposit

F670/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F751d/10 Environment Agency Objection
F852/634 J Taylor Objection
F1130/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R141/10 Environment Agency Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy suitably accords with national policy.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

9.2.1 I welcome the deletion of the reference to the Environment Agency at the Re-Deposit stage. Whilst I have no doubt that the Agency will continue to provide crucial advice on matters of surface water run-off, it is the Council which is the local planning authority.

9.2.2 The Environment Agency requests the deletion of new from the Policy, thereby ensuring that it applies to all development. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 25 Development and Flood Risk does, however, refer to new development in its Annex F: Managing Surface Water. Appropriate surface water drainage arrangements are required, it states, to manage flood risk satisfactorily in new development, and I see no good reason to depart from this policy.

9.2.3 I agree with the Environment Agency that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) should be a relevant consideration in the determination of applications for planning permission for the re-use of previously-developed land. Much will depend upon the circumstances of the case, and it might not always be reasonable or practicable to insist that surface water run-off from redevelopment must be no more than it would have been prior to any development taking place. The reasoned justification should acknowledge the matter, as I recommend.

9.2.4 I accept the Council’s point that SuDSs is appropriate in practically all cases so I see no need to qualify the Policy as Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd suggests. I agree with the Council, however, that a blanket requirement is too restrictive on all development. The Policy, as recommended to be amended, is as exacting as it should be.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT5

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT WHERE SURFACE WATER RUN-OFF WOULD EXCEED THAT
WHICH WOULD BE EXPECTED FROM THE APPLICATION SITE IN ITS UNDEVELOPED STATE.

THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK THE PROVISION OF A SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE SYSTEM WHERE THIS METHOD IS DEEMED TO BE THE MOST APPROPRIATE WAY OF DEALING WITH THE DISPOSAL OF SURFACE WATER.

And include the following addition to the reasoned justification:

Surface water run-off from schemes proposed on previously-developed land should be less than that produced before redevelopment and, where reasonable, reduced to an amount which would have been expected from the site in its original undeveloped state.
10. CHAPTER 13: RENEWABLE ENERGY

10.1 POLICIES REN2 & REN3: WIND FARMS & HYDRO-ELECTRICITY

Objections

Further Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E32/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E33/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether these Policies should be amended at this stage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.1.1 These Policies are unchanged and so are the same as in the adopted Local Plan. The Cornwall County Council considers that its Objections can be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and I endorse that advice.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
11. PROPOSED NEW CHAPTER: SHOPPING CENTRES, INCLUDING POLICY ALT6: LARGE SCALE RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

Objections

First Deposit

F144a/153 Somerfield Stores Ltd Objection
F144c/153 Somerfield Stores Ltd Objection
F256/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F260a/229 Concise Construction Limited Objection
F594/3 Cornwall County Council Objection
F842/627 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd Objection
F859/635 Waitrose Ltd Objection
F1131/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R85/886 Saltash Chamber Of Commerce Objection
R95/627 Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd Objection
R219/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R220/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R221/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R222/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R223/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R224/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R225/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R226/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R227/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R228/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R229/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R230/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R231/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R232/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R233/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R234/901 Tesco Stores Ltd Objection
R235/902 WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC Objection
R236/902 WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC Objection
R237/902 WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether land should be allocated for additional retail development, or whether Policy ALT6 would, in principle, provide a suitable basis for the determination of applications for planning permission for this type of development;

b. Whether proposed extensions should be subject to the same criteria of the Policy as new schemes, and whether the reference to a retail impact study is adequate;
c. Whether Policy ALT6 should be amended in any other way.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

11.1 **Waitrose Ltd** says that the proposed new chapter does not have sufficient regard to national guidance which states in essence that retail policies and proposals should be based upon a factual assessment of retail developments and trends, and that the Alteration has not been informed by a recent District-wide retail capacity study. The Company considers that there is both a quantitative and qualitative need for more convenience and comparison goods floorspace in the Saltash area in addition to that which the adopted Local Plan proposes in Saltash town centre.

11.2 Policy ALT6 is criteria-based, and the few changes which the Council has introduced into it at the Re-Deposit stage bring it more into line with national policy expressed in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 6. These changes are in response to the Objection made by the **Government Office for the South West** and comprise mainly references to the function of a town centre and evidence of need for additional retail development within the town. They reflect national policy concerning the hierarchy of centres and the requirement to assess need. The Policy satisfactorily accommodates the concept of the sequential test in that it accords with the order set out in PPS6 of appropriate existing centres, edge-of-centre locations and then out-of-centre sites.

11.3 The adopted Structure Plan Policy 14 states that retail development should be in or adjoining town centres where it can help sustain the centre’s viability and vitality. Policy ALT6 departs somewhat from this objective in that it distinguishes town centre sites from edge of town centre sites. There may be little practical difference between the Structure Plan and the Alteration, in that a site adjoining the town centre might reasonably be regarded as at its edge. Indeed, PPS6 refers to larger sites adjoining the primary shopping area as edge-of-centre locations. In any event, however, I prefer the approach of Policy ALT6 in that it emphasises the importance of the town centre and accords better with the sequential test as set out in PPS6.

11.4 The Policy rightly takes heed of the prospect of the unavailability of suitable sites within and/or at the edge of a town centre. The reasoned justification for the Policy confirms the approach. Vitality and viability is acknowledged. The Alteration does not allocate any land for retail development and, on the assumption that there is a need for more shopping floorspace in the District during the limited life of the Local Plan, it does not comply with PPS6 paragraph 2.16 which states that local planning authorities should identify and allocate sites in accordance with its paragraphs 2.28-2.51. I agree with the various Objectors who make these and similar points.

11.5 The Council intends to address the issue of town centres and retailing as part of its Local Development Framework (LDF). Work has already started on the preparation of this document, and I have no doubt that the Council will comply with all relevant considerations in PPS6, including an assessment of the need for new floorspace, quantitative and qualitative, and the identification of any deficiencies in provision. In my judgement the emphasis should be on making good progress on the LDF, rather than delaying it by allocating more resources to
the retail aspects of the Local Plan. One of the reasons for my saying that is because Policy ALT6 complies with the last point of PPS6 paragraph 2.16 concerning criteria-based policies. Until such time as the LDF is adopted, it should provide an adequate basis for the Council’s consideration of any proposals for large scale retail development. In the meantime, there is no need to allocate any land for the purpose.

11.6 The Cornwall County Council says that smaller retailing units play an important role in towns and local centres and they too should be subject to similar considerations, including the sequential test, as larger scale retail proposals. This is not a matter which has prevented the issuing of a Statement of General Conformity for the Re-Deposit Plan, and like the District Council I question whether there is likely to be much benefit in subjecting a small scale proposal of less than 500 sq m gross floorspace to the rigours of the test. An out of centre location for this scale of development may result in little impact on the vitality and viability of existing centres. Material considerations could, of course, outweigh this general conclusion in particular cases.

* *

11.7 On the second issue, I consider that sizeable extensions to existing facilities should be subject to the same criteria as new development and the redevelopment of existing facilities. This approach accords with national policy in PPS6, especially its paragraph 3.1 and I see no reason to depart from it. It should be made clear, however, that the sequential approach is a relevant consideration only in relation to extensions where the gross floor space of the proposed extension exceeds 200 sq m. The Policy should make this clear, as Tesco Stores Limited and William Morrison Supermarkets Limited request and as I recommend. Hopefully this will also meet one of Mr Colin Breed MP’s concerns. He refers to proposed extensions of more than 10% of the existing floorspace, and considers that they should be treated as a new application and be subject to all the criteria of the Policy.

11.8 I agree with him in principle, although it would be better to define the floorspace of an extension to which the Policy applies. He will also note that a local planning authority can attach a condition to a planning permission to bring under control the creation of additional floorspace by way of, for example, a mezzanine floor. I agree with Tesco Stores Limited that a planning condition should be imposed to prevent the sub-division of a store where this action can be justified in terms of the tests in Circular 11/95. It should not be a matter of policy, and Criterion (c) (viii) should be deleted.

11.9 Tesco Stores Limited says that it is unnecessary to include criteria which relate to matters which would be examined as part of an impact assessment. In my opinion, however, Policy ALT6 rightly draws attention to them in the bullet points of its criteria (c) (ii). Nevertheless, the reason justification should be expanded, drawing attention to the requirement for an impact assessment for developments of more than 2,500 sq m gross floorspace, or for smaller schemes as appropriate.
11.10 There are other matters. I agree with the Council that a new store should be sited on that part of the land nearest the town centre, and that it should have direct street frontage onto the town centre. Much may depend upon the size and shape of the application land, considerations which would be taken into account before and at the planning application stage, but the Policy rightly emphasises the need to ensure that shopping facilities are as close to a town centre as possible. This serves to retain a shopping frontage, strengthen the vitality of the centre, accentuate its compactness and increase the convenience of those who shop in it. Bearing in mind the need for flexibility in format, design and scale (including car parking) in the determination of development proposals, as the Structure Plan requires, I do not consider that the criteria to which Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Limited and Tesco Stores Limited refer are unduly onerous. The objective should be a matter of policy, and more than a preference.

11.11 Although it is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition, preserve existing commercial interests or prevent innovation, I consider that Policy ALT6 rightly seeks to avoid harm in terms of the likely effect on future private sector investment in nearby town centres. This approach should serve to safeguard the position of a town in the District and County hierarchy. Criterion (c) (ii) 2 is in the public interest and I support it.

11.12 I agree with the Cornwall County Council that an objective should be to avoid a substantial increase in all, and not just single purpose, car journeys. The Re-Deposit Plan meets the point. Tesco Stores Limited objects to the criterion concerning the provision of “dual role” car parking. It does, however, accord with national policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 which encourages the shared use of parking, particularly in town centres, and I see no good reason to depart from it. Size of site may be a vital consideration, but the objective is of sufficient importance to make it a matter of policy. There is no Alteration to Policy EV13 Car Parking in the adopted Local Plan, and the Council should take it into account, together with national policy in PPG13 and particularly its Annex D Maximum Parking Standards, in its determination of applications for large scale retail development.

11.13 Criteria (c) (iv) and (v) deal with different points and should not be combined. But (vii) should be deleted, for the reasons which Tesco Stores Limited says. The development plan should be read and applied as a whole, with due weight being attached to each of its policies according to the circumstances. In other words, policies for the protection of the countryside and the environment should be applied in their own right and should not be part of Policy ALT6.

11.14 Tesco Stores Limited makes other Objections. I see nothing wrong with the criterion which seeks to ensure that buildings are of a character which reflects the typical local architectural style. Town centres in the District have great character which should be protected from development of poor design and materials. Local distinctiveness is an important consideration, and the criterion should stay.

11.15 I see nothing fundamentally wrong with (b) If no suitable sites are available within a town centre..... in that viability can be regarded as but one of the aspects of suitability. Others include size, shape, availability, accessibility and being well served by a choice of means of transport. Nevertheless, I think that the criterion
could be improved with a reference to viability, along the lines of PPS6 paragraph 3.19. I recommend accordingly.

11.16 I have my doubts about Criterion (b) (iii) which states that a suitable site should immediately abut the town centre. For retail purposes, PPS6 defines an edge-of-centre location as being within easy walking distance (ie up to 300 m of the primary shopping area). Although I take account of local considerations, particularly the small scale of the District’s towns and their centres, I do not consider that they are sufficiently compelling to outweigh national policy. I agree with the comments of Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Limited and those of the Council in its Document CDCWR28 and recommend accordingly. All I would add, however, that a main road within 300 m of a town centre might make a site at that distance from it unsuitable for a store. I am not so concerned about this possibility, however, to recommend that it be included in the Policy.

11.17 My recommendation also takes account of various other representations made by Objectors and the Council which should bring the Policy and its reasoned justification more into line with PPS6, whilst taking reasonable account of local circumstances. I deal with the Objection made by Concise Construction Limited in my consideration of Policy LISK3. Car parking charges would not be appropriately included in a Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

**POLICY ALT6**

(A) **PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR PROPOSALS FOR LARGE SCALE RETAIL DEVELOPMENT, INCLUDING EXTENSIONS TO EXISTING STORES, IF THEY ARE LOCATED WITHIN TOWN CENTRES AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP AND THEY COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:**

i - iii as stated;

(B) **IF NO SITES ARE AVAILABLE, SUITABLE OR VIABLE WITHIN A TOWN CENTRE, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR EDGE OF TOWN CENTRE SITES ONLY IF THEY COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:**

i – ii as stated;

iii **THE SITE IS WITHIN 300 m, TAKEN ON THE LEVEL OR OTHERWISE SUITABLE GRADIENT, OF THE TOWN CENTRE AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP;**

iv **THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE CONVENIENTLY AND SAFELY ACCESSIBLE BY A CHOICE OF MEANS OF TRANSPORT, INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING, CYCLING AND THE CAR, AND BY DISABLED PEOPLE, FROM THE TOWN CENTRE AND THE SURROUNDING AREA;**

v as stated;

vi **THE STORE WOULD BE SITED ON THAT PART OF THE APPLICATION LAND NEAREST THE TOWN CENTRE;**
vii  THE STORE WOULD HAVE A DIRECT STREET FRONTAGE THAT IS WITHIN 300 m, TAKEN ON THE LEVEL OR OTHERWISE SUITABLE GRADIENT, OF THE TOWN CENTRE AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP.

(C)  IF NO TOWN CENTRE OR EDGE OF TOWN CENTRE SITE IS AVAILABLE, SUITABLE AND Viable, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR AN OUT-OF-TOWN CENTRE SITE PROVIDED THAT:

i – ii as stated;

iii  THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT HARM THE RURAL ECONOMY (INCLUDING THE ROLE OF VILLAGE SHOPS);

iv as stated;

v  THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD BE CONVENIENTLY AND SAFELY ACCESSIBLE BY A CHOICE OF MEANS OF TRANSPORT, INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING, CYCLING AND THE CAR, AND BY DISABLED PEOPLE, FROM THE ADJOINING BUILT UP AREA;

vi as stated;

vii deleted;

viii deleted.

Reason Government guidance in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 6: Planning for Town Centres states that planning applications for new retail development should be assessed on the basis of a “sequential approach to site selection”. This means that planning permission should not be granted for retail development outside town centres unless it can be demonstrated that no sites are available, suitable or viable within, or on the edge of, the town centre. The aim is to concentrate retail activity within existing centres in order to increase accessibility by public transport and to promote more compact, integrated and convenient forms of development.

Policy ALT6 applies and enforces the sequential approach by requiring developers of out-of-town schemes to demonstrate that no sites are available, suitable and viable closer to the town centre. It also requires developers to demonstrate that a proposal would not harm the viability of centres. This is normally achieved by means of an impact assessment. Nationally, PPS6 envisages the provision of impact assessments for developments of more than 2,500 sq m gross floorspace, but the Council envisages that in Caradon, with its small towns and their centres, impact assessments will be required for smaller proposed developments. Town centres are defined on the Proposals Map and are the same areas to which Policy HO12 applies.

Planning permission for extensions to existing large scale retail developments (defined as developments greater than 500 sq m gross floorspace) outside town centres will be granted only if they comply with (C) above. For the purpose of the Policy, factory outlet centres, discount stores and warehouse clubs are treated as retail businesses. Large scale
extensions are those with a proposed gross floorspace of more than 200 sq m (see PPS6 paragraph 3.29).

Where circumstances justify it, the Council will by way of condition(s) restrict the subdivision of a store into smaller shops and/or extensions which would result in additional floorspace.
12. LISKEARD AREA STATEMENTS

12.1 POLICIES LISK1 & LISK2: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE & LARGE SCALE RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

Objections

First Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F74c/86</td>
<td>N A Pampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F74d/86</td>
<td>N A Pampling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether these Policies should be retained in, or deleted from, the Local Plan.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

12.1.1 These Policies which apply to Liskeard are proposed to be deleted from the adopted Local Plan and superseded by Policies ALT1 and ALT6 which apply throughout the District. Hence they are not included in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration. The former applies to railway and associated land whilst the latter applies to large scale retail development. There is no need for the duplication which would result from the retention of Policies LISK1 and LISK2 and I support their deletion from the Local Plan. In particular Policy ALT6, as recommended to be modified, would be more in line with national policy.

12.1.2 The Objections are of a general nature and do not lead to any requirement to change my recommendations concerning the Altered policies. And it is not for me to review previous Council decisions concerning, for example, Trago Mills.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
12.2 POLICY LISK3: NON-FOOD RETAIL ALLOCATION

Objections

First Deposit

F1134/1  Government Office for the South West Objection
F260b/229 Concise Construction Objection
F593/3  Cornwall County Council Objection
F74e/86  N A Pampling Objection

Re-Deposit

R274/1  Government Office for the South West Objection
R302/3  Cornwall County Council Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this Policy should be deleted from the Local Plan.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

12.2.1 These objections have been superseded by events in that the land concerned is fully developed in accordance with the Local Plan Policy. In these circumstances, it would be misleading to portray the land as an allocation.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended by the deletion of Policy LISK3.
12.3 POLICY LISK4: WEBB’S HOTEL

Objection

First Deposit

F74f/86 N A Pamling Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Objection calls for any modification to the First Alteration.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.3.1 There is no proposed Alteration to this Local Plan Policy and it is not for me to review the Council’s decisions concerning land near this building.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Local Plan.
12.4 POLICY LISK6: PROTECTION OF SHOPPING CORE

Objection

First Deposit

F74g/86 N A Pampling Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this Policy should be retained in, or deleted from, the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.4.1 The Objector is concerned about the alleged abandonment of Liskeard town centre rather than the First Alteration’s proposed deletion of the Policy and paragraph 1.21. Hence these provisions do not appear in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration. The substance of the Policy is included in Policy ALT7 which I consider elsewhere in my Report. This will be a District-wide policy which is a better approach than preparing individual, similar policies for different parts of the District.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
12.5  POLICY ALT9: INDUSTRIAL LAND ALLOCATION & POLICIES

ALT10 - ALT15

Objections

First Deposit

F168/176  Johanna Matthews  Objection
F214c/217  Liskeard Town Council  Objection
F233c/225  CPRE - Caradon  Objection
F282/240  Jane Owen  Objection
F372/320  Miss Lynne Taylor  Objection
F558a/484  Mrs B Moss  Objection
F559a/485  PS Moss  Objection
F682/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Objection
F751e/10  Environment Agency  Objection
F751e/10  Environment Agency  Objection
F798b/592  Highways Agency  Objection
F835a/620  William Douglas Fisher  Objection
F849/633  Brook Street Properties Ltd  Objection
F903a/678  Frank & Sidonie Driburgh  Objection
F945a/720  Janet Owen  Objection
F947a/722  Jane Luiten  Objection
F948a/723  Anthony Luiten  Objection
F949a/724  David Van Meurs  Objection
F950a/725  Mrs MA Van Meurs  Objection
F951a/726  M Hambly  Objection
F952a/727  Eileen Hambly  Objection
F953a/728  John Hambly  Objection
F1011a/785  Mrs PM Aldworth  Objection
F1012a/786  AJ Aldworth  Objection
F1013a/787  B Woodman  Objection
F1014a/788  WA Woodman  Objection
F1076a/848  Mrs J V Aldworth  Objection
F1077a/849  James Lockyer  Objection
F1078a/850  G C Aldworth  Objection
F1135/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R32/320  Miss Lynne Taylor  Objection
R167/225  CPRE - Caradon  Objection

Main Issues

a. Whether these Policies, as appropriate, should include a reference to the need for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).

b. Whether there is a need for more land to be allocated in Liskeard for industry, business and commercial development and, if so, whether the Council’s proposal is of the right amount and in the right location;

c. Whether the Proposals Map gives sufficient information.
Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.5.1 The Environment Agency will note my comments on Policy ALT5 and there is little to add to them here. I would expect all concerned to agree on the importance of these systems. I have no doubt that the Council, in consultation with the Agency, will insist on their adoption where appropriate. There is no need to labour the point in each of these policies.

12.5.2 My understanding is that carbon dioxide, although the main greenhouse gas, is not the only one. I therefore agree that Policy ALT9 should acknowledge the point. Criterion (c) could, with benefit, be made shorter and sharper.

12.4.2 On the second issue, some Objectors say that not enough land has been allocated to provide jobs for the large increase in residential development envisaged. These representations, however, were made at the First Deposit stage of the First Alteration, since when the Structure Plan has been adopted (2004) which reduces the amount of housing land required in the District. This, in turn, has resulted in the deletion of some of the residential allocations proposed for the town. This, in my view, has brought residential and employment allocations more into balance and emphasises the importance of Liskeard as a local centre.

12.4.3 Structure Plan Policy 12 requires that a range and choice of marketable and quality sites for employment should be made available based upon assessments of likely demand from existing and new firms and other relevant considerations. Its Policy 25 notes that certain other main towns, including Liskeard, play an important role as local centres for employment and other purposes. In that context, the Council instigated an Employment Land Assessment May 2005 (Document CD/14). This work took account of the existing situation, created a picture of new requirements and identified a new portfolio of employment sites. Thus the amount of land proposed and its location east of Charter Way are based upon its findings.

12.4.4 There are a number of especially important findings. These include the dearth of undeveloped land within employment areas in Liskeard, amounting to as little as 0.77 ha. The town accounted for over one third of all enquiries in the District for employment land during 1990-2003, and these figures suggest that growth has been constrained by a limited amount of available land. The analysis of employment growth by main towns during 1995-2002 shows that the faster growing areas are related to the Plymouth economy, with Saltash and Torpoint accounting for 54% of the employment growth in the District. Liskeard and Callington showed hardly any employment growth. The Consultants conclusion here, however, is that the take-up of new sites and premises in Liskeard has been steady and the impression given from the data from the enquiries indicate rather more optimism in the town than past employment growth trends might suggest. In line with these findings are the results of the Council’s Industrial land Survey 2006 which shows that 237 of the 244 units on the town’s industrial sites were occupied, and occupancy rate of 97%.

12.4.5 The main growth sectors have been construction and other services, and another conclusion is that the economy will continue to grow in Liskeard, Looe and the western rural areas. I therefore accept that Liskeard requires more land for employment purposes. The predicted future growth in employment has been translated into land requirements, and it is estimated that 35.66 ha of land should be allocated in the District for the purpose. There is no need for me to repeat at
length the findings of the Assessment. It is in the public domain and so it is there for all to read. Suffice it to say that I find the findings comprehensive and convincing. There is no evidence more compelling which would lead me to the conclusion that the Consultant’s estimate of the net new employment land requirement in Liskeard is wrong. I accept that there is a need for another 11.35 ha of land to be allocated for the town and I consider that there is a reasonable prospect of its being taken up, and with more jobs being provided for local people and thereby reducing their need to travel into Plymouth or elsewhere for work.

12.4.6 Brook Street Properties Ltd and other parties object to the proposal on grounds of visual intrusion and nature conservation. The CPRE, for example, draws my attention to what it describes as the highly visible nature of the present development. Like all the rural surroundings of the town, I agree that this land is attractive countryside and, unless a development on it is sensitively designed and landscaped it would intrude into it. The Proposals Map indicates substantial landscaping along the edge of the site with Green Lane and Charter Way, and this should much reduce visual intrusion. Green Lane would provide a useful physical boundary to the development but, owing to the pronounced downward sloping nature of the land in the vicinity generally from south-west to north-east, substantial screening will be necessary and careful attention given to the height and design of the buildings. These considerations should combine to reduce visual impact upon the surroundings.

12.4.7 It is alleged that no comprehensive ecological analysis of the site has been undertaken. That appears to be true, but I am given no evidence to suggest that this is so important a constraint to justify rejection of the allocation. The Council will have to take a view on it at the planning application stage, and presumably it will introduce any reasonable measures to mitigate impact. As with so many planning decisions, a judgement must be made on competing objectives. In this case, it must be based upon the need to protect this part of the rural scene and the attributes of the site and upon the need for employment opportunities to cater for the reasonable job expectations of the town and its people.

12.4.8 The Objector Company continues that the land is isolated from any proposed residential allocation and would therefore not benefit from being a mixed development scheme of the type which it puts forward for Tencreek Farm. The Government Office for the South West says that the proposal is not well related to the town centre and that it is not clear how employees would travel to work other than by car. I agree that the location is not ideal, in that it is not close to some of the main residential parts of the town and it is to some extent severed from the main built up parts of the town by Charter Way. Even so, it is within a short walking distance of residential areas to the west of Charter Way and from the Council’s proposed scheme at Addington which I support. It is within about 15-20 minutes walk of the town centre. In that way it compares favourably with, and indeed a little better than, Tencreek Farm. Its proximity to, and continuation of, the existing Oaklands Industrial Estate at Charter Way makes sense. It has good access to the A38 and A390 roads. I endorse the Consultants’ recommendation and the reasons for it which they give.

12.4.9 Charter Way is on 3 bus routes. No 274 is an infrequent service every one and a half to 2 hours between Liskeard Rail Station, the town centre and Merrymeet/Menheniot. No 574 provides a service every hour or so each way during the working day between Liskeard town centre, the Hospital, Morrisons and Callington. No 593 provides a similar hourly service between the town centre and Plymouth. A public transport service of this, albeit limited, frequency together with
the proximity of existing and proposed residential development with its prospect of convenient walking distance to and from the proposed employment area gives the land a good degree of sustainability. No doubt green travel plans could increase it, and consideration should be given to a bus stop within the scheme.

12.4.10 In my judgement, the location gives considerable scope for walking, cycling and using public transport for people to get to and from work. This should minimise further demands on local roads and accord with Government policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 4 of encouraging new industrial development in locations which minimise the length and number of trips, especially by motor vehicles. Significantly, the Highways Agency agrees that the site is within the most sustainable location to create a self-contained community and acknowledges that improvements to public transport will also be important in achieving this objective. Following the deletion of various proposed allocations at the Re-Deposit stage, the Agency’s objection is withdrawn on the understanding that what I regard as its reasonable requirements set out in its letter of 09 October 2006 are met. One of them is consultation on the scope, content and appropriateness of a Transport Assessment, to be submitted in support of any development proposals for the site.

12.4.11 Taking all the above matters into account, I conclude that the right amount of land is proposed to be allocated for employment purposes. Despite some uncertainties and disadvantages, the proposed location is suitable.

12.4.12 On the third issue, Johanna Matthews says that the proposed allocation on the Proposals Map should indicate roads. Other Objectors say much the same with respect to tree belts, footways and cycleways. I would resist these suggestions. An allocation on a Proposals Map establishes the principle of a development. The setting out of detailed matters at this stage would fetter the Council’s discretion in its determination of a planning application. I do not doubt the importance of these considerations, but indicated routes of these various means of access at this early stage of allocation might not be the best ones. The design and appearance of a scheme and means of access to and within it should be a matter of negotiation between the Council, prospective developers and other parties prior to, and during, the planning application stage. The reference in the Policy to a 15 m wide heavy planting strip and the retention of important hedgerows is, however, a useful start.

12.4.13 Some Objectors are concerned about the possible effect of surface water run-off and pollution. I have no doubt that the Council will take these points into account, relying on local and national policies and the advice from consultees including the Environment Agency as it does so. From the evidence, I am not persuaded that these potential problems would be insurmountable and should prevent the envisaged development. In particular, however, I would urge the Council to pay careful attention to the detailed points made by Miss Lynne Taylor.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT9

(C) A SUSTAINABLE DESIGN THAT INCORPORATES RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES AND MINIMIZES ENERGY LOSS AND THE RELEASE OF GREENHOUSE GASES.
12.6 POLICY ALT10: HOUSING - LAMELLION

Objections

All objections to this Policy are listed in Appendix 4.

Main Issue

a. Whether this Policy should be re-instated in the First Alteration of the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.6.1 This Policy, which allocates approximately 16 ha of land for about 400 dwellings at Lameillion, appeared in the First Alteration to the Local Plan. It attracted a considerable number of objections at that stage and it has been deleted in the Re-Deposit stage of the Alteration. A key consideration has been the reduced housing requirements of the adopted (2004) Cornwall Structure Plan. This has led to a number of allocations in Liskeard and elsewhere being deleted to bring the Local Plan into general conformity with the Structure Plan, a statutory requirement. These circumstances still apply, and my approach in adjudicating on the objections is to decide where an appropriate amount of land for housing in Liskeard can most suitably be located. For reasons which I set out in my consideration of Policy ALT11, I consider that the Council’s proposals for Addington best meet those objectives and that the allocation of any other land in the town for housing would not improve the Local Plan. That, by itself, is enough to uphold these objections to Policy ALT10. But I will continue, demonstrating the additional unsuitability of this land for housing.

12.6.2 Virtually all the rural surroundings of Liskeard comprise attractive countryside, but in my opinion the land to which this Policy refers is particularly so. I much agree with the representations made by Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited whose Document P026 Appendix 15 the Council adopts as its own. I agree that much of the land is within one particular Landscape Character Type, Rolling Agricultural Downland. Its strongly undulating nature, its pattern of fields, its trees and its boundaries invariably marked by hedgerows are amongst the features which contribute to a landscape of much character and beauty. Its exposed nature and prominence in the wider area draws well-deserved attention to it. It is well worth protecting, and particularly when there is no need for the development which the Objectors at the Re-Deposit stage seek for it.

12.6.3 The A38 road with its dualled carriageway forms a strong physical barrier between the more and less urban parts of Liskeard. Even though there is some compact and some more scattered development to the south west beyond the London Paddington - Penzance railway line, this strong physical feature forms an even more emphatic boundary between the main built up parts of the town and its rural setting. This point is well illustrated by Drawing No 2876/25 in the above mentioned document. There is no doubt in my mind that the development of this land at Lameillion would result in a large urban incursion, consolidating and extending that which already exists and causing substantial damage to the peace, tranquillity and beauty of the rural scene. As is stated, it would neither conserve nor enhance the existing character of the site and its environs.
12.6.4 The location of the land results in further disadvantages. The objectors at the Re-Deposit stage have no credible proposals for a suitable means of access. They do not control land between the site and the re-aligned A38 Road towards Dobwalls, and so it could not be served from the Dobwalls By-Pass even if that could be undertaken in a satisfactory fashion and with the agreement of all relevant parties. In reply to the Council’s question at the Inquiry, it was stated on behalf of **Messrs Blamey, Cross and Gregory**, No, we do not have control over all necessary land to provide the proposed road. This state of affairs would result in yet more traffic, and in all probability a substantial amount of it, being drawn through the town centre and Station Road to and from a development of considerable scale. Whilst there is no estimate of the number of vehicles likely to be generated by as many as 400 dwellings, a primary school and all that is proposed in the deleted Policy, it is reasonable to suppose that this additional traffic would cause a significant amount of congestion and inconvenience, and that is putting it mildly. The Policy fails on this count also. The closeness of Liskeard railway station does not alter that, or any of my other conclusions in this part of my Report.

12.6.5 A further point concerns distance from the town centre and the convenience or otherwise of walking to and from it. It took me about 20 minutes to walk to the town centre, as marked by Lloyds TSB bank on The Parade, from the entrance to Lamellion Cross. The comparative journey from the centre of the Addington site took me about 15 minutes. Bearing in mind national policy to reduce the need to travel, especially by car, I consider that this is yet another reason why the Policy should not be re-instated. The bus service is relatively good with an hourly or so frequency during most of the day, but it is not significantly better than the service between Addington and the town centre.

12.6.6 I note local concerns about sewage treatment. Maybe any current problems could be overcome with or without the development, but it is not a matter which justifies the Policy in the teeth of the many constraints to which I refer. I have taken into account all the other points raised. These include Liskeard Action Plan Final Report which was published in January 2003 and prior to the adoption of the Cornwall Structure Plan 2004, the suggested phasing of development and the provision of a commuters’ car park and affordable housing. Again, however, they do not make the development acceptable. The Policy should remain deleted, as the Re-Deposit plan ensures.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
POLICY ALT11: HOUSING - ADDINGTON

Objections

All objections to this Policy are listed in Appendix 5.

Main Issues

a. Whether, bearing in mind Structure Plan policies and requirements, the Council is proposing too many, or too few, dwellings in this part of Liskeard;

b. Whether, bearing in mind mitigation, compensatory and enhancement measures, such assets of the land as its landscape and scenic quality, its flora and fauna, outweigh any need to develop the land for housing;

c. Whether a phasing policy for its development is justified, and whether land ownership is an issue which might delay the scheme or otherwise cause problems;

d. Whether the requirements of Policy HO11 concerning affordable housing are too onerous for this particular site;

e. Whether the requirements are excessive concerning sports facilities and that one hectare of housing be built to the highest achievable standards of sustainable construction;

f. Whether the requirement concerning contributions to a primary school is justified;

g. Whether a suitable level of infrastructure is available or could be provided as part of the scheme.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

Introduction

12.7.1 As part of the Inquiry, I held a Round Table Session (RTS) on Policies ALT11 and ALT15 on Tuesday 05 December 2006 at which the above issues were discussed. Those attending included representatives of the Addington Environmental Action Group (AEAG) which opposes the allocation of land for housing at Addington, the prospective developer company, Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited which in principle supports the allocation but considers that additional land should be allocated, a local resident Mr Alan Cook and the Council. I have taken into account all the points made at the RTS as well as those in the many written representations submitted by local people who object in both principle and detail to the Policies. I made an accompanied site inspection during the morning of Tuesday 06 February 2007 and I have made unaccompanied site inspections before and after the RTS.

Structure Plan requirements and the number of dwellings

12.7.2 My Conclusions on this issue accord with those in my consideration of such Policies as HO1-HO4. Briefly, I conclude that focussing much of the District’s housing requirements on Liskeard is in line with national and Structure Plan policies as well as emerging Regional policy concerning sustainability. In essence, they ensure that housing developments are promoted in suitable locations which offer a
good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Linked to that objective is the need to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The main role of Liskeard is that of a service centre for the surrounding rural area. These are amongst the reasons which lead me to support the Council’s broad strategy of steering most growth towards the District’s main towns, of which Liskeard is one.

12.7.3 For reasons already explained, I support the thrust of the Council’s case that more land is required for housing to meet Structure Plan requirements for the District. I do not agree with all the Council’s calculations, particularly its allowance for various types of windfalls, but in view of my recommendations concerning other proposed allocations and the Omission Sites, I agree with the Council that a development of about 475 dwellings in Liskeard is needed. This, with the other considerations, should result in an overall housing provision comfortably within the flexibility of the Structure Plan target and which acknowledges the general direction of travel at national, Regional and local level towards more housing, whilst ensuring continued general conformity with the Structure Plan.

12.7.4 Related to the number of proposed dwellings is the size of the site. There are clear advantages stemming from the scale of development envisaged. It puts the Council in a better position in reasonably requiring a developer to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure. As a general proposition, that infrastructure is more likely to be provided quicker, and hence to the greater benefit of the community, if a developer is able to concentrate resources on a larger site. This should also result in the speedier provision of affordable housing, so urgently needed in the District. The size of the site must, however, be weighed in the balance with the environmental consequences, a matter to which I will return. Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited objects on the basis that about 27 ha of land (or 26 ha when account is taken of Tenerife, Timberlee and Elizabeth Cottage) should be allocated for about 600-700 dwellings, and this is the basis for the 3 Concept Plans which are prepared on the Company’s behalf (Document P026 Appendices 23, 24 & 25). Bearing in mind my calculations about commitments and windfalls etc, I do not consider that this scale of development is needed at present. The resulting extension northwards is therefore unjustified. Moreover, the Council’s proposed northern boundary of the land is clearly identifiable and development beyond it would result in a prominent incursion into rising land. The inclusion of the additional land in the allocation would no doubt assist in the implementation of the road scheme, but this consideration is outweighed by the environmental damage.

12.7.5 Several additional and/or alternative locations are put forward for major residential development in Liskeard. They are mainly Tencreek Farm and Lamellion, and I examine their advantages and disadvantages in some detail elsewhere in my Report. In comparison with them, the land at Addington has clear advantages. It is closer to the town centre and so gives greater scope for walking to its shops, banks and other facilities. It took me about 18 minutes to walk from the centre of the site to Lloyds TSB bank on The Parade. It is close to a good range of leisure facilities at the Lux Park Leisure Centre and enjoys convenient access to primary and secondary schools including the Liskeard School and Community College. It is near the Council Offices at Luxtowe House, a major local employer, and within reasonable walking distance of the Council’s proposed allocation of land for employment purposes at Charter Way (Policy ALT9). The 574 bus provides a generally hourly service throughout much of the day to the town centre, taking in Morrisons and Liskeard Hospital. The site does not extend beyond a strong physical feature like a main road or railway line which, as is the case with
Lamellion, marks an emphatic edge to the main built up area of the town. Nor, like Tencreek Farm, does it give the impression of being somewhat remotely located and isolated from the town centre beyond the urban fringe of an out-of-centre complex. Instead, its position between St Cleer and Callington Roads and its proximity to residential areas of substantial size to the west, south and south east give it a greater degree of physical and visual containment as compared with its 2 proposed alternative/complementary schemes.

12.7.6 Mr and Mrs Groves suggest that the southern part of the land allocated under Policy ALT15 in the First Deposit of the First Alteration be re-included to enable the proposed Charter Way link road extension to be routed away from existing housing at Trecceca Cottages and the Halbachic Burial Ground. Fields A, B and C on their Appendix 1 plan are between the lands allocated at the Re-Deposit stage under Policies ALT11 and ALT15. The area includes additional land which Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited wishes to be allocated for residential development. I recommend against the Company’s suggested extension to the Council’s proposals under Policy ALT11, but I note the Council’s reference in its Document CDCP13B to the ability to expand the (ALT11) site northwards if further housing land needs to be allocated in a future development plan. No decision should be made now that might prejudice that later assessment of land north of Tremblaze Lane towards the site which the Re-Deposit plan allocates for open recreational use.

12.7.7 I conclude on this issue that the Council’s proposed scale of development of about 475 is right and that a larger or smaller figure would not improve the Local Plan. I further consider that, although the frequency of the bus service is far from ideal and would probably not therefore attract a large number of future residents to it, the location is in principle the best one under consideration for the scale of development proposed.

* The assets of the land and their implications.

12.7.8 As with all the rural surroundings of the town, the allocated land is attractive and has many attributes which include its trees, its lanes, its undulating nature and its quality for wildlife and its habitats. The AEAG refers, for example, to buzzards, bats and deer in the area, including in and around gardens, and I have great sympathy with the many local people who do not want to see the land developed. Like the competing sites, it is not subject to any national or local designation for its protection, but I consider that it is less exposed and prominent in the wider surroundings than, say, Lamellion. Its topography thus provides a greater opportunity to keep development below the skyline and hence minimise its visual impact.

12.7.9 The southern part of the site has the more enclosed character with high, dense boundary hedgerows between fields and the steep hedgebanks along Tregay Lane. Much work has already been undertaken to show how the impact of the development could be minimised by demonstrating how features like certain trees and hedgerows could be retained and how and where new planting, buffer areas and zones of protection could be introduced. This is a good start and I would expect any landscape proposals to seek to incorporate and accentuate the characteristic features of the Caradon Southern Landscape Character Area set out in Document P026 Appendix 5 page 8. Those proposals should pay special attention to the rural character of Tregay Lane, the historic farm tracks, field boundary hedgerows, hedgebanks and green corridors linking with features beyond...
the site in the open countryside.

12.7.10 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would have to accompany the planning application, and this would deal in greater detail with those matters which at present are the subject of the appraisals. These appraisals, submitted by Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited, are comprehensive and thorough and persuade me that, although there would inevitably be a substantial impact upon such attributes of the site as its landscape, flora and wildlife and its habitats, suitable mitigation, compensatory and enhancement measures could be introduced to make the development acceptable. I appreciate that these measures could be applied to any large site on the edge of the town, and that Structure Plan Policy 1 Principles for Sustainable Development would equally apply. In those respects the allocated land is not unique, but its topography would make those measures more effective. Surveys show that there is little to choose between Addington, Tencreek Farm and Lamellion in terms of agricultural land quality, and although farming practices and the size of holdings varies, none of these 3 sites enjoys any distinct advantage over the other 2 on this count.

12.7.11 On the basis of the evidence, there is nothing to show that the 2 aforementioned alternative sites are at any significant advantage in terms of ecology, agriculture land quality or landscape. Indeed, I consider that the less exposed nature of the land when compared with Lamellion and its greater degree of containment when compared with both is a better basis for the measures outlined. This gives greater opportunity for the development to be assimilated into the landscape through the retention and enhancement of the locally characteristic features to which I refer and, returning to my examination of the first issue, it is the most logical location for the growth of the town and to provide for its needs. Its undoubted assets, so well explained and described by local people at the Inquiry and in their written representations, do not outweigh that Conclusion.

* Phasing and land ownership and its assembly

12.7.12 On this third issue, there is little that I can add to my Conclusions concerning Policy HO3. At the time of writing, the start of the second phase (April 2008) as anticipated by the Council is less than one year away and I suspect that it will be overtaken by development during the Council’s proposed first phase. Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited envisages development starting in 2008/09 and shows its expected rates of completion on the site. In round terms, they are of 50-125 dwellings annually. I have no reason to dispute the Company’s evidence on the matter, and the steady delivery of homes from this large site should be welcomed. That is a more certain and hence better approach than placing a somewhat arbitrary phasing constraint on the land. That is my conclusion, irrespective of the weight which should be attached to the advantages of phasing in particular circumstances and national policy on the management of land as expressed in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3.

12.7.13 Furthermore, it would be wrong to delay any of the development until such time as all, or a substantial majority of, previously-developed land and various commitments, has been exhausted. Nor should it await the bringing forward of a good proportion of the expected windfalls. Either delay could too much hold up the supply of homes, contrary to national policy. A related advantage is that more urgently needed affordable homes should be sooner provided, and there would be a more certain basis for the provision of infrastructure. I support the allocation of the land and the developers should, in
principle, be allowed to get on with a scheme for it as soon as possible and, to use common parlance, without let or hindrance. This should ensure the objective in PPS3 of delivery a *flexible, responsive supply of land*. A phasing policy for this land is unjustified.

12.7.14 The above Conclusions bring me to the matter of whether the allocation should be defined as *strategic*. The Council considers that a site should be treated as strategic if its strategy for housing would fail without it. In other words, as PPS3 puts it, it is critical to that strategy. Owing to the Council’s undue reliance on windfall sites, I think that it is a moot point whether the allocation of land at Addington and its prompt development would make the difference between the success and failure of its strategy. The main point, however, is that development at Addington should start as soon as possible, and the supply of housing on it should continue without any unnecessary constraint. On that basis, it is my view that it matters little whether or not the land is described as *strategic*, and I make no recommendation on the matter.

12.7.15 I understand that **Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited** controls all but one field on the allocated land and that this is at the periphery of the likely development area. I am assured that the Company controls sufficient land to allow for most of the development to take place, including the construction of the proposed road. The control is in the form of options for a certain number of years. I do, of course, accept these assurances and there is no evidence to suggest that land ownership or any problems of land assembly render the site anything less than what PPS3 describes as *deliverable*.

---

**Affordable Housing**

12.7.16 I deal with this matter in some detail in my consideration of the Objections to Policies HO11 and HO13, although the former is of greater consequence in respect of Addington. I appreciate that its prospective developers may reasonably be required to contribute towards the provision of infrastructure, perhaps including public open space proposed at St Cleer Road (Policy ALT15). I agree with **Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited** that it is not possible at this stage to determine the precise number or percentage of affordable homes which should be provided on site. Reasons include other obligations which might be justified, including perhaps for education. As far as I can see, there are no intense physical or other constraints on-site which might depress the number of affordable homes which might reasonably be sought. Bearing in mind such matters as the approach of Policy HO11 with its requirement for the Council to seek the provision of a minimum of 40% affordable housing on a site of this size and my attaching importance to negotiations and flexibility, I see no reason why this land should be given exceptional treatment by way of a lighter requirement. Policy HO11, modified as I recommend, should apply to it. And in view of the Government’s policy to promote sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, the Council should seek to get as many affordable homes on it as is reasonably possible.

---

**Sports facilities and sustainable construction**

12.7.17 On this fifth issue, I turn my attention mainly to Policy ALT11 d) and f). In principle, I can see nothing wrong with the Council’s expectation that the developers should contribute towards on-site community facilities, including play areas and open space and, if reasonable, to the development of 8.8 ha of sports...
pitches on the land to which Policy ALT15 applies. Presumably any contributions would be by way of a Section 106 Agreement, and the crucial point is that any obligation must meet the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations. Perhaps of especial importance in this case is its B5 (iv) which requires that an obligation must be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. For that reason, I am doubtful about the clause in d) which states that the community facilities are to be based upon an assessment of community need. Much would depend upon the community identified for the purpose, but the clause is prone to ambiguity. The inference might be drawn that the Council is seeking to oblige the developer to redress existing shortages. It would be better to delete this clause and rely on the Circular in the application of this part of the Policy.

12.7.18 The 3 Concept Plans show different ways of providing open space and its relationship with residential development. These Plans, however, accompany the objection lodged by Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited for a larger allocation of land at Addington than the Council proposes. As intimated above, I do not consider that this would improve the Local Plan and I recommend against it. I am therefore working on the presumption that residential development will proceed generally as the Council intends, and that the land to which Policy ALT15 refers will be developed for open recreational use. This future use of land will set the context for the drafting of any planning obligations. On the assumption that the open space within the development would be small scale compared with the playing fields to which Policy ALT15 refers, each would serve a different need. It would then seem reasonable for the developer to contribute towards both of them, in accordance with the tests of the Circular. The developer should probably not be expected to contribute towards pitches on- and off-site. In this respect, however, the relevant clauses of the Policy would need to be applied in accordance with the same tests.

12.7.19 Policy ALT11 h) requires that about one hectare of the allocated land be reserved for a housing scheme of the highest achievable standards of sustainable construction. The Council refers to Policies RE6, 3 and RE5 in RPG 10, the Structure Plan and the South West Regional Spatial Strategy (SWRSS) respectively as well as PPS3 paragraphs 14-15. These policies certainly encourage various aspects of sustainability including the greater use of renewable energy sources and sustainable construction principles. I do, however, have strong reservations about drawing attention in this way to one particular part of a residential scheme. Sustainability is a concept that should be applied throughout, and the inference might be drawn that it applied less than it should do to the other, larger part of the site. I also agree with Mr Stacey on behalf of Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited that modern standards of construction are fast evolving and may, as he says, be contradictory. And the somewhat vague nature of the clause raises doubts in my mind about its actual requirements.

12.7.20 I appreciate that the Council wants to promote something special, but the deletion of this clause in the Policy would not prevent them from doing so. Indeed, as Mr Stacey says, it would be in the interests of the developer to follow the approach which the above general policies encourage. With the rising cost of energy, another relevant point as agreed at the RTS is the likely better marketability of homes constructed at a high standard of sustainability. In my opinion, purchasers will increasingly demand homes which are more energy-efficient. Policy ALT3 concerns sustainability in its various aspects, and should be brought to bear in the preparation of a residential scheme at Addington and elsewhere. In short, I do not consider that Policy ALT11 h) is necessary. It should
Contributions to a primary school

12.7.21 The County Council estimates that a scheme of 475 dwellings would generate about 60 children of primary school age. Policy ALT11 e) requires contributions towards the primary school for which land subject to Policy LISK7 is allocated. Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited draws attention to declining school rolls in rural areas and considers that Policy ALT11 e), which requires a contribution towards a primary school, is unnecessary. On the Company’s behalf, Mr Stacey draws attention to his proof P016 paragraph 6.1-3. This information is provided by the Cornwall County Council and shows that in October 2006 Liskeard Hillfort (Infant and Junior) School and St Martins C of E Primary School had net capacities of 420 and 290 pupils respectively. Numbers on rolls were 395 and 270 respectively, with a forecast of 333 and 277 respectively in January 2008. This forecast thus shows that there will be 100 fewer children at these schools than their net capacity (420 + 290 = 710) – (333 + 277 = 610). Forecasts further indicate increasing spare capacity at schools a little further from Liskeard at Dobwalls, St Cleer and Menheniot.

12.7.22 The e-mail of 24 January 2007 from the County Council to the Programme Officer states that forecasts show an increase in numbers for both Liskeard Hillfort and St Martins Schools than those indicated in your (the Programme Officer’s) letter. They indicate a combined additional 27 places required for 2008 so the need for additional pupil spaces in Liskeard is still growing. Mr Stacey says that the Company is not seeking to walk away from any obligation to contribute towards primary school provision, and I am in no doubt that all parties concerned can rely on its good word. But the clause should stay in the Policy as a marker of what might reasonably be required should, for example, the development result in a need for more school places if that need cannot be accommodated by any spare capacity at the time or in the foreseeable future.

12.7.23 In its e-mail of 08 March 2007 (Document P026G) the County Council explains that 2 new classrooms have just been built at Liskeard Hillfort Primary School and that this was to cope with the potential of the new development. It now wishes to recoup some of that cost by obtaining the Section 106 for the houses which will put that pressure on the School. As with Clauses d) and f) of the Policy, the acid test will be whether the seeking of a contribution either retrospectively or in the expectation of future school building would meet the tests of reasonableness set out in Circular 05/2005. And, once more, its paragraph B5 (iv) concerning scale and kind is likely to be especially important. If those tests cannot be met, little if any weight should be attached to Clause e). Mr Stacey well sums up the matter in that the issue is then whether such a retrospective contribution is a reasonable request in the context of Government guidance and Circular advice on the matters and that this would have to be addressed as part of the overall package of Section 106 matters.

12.7.24 I doubt whether the Clause should refer to land already held by the County Council on the site allocated by Policy LISK7. Whilst I am not aware of any intention of the County Council to dispose of the land, plans and intentions change over time and I see no need for the Policy to be so definitive. The Clause would lose no clout as a result of the deletion of this part of it.

Liskeard Area Statements 150
Infrastructure

12.7.25 Local residents are concerned about provision of all necessary infrastructure for a scheme of the scale proposed. They point to present problems about sewage treatment works, water supply, flooding and roads and their capacity. I rely a good deal on the Statement Regarding Infrastructure, Access and Sustainability (Document P026 Appendix 7) none of the findings of which is seriously challenged. The same applies to the Draft Statement of Common Ground concerning highways and related matters (Document P026B). There is no reason to believe that all reasonably required infrastructure will not be provided as part of the overall scheme. To that end, for example, national policy on development and flood risk aims to ensure that flood risk is taken into account at all stages of the planning process. I note that the Environment Agency is keen to ensure that a Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) is implemented, and other consultees are likely to advise and/or insist on other measures and requirements. The precise alignment of the proposed link road between the unused arm of the A390 roundabout and the B3254 St Cleer Road has yet to be confirmed, but I have no reason to conclude that it would not suitably serve the residential scheme. It should also provide relief from traffic for those parts of St Cleer Road south of its junction with the proposed link road, to the benefit of those whose properties front this road.

12.7.26 Inevitably a scheme of the scale proposed will result in a significant amount of traffic. An important aim, however, must be to locate it where the traffic generated can be kept to a minimum. The proximity of the site to the town centre and other facilities and employment land close by, as well as the availability of public transport, does provide that opportunity. The design of the scheme should include safe and convenient routes for pedestrians and cyclists with links to existing routes, and I have no doubt that the Council will work with the developers and others as appropriate in ensuring that it does so. Indeed, consultation with statutory undertakers, the Environment Agency and other parties will be a vital part of the planning process. In conclusion, I am not persuaded that any present problems of infrastructure, or the insurmountability of any in the future, should preclude the type and scale of development which the Council proposes.

-0-

12.7.27 There are some other matters which have some bearing on the drafting of the Policy. As discussed at the RTS, it should be made more exacting, with should being replaced by must or shall. Clause i) explains how the Policy will be applied, or rather what should accompany the planning application; it should be part of the reasoned justification. There is no need to cross-refer to other Local Plan policies as the development plan should be read as a whole. Other re-wording, mainly minor, is in accordance with my Conclusions.

12.7.28 The Council will note the point which the Highways Agency makes in its letter of 07 December 2006 that it still reserves the opportunity to comment on the suitability of site-specific proposals.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT11

A SITE OF ABOUT 19 HECTARES IS ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT AT ADDINGTON AND IS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP. DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE MASTERPLAN FOR THE WHOLE SITE AND SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

A) ABOUT 475 DWELLINGS;
B) A PROPORTION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING;
C) A LINK BETWEEN THE A390 AND ST CLEER B3254 ROADS;
D) ON-SITE COMMUNITY FACILITIES, INCLUDING PLAY AREAS AND OPEN SPACE;
E) IF REASONABLE, A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATION;
F) IF REASONABLE, A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF 8.8 HECTARES OF SPORTS PITCHES ON LAND AT ST CLEER ROAD ALLOCATED FOR THE PURPOSE;
G) A SAFE AND CONVENIENT PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE NETWORK LINKING TO THE TOWN CENTRE, THE PROPOSED SCHOOL SITE AND THE ADJACENT RECREATIONAL LAND;
H) OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AS REASONABLY REQUIRED.

Reason In support of any planning application for the development of this land, the Council will require the submission of a Transport Assessment to determine its effect on existing infrastructure and the potential for maximising the use of modes of transport other than the private car for travelling to and from it. The Assessment will therefore examine the opportunities for public transport to serve the development and it will propose measures to maximise their effectiveness. This is in acknowledgement that sustainable transport is an important issue and it will have to be a vital component of the Masterplan. The site is within reasonable walking distance.........

And deletion of references to the phasing of development.
12.8  POLICIES ALT12, ALT13 & ALT14: HOUSING - BRAMBLE LANE END, WESTERN AVENUE & ROSEMELLEN TERRACE

Objections

All objections to these Policies are listed in Appendix 6.

Main Issue

a. Whether these allocations should be re-instated.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.8.1 These Policies were introduced into the First Alteration at its First Deposit Stage but deleted at the Re-Deposit stage. Policy ALT12 allocated about 1.7 ha of land at Bramble Lane End for 50 or so dwellings, Policy ALT13 allocated about 1.5 ha of land at Western Avenue for 45 or so dwellings and Policy ALT14 allocated about 1.61 of land at Rosemellen Terrace for 40 or so dwellings. The many objections to these Policies at the First Deposit stage refer to such matters as problems of access, capacity of local roads, pollution, the effect upon the landscape and wildlife and the proposed development of and loss of greenfield land.

12.8.2 The sole Objector to Policy ALT12 at the Re-Deposit stage is Mr T Mitchell who requests its re-instatement. In summary, he says that this small site is available and represents a modest infilling which meets the sequential test in the identification of land for housing which was set out in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3. Small sites such as this, he says, are essential to compensate for any delays in bringing forward larger sites. Mrs M Solomon, the sole Objector at the Re-Deposit stage to Policy ALT13, makes similar comments with regard to the land at Western Avenue. Nobody objects to Policy ALT14 at the Re-Deposit stage and the inference must be that all Objectors are content with the Council’s deletion of the site at the Re-Deposit stage. I see no reason to disagree with them.

12.8.3 There are good reasons to support the deletion of both sites to which Policies ALT12 and ALT13 apply. Following the reduced housing requirements for the District in the adopted Structure Plan, there is no need for them to be allocated and for greenfield sites to be developed. The position of the land at Bramble Lane End at the rear of existing dwellings makes it far from ideal for residential development, and the less than satisfactory means of access further detracts from its suitability. The Western Avenue site is further from certain main community facilities than would be the development for which land at Addington is proposed to be allocated.

12.8.4 The Highways Agency notes that the deletions reduce the level of residential allocations present in Liskeard and hence supports this action. It is better to focus the housing needs of the town on a large, well-located site with its better opportunities for community gains than to rely on dispersal. There is no evidence to show that development at Addington will be unduly delayed, and that it will not provide a reasonable number of urgently needed affordable homes and other benefits. In summary, the Local Plan would not be improved by the re-instatement of the Policies the subject of this part of my Report. These Policies should remain deleted, as the Re-Deposit Plan proposes.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
12.9 POLICY ALT15: OPEN RECREATION - ST CLEER ROAD

Objections

All objections to this Policy are listed in Appendix 7.

Main Issues

a. Whether the development of this land for recreational use would be unduly intrusive in the surroundings;

b. Whether the allocation will help to meet current and future shortfalls of playingfields.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.9.1 There is a good number of Objections to this Policy, although a substantial proportion of them relates to Policy ALT11 concerning the proposed allocation of about 19 ha of land at Addington for a development of about 475 dwellings.

12.9.2 Mr Wilton on behalf of the Addington Environmental Action Group (AEAG) says that there is a lack of clarity about the Council’s proposals for the land. He is particularly concerned about the grading of the site and, in his view, the need which will arise for unsightly retaining walls, high fencing and the effect on wildlife. There is, of course, a substantial difference between the detail required at the stage of an allocation of land and the greater amount of it to be submitted as part of a planning application. At that later stage, the suitability or otherwise of floodlighting, the appropriate number of car parking spaces and access arrangements would be determined. The Policy rightly refers to open recreational use, and that should be expected on land beyond the existing and proposed main built-up parts of the town. Existing openness should be part of the prevailing form of the use of this land for recreation, with an emphasis on sports pitches and the like. Any buildings and/or structures or works should be small in number and scale to reduce their impact upon the landscape. That is the thrust of the Policy, and I support it.

*  

12.9.3 On the second issue, I do not doubt that there is a need for the facilities to which the Policy refers. Nevertheless, the House Builders Federation is correct that developers should provide for a proportion of recreation land based on future demand, not existing shortfalls. More accurately, the Council should seek obligations which meet the tests set out in Circular 05/2005, and particularly in its Annex B5 which says that an obligation must be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. Bearing in mind my recommendations concerning Policies RE2 and ALT11, the importance of the Circular in this matter and the reference in the Reason to local authority funding, I see no need to modify the Policy or its reasoned justification.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
13. SALTASH AREA STATEMENTS

13.1 SALTASH: MISCELLANEOUS

Objections

Re-Deposit

R149/171 Saltash Town Council  Objection
R158/900 Cllr Brian Carter  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether priority should be given to affordable housing.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

13.1.1 The Council lists these representations as comments rather than objections, and notes the points made. As I say elsewhere in my Report, the need for affordable homes is urgent and it should be treated as a priority. I consider that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration, amended as I recommend, will do all that is reasonable in land use terms to bring forth their provision.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
13.2 POLICY SA1: BROADMOOR FARM SALTASH & PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS01 BROADMOOR FARM, SALTASH AND POLICY SA2: HOUSING

Objections

First Deposit

F14/27 Mr J Phare Objection
F163/171 Saltash Town Council Objection
F163/171a Saltash Town Partnership Objection
F219/219 H J Kendall Objection
F233a/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F233b/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F396/343 South West of England Regional Development Objection
F465/402 Mr R F Rogers Objection
F490e/427 Kier Bond Objection
F693/528 Plymouth City Council Objection
F751j/10 Environment Agency Objection
F817/603 Liz Waugh Objection
F822/607 R J Parsons Objection
F823/608 Forder Community & Conservation Association Objection
F1141/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R16/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
R76/881 TTR Developments Ltd Objection
R146/171 Saltash Town Council Objection
R201/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether, bearing in mind Structure Plan policies and requirements, there is a need for the employment uses which the Policy proposes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.2.1 Policy SA1 was altered at the First Deposit stage and deleted at the Re-Deposit stage. Most Objectors at the First Deposit stage challenge the need for the employment and/or housing, although the Policy refers to a prestige site for significant employment-generating business development. The Government Office for the South West advises the Council to review the proposal in the light of the Panels’ Reports on the Devon and Cornwall Examinations in Public (EiP), and states that the proposed development would not appear to be well-related to a choice of means of transport and that traffic which it would generate may exceed the capacity of the roads to Plymouth. The Highways Agency says that transportation remains a major issue which is yet to be resolved. Others express their concern about such matters as the loss of countryside and the possibility of flooding.

13.2.2 Since the publication of the First Deposit of the First Alteration in June 2003, the Cornwall Structure Plan October 2004 has been adopted. Besides reducing the housing requirements for the District, it provides the context for Major Strategic Sites for employment. Such sites, its explanatory memorandum says,
should be of a minimum of 12, and preferably of 50, hectares. They are expected to be well-related to the Principal Urban Areas or, in the particular case of Cornwall, the Principal Regeneration Area (Camborne-Redruth). It continues that sites of this type are not proposed in the Structure Plan and that major employment needs will be focused on regeneration throughout the Camborne-Pool-Redruth area and in other towns in Cornwall; individual major sites would not complement this approach. The demand for such a scale of development is not supported by the evidence and the Structure Plan does not retain its former proposal for Broadmoor Farm. The Council’s deletion of Policy SA1, and the 160 ha site on the Proposals Map to which it relates, accords with these considerations and keeps the Local Plan in general conformity with the Structure Plan. I therefore support the Council’s decision.

13.2.3 Several Objectors suggest that the land be retained as an allocation for a mixed development and/or an education campus. Mixed development to my mind would include housing as well as employment. As I conclude elsewhere, the Local Plan as Altered will include enough land to meet Structure Plan requirements and there is no need for more land to be allocated at Broadmoor Farm. I agree with the Council that the need for the scale and type of educational facilities for which the site might provide would be better considered after the adoption of the Regional Spatial Strategy. That implies inclusion or otherwise in the Local Development Framework.

13.2.4 Maybe, as put to me at the Inquiry, this land will be considered for development in the future. Mr Wilks, on behalf of TTR Developments Ltd, says that the crux of his objection is that more land should be allocated in Saltash to provide for its long term natural growth and to obtain a better balance of residential and employment development. Mr Colin Breed MP says that he does not object to the Council’s current stance, but wishes to ensure that this particular strategic piece of land when ultimately developed, as it surely will be, conforms to the wishes of the community as expressed in its local consultation exercise. These 2 Objectors and the Council suggest the inclusion of 2 paragraphs in the reasoned justification of the First Alteration.

13.2.5 I cannot, of course, anticipate national and Regional policy at whichever time in the future Broadmoor Farm might be considered for development, and I make no comment on what the decision might be. Nevertheless, I endorse their suggestion with my recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended by the inclusion, wherever the Council thinks appropriate, in its reasoned justification of the following:

The Council has, in the past, recognised the potential of land at Broadmoor Farm, Saltash for development. For example, Policy SA1 in the First Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan safeguarded 160 ha of land there as a special site for significant employment-generating business development with community services, housing and educational facilities. It was deleted in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration owing to considerations which included the provisions of the adopted Cornwall Structure Plan.

The allocation of this land at present would not generally conform with the Structure Plan, but the Council accepts that, owing to its scale and
location, Broadmoor Farm is one of several options which may be considered for an urban extension to the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA). Should Broadmoor Farm be developed at some time in the future, the Council would expect a scheme to be based upon the 3 following principles. It should be community-led, it should reflect the needs of the community and it should be based upon a comprehensive, holistic approach with a strong emphasis on all relevant aspects of sustainability, including the generation of renewable energy, minimum greenhouse gas emissions and the achievement of the highest environmental standards.
13.3 POLICY SA4: HIGHWAY RESERVATION

Objection

Further Deposit

E6/635 Waitrose Ltd Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the land to which this Policy relates should continue to be safeguarded.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

13.3.1 Neither the First Deposit nor the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan proposes any alteration to this Policy. It thus remains as it appears in the adopted Local Plan as Policy SA4 and on the Proposals Map (Map 27).

13.3.2 I have had serious reservations about this Policy. I question whether the Council’s statement in Document CD/1 that the retention of the Policy enables/provides options when considering the future growth of the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA) is sufficient justification for safeguarding the land shown on Map 27. That response does not seem to me to accord with national policy in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) paragraph 5.22 that, in safeguarding land local authorities will need to be realistic about the prospects for the start of the project in the plan period.

13.3.3 The Council, as I requested, has taken the matter up with the Highways Agency and the correspondence is an Inquiry document (Document ID036, A, B, C, D & E). The 2 pieces of land to the north of the Carkeel roundabout and to which the Policy refers were protected for a possible future improvement to the roundabout. The Highways Agency supports this protection as increasing congestion will inevitably lead to a need to improve the roundabout, and is currently developing an improvement scheme.

13.3.4 Waitrose Ltd has submitted a planning application to extend its store on land to the north east of the roundabout within the safeguarded land, and this is the subject (June 2007) of ongoing negotiations. The Agency has, however, accepted the principle that an exchange of land to facilitate a future roundabout can form part of the negotiated mitigation package. Drawing ID036C is a drawing which forms part of the application and purports to show the land to be reserved for the improvement to the roundabout.

13.3.5 The Council supports the Highways Agency’s view and has no objection to the area shown on Map 27 being reduced to that shown on Drawing ID036C. The Drawing, however, is not entirely clear. I presume that the land to be reserved is the piece of the land to the north east of the roundabout to which the Policy refers, but the Drawing does not show its entire area. Indeed, it appears to be exactly the same area as that to which the Policy refers.

13.3.6 The additional information persuades me that the road improvement proposals are sufficiently realistic to protect the land concerned. Nevertheless, the Council, the Highways Agency and Waitrose Ltd should agree on the precise area of
land to be protected, and the Local Plan should be amended accordingly.

13.3.7 The Highways Agency says that the piece of land to the north west of the roundabout should remain protected as shown on Map 27.

13.3.8 Although not the subject of an objection, the A38 Saltash to Stoketon Cross improvement (shown as a black dashed line on Map 27) was withdrawn from the national road programme in 2004 and the Route Protection (TR111) was cancelled. No doubt the line will be deleted, and presumably as part of the preparation of the Council’s Local Development Framework (LDF).

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that the Local Plan be amended by the deletion of land the subject of Policy SA4 to the north east of the Carkeel roundabout and its replacement with the definition of a revised strip of land, its area to be agreed by the Council, the Highways Agency and Waitrose Ltd.
13.4  POLICY SA8: REDEVELOPMENT IN FORE STREET

Objections

Re-Deposit

R86/886  Saltash Chamber Of Commerce  Objection
R143/897  Saltash Partnership & Gateway to Cornwall MCTI  Objection
R147/171  Saltash Town Council  Objection
R156/900  Cllr Brian Carter  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this Policy should be re-instated or remain deleted, as in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

13.4.1  The Re-Deposit of the First Alteration proposes the deletion of this Policy and its reasoned justification at paragraph 1.23. I agree with one objective of the Policy, to promote the comprehensive development of this land between Fore Street and Lower Fore Street, but I am not convinced that it should be limited to all the types of use which are proposed. Other uses, perhaps including residential or a mix of commercial and residential, may be suitable in principle. The Policy and its reasoned justification are rightly deleted in the Re-Deposit Plan, thereby releasing the land of an unnecessary constraint.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan, and hence that the Policy and its reasoned justification remain deleted.
13.5  ST MELLION STATEMENT & INSET MAP 36

Objection

Further Deposit

E5/907  Crown Golf Ltd  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the First Alteration to the Local Plan should include a policy allowing a mix of development, the improvement of existing facilities and benefits to the local community at the St Mellion Golf Course.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.5.1 I consider that a policy along the lines suggested, even if it had been agreed between the parties, could have proved to be a hostage to fortune and committed the Council to a scale and type of development which might not have been appropriate. It would be better for the Company to discuss its proposals prior to the submission of a planning application, with the hope that the negotiations proved fruitful in the context of relevant national and local policies. The introduction of a policy would not improve the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
13.6 POLICY ALT23: SALTASH EMPLOYMENT ALLOCATION

Objections

Re-Deposit

R72/27  Mr J Phare  Objection
R165/225 CPRE - Caradon  Objection
R283/1 Government Office for the South West  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the allocation of this land west of Carkeel Services for industry, business and commerce is justified.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

13.6.1 **Mr J Phare** says that there are empty industrial premises and other vacant land in the Saltash area and so there is no need for the allocation. The **CPRE** makes similar points. The **Government Office for the South West** points out that the Council will need to satisfy itself that local needs at Saltash justify the scale of provision and the visually significant expansion of the urban area.

13.6.2 In relation to South East Cornwall (Saltash and Torpoint), Structure Plan Policy 24 states that employment provision should be for local needs. In justification of the allocation, I find that there is little which I can add to the Council’s response to the Objections in its Topic Paper Five Employment Land 2006. The Employment Land Survey 2005 identifies further demand for employment land in the Saltash area, and the Industrial Land Survey 2006 found that there were only 9 industrial units vacant of the 209 on existing industrial estates. In my experience, a vacancy rate of just over 4% is low and may well reflect nothing much more than changes in the occupancy of buildings. It is consistent with a strong demand for premises. Predictions suggest that a total of 35.66 ha of additional land is required in the District during the plan period 2001-2016, and a share of this at Saltash of 11 ha is reasonable.

13.6.3 Inevitably, any allocation of greenfield land on the edge of a built-up area will result in an incursion into the countryside, as is the case here. As the Council says, however, the land enjoys no special landscape designation and lies to the south west of the main ridgeline. This gives it some sense of enclosure, and should help to shield views of its intended development from the surroundings. I have no doubt that the Council will insist on a suitable landscaping scheme to ensure further protection, and to blend the development as far as is reasonably possible with the rural scene to the north and west.

13.6.4 The surroundings to the east and south are distinctly urban in character, and there is sense in choosing land close to existing employment land at the Tamar Valley Industrial and the Moorlands Trading Estates, to main roads and transport routes. Although located on a different, northern side of the A38 road from the main residential parts of Saltash, it is not beyond a reasonable walking distance from some of its neighbourhoods. It is also on or close to a number of bus routes.

13.6.5 I think it significant that the **Saltash Town Council** supports the allocation. It says that there needs to be a good cross section of small start-up....
businesses and to allow the already established businesses in the town to obtain units large enough to retain them in Saltash. This accords with the findings of the Surveys. There is a good case for allocating land for employment to meet local needs, and I am not persuaded that a better location could be found for it. The need outweighs the harm to the rural surroundings and the allocation is justified.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
14. LOOE AREA STATEMENTS

14.1 POLICY LO8: DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING LOOE CONSERVATION AREA HOTEL REDEVELOPMENT

Objections

First Deposit

F215/218  Mr & Mrs V Bennett  Objection
F812/600  Robert Winter  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy is sufficiently precise and rigorous.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

14.1.1 Mr and Mrs Bennett say that there are several examples of 4 and even 5 storey buildings within the Looe Conservation Area and development should not be restricted to 3 storeys as Criterion (ii) normally requires. The Criterion includes normally, but I would advise against the use of this word because it introduces unnecessary vagueness into a Policy. Sufficient flexibility is already provided by virtue of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Section 38 (6) which ensures that a determination is made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The same applies to Criterion (v). Either the word should be deleted from the criteria or, in the case of (ii), it should be replaced with a clause along the lines which the Objectors suggest. Indeed, that would be preferable and I recommend accordingly. I do not think that have regard to is strong enough. Accord with would be better.

14.1.2 The Council raises doubts whether Mr Winter’s Objection is duly made. On the assumption that it is, I see nothing wrong with Criterion (vii) and do not consider that the Local Plan would be improved by any Alteration to it. To make the Policy more exacting and rigorous in other ways, I consider that should be replaced by shall.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY LO8

(ii) THE HEIGHT OF THE PROPOSED BUILDING SHALL ACCORD WITH THE SMALL SCALE LOCAL ARCHITECTURAL CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDINGS, OR IN OTHER CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL BE OF A SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THAT OF ITS TALLER NEIGHBOURS AND SHALL FOLLOW EXISTING BUILDING LINES,

with the replacement throughout the Policy of should with SHALL, the deletion of normally in Criterion (v) and with the following addition to the Reason:
Many of the buildings in the Looe Conservation Area are of no more than 3 storeys in height. Where they are of more storeys, the Council may be prepared to grant planning permission for a building of a similar height to reflect the prevailing height of its immediate neighbours.
14.2 POLICY PEL1: LAND SOUTH OF PELYNT VILLAGE (PROPOSED OMISSION SITE OS28) & POLICY ALT17: HOUSING - PELYNT

Objections

All Objections to these Policies are set out in Appendix 8.

Main Issue

a. Whether Pelynt is a sufficiently sustainable settlement for significant growth and, if so, the appropriate scale and location of that growth.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

14.2.1 Policy PEL1 in the adopted (1999) Local Plan allocates land at the south of the village for not more than 18 dwellings. The Policy remained unaltered in the First Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan, but the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration increases the number of dwellings on this 1.72 ha site to 50. Policy ALT17 in the First Deposit of the First Alteration allocates a site of about 1.3 ha at the north of the village for no more than 40 dwellings. The many Objections at the First Deposit stage are to Policy ALT17. The Re-Deposit deletes this Policy and so presumably meets the Objections.

14.2.2 Pelynt is one of the larger villages in the District with a population in 2001 of 1,124. In its CD50 the Council outlines its facilities which, according to this evidence, comprise primary school, post office, surgery and petrol filling station. The 573 Liskeard – Looe – Polperro bus provides a generally 2-hourly service during much of the weekday (Mondays to Saturdays) with a higher frequency towards Liskeard of 30/60 minutes during peak periods; there is no Sunday or Public Holiday service (CD/69). Mrs Lonsdale says that this service has replaced that provided by Hamblys Coaches and, like her, I am not sure that these times would help people getting to work – Plymouth, Liskeard, Trago etc. I think it significant that the Cornwall County Council, in its objection to Policy PEL1, says that without specific justification the proposals seem likely to be highly car dependent and encourage travel to larger centres in conflict with Structure Plan and national policy.

14.2.3 At the Inquiry, I sought further information about services and facilities in the village and spent some time assessing them in terms of quantity and quality. Pelynt School has 72 enrolled pupils in 2006/07 with a potential capacity of 114 with only a few minor improvements. Mr Jolliff tells me that the surgery includes a chemist, and that within the village there is the Jubilee Inn, the petrol filling station which includes a repair garage, a general store cum post office which, as I saw, provides a good range of daily needs. The grocery’s and butcher’s premises have recently been extended, there are 2 hairdressers, a kennels and cattery. The Pelynt Club and the Village Hall comprise 2 separate buildings. There is a mobile bank which calls on Friday mornings and a cash dispenser in the post office. There are some jobs within and without the village, including at the aforementioned community facilities, on nearby farms and holiday cottages and at the 3 large holiday parks. Significantly, however, there is no secondary school, supermarket, permanent bank, dentist, leisure centre as defined by the Council, library, hospital or train service. The dispersed and limited number and type of jobs implies commuting mainly to towns and, owing to the generally infrequent bus service, in
all probability by car.

14.2.4 The Council says that it has retained Policy PEL1 in the Re-Deposit on the basis of the Inspector’s Report into Objections to the now adopted Local Plan, and is not justifying this allocation on sustainability grounds. From my assessment above, that is entirely understandable. **Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited** says that Policy PEL1 seems to be based purely on the existence of an established part of the site for caravans and camping, and there appears to me to be some truth in this comment. In the Inspector’s view, Pelynt was relatively well-served by facilities and public transport. But that conclusion was expressed over 10 years ago in January 1997, since when there has been considerably more national, regional and local emphasis on sustainability. Crucial policies include those in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 3 (2001) to reduce the need to travel especially by car, Structure Plan Policy 1 (2004) which seeks a reduction in the need to travel and Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 (2006) which promotes housing developments in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. I have brought them to bear on these Objections.

14.2.5 The village is not sufficiently sustainable to provide for a scheme of 18 dwellings, let alone 50. **Mr Jolliff** seeks the allocation of about 7 ha of additional land at the south of the village for housing which, at 30 dwellings per hectare, could result in another 210 dwellings. He thus envisages a total of up to 260 or so dwellings at the southern end of the village. This is completely unjustified and would raise questions about general conformity of the Local Plan with the Structure Plan. Furthermore, the residential use of the land allocated by Policy PEL1 would result in a consolidation of development and a more urban intrusion into the surroundings. Development of the additional 7 ha of land to which his objection refers would lead to an even more pronounced erosion of the countryside.

14.2.6 There are other, related matters. In his consideration of **Mr Jolliff’s** land at the south of the village, the Inspector noted that Casey Lane was narrow, and that the visibility at its junction with the B3359, a busy main road, was extremely restricted in a southerly direction. It was not surprising, he said, that there had been a number of accidents on this count. He felt that the regular and fairly extensive use of the junction by vehicles emerging from Casey Lane was clearly dangerous, and the prospect of an alternative access and partial one-way system funded by a limited residential scheme on the land added weight to the case for its development. This is not, of course, the same as justifying it, and I understand from the Project manager of Local Safety Schemes that there have been no police recorded accidents in Casey lane since 1995 to the present day.

14.2.7 The Inspector took account of the somewhat complex planning history of the site. I have studied the evidence on the matter, but I follow his lead in declining to say what the present lawful use, or any part of it, might be. I see, however, that an established use certificate was issued in 1972 confirming use of part of the site as a caravan and camping site, and the Council says that this still appears to be extant. Certainly the land has a discernibly different character from the agricultural land to the south, and the generally rural surroundings hereabouts. The Inspector came to the view that there was little practical merit in excluding the land from the village development limits. That conclusion does not oblige me to come to the same, or a similar view. As outlined above, planning circumstances have significantly changed during the last 10 or so years.

14.2.8 The increase in the number of dwellings which the Council proposes, from 18 to 50, accords with national policy concerning higher densities. I agree
that the higher number would be more likely to deliver such benefits as more affordable homes, a play area, a road link from Casey Lane to the B3359 and a contribution towards a playing field. Higher densities are to be welcomed in principle, but they should be promoted in suitable locations. Pelynt does not meet the criteria set out in PPS3 and none of these other matters outweighs the strong policy reasons which militate against the allocation of the land to which Policy PEL1 refers.

14.2.9 Objections to Policy ALT17 are mainly on the basis that more traffic would put a strain on parking, access to the site is dangerous and wildlife and its habitat would be destroyed. These and other points are well made by, for example, Mr and Mrs Lang and Mrs Lonsdale. But I doubt whether any of these matters justify the deletion of the Policy. I place more emphasis on the limited degree of sustainability of the village with its restricted range of community facilities, poor access to jobs and key services and the incursion into open countryside which would result from the development of the land. The Council is right to delete the Policy, and it should remain so as the Re-Deposit Plan proposes. Whether the site would be suitable for an affordable housing scheme under Policy HO13 is for the Council to determine.

14.2.10 In short, Pelynt is not a suitable location for expansion for significant development. None of the related matters outweigh that conclusion, and none of the sites should be allocated for up to 18, 50 or more dwellings.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended by the deletion of Policy PEL1.
14.3 POLICY P3: DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING POLPERRO CONSERVATION AREA

Objections

First Deposit
F813/600 Robert Winter Objection
F1089/861 Lansallos Parish Council Objection

Re-Deposit
R119/861 Lansallos Parish Council Objection

Main Issue
a. Whether the Policy could be made more certain and exacting.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.3.1 I consider that criterion (vii) should remain as it is. The emphasis should be on keeping extensions in the style of the parent building, and in ensuring that any replacement building in a period block or terrace is in the same idiom as its neighbours. A high quality contemporary design solution might be suitable in some circumstances, and this might be a case where material considerations outweighed the criterion in the Policy.

14.3.2 The harbour area is within the Conservation Area and relevant local and national policies should suffice in ensuring that the Council abides by the statutory requirement of paying special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. For the Policy to specify that delabole slate should always be used on roofs would make it too prescriptive. Materials to be used should be a matter of negotiation between the Council and the prospective developer in the context that they must be sympathetic to the character of the area. The Policy goes as far as it should, and can be amplified by reference to existing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) or any future Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which the Council might prepare.

14.3.3 There are other matters. Normally should be deleted from Criteria (ii) and (v), shall should replace should throughout the Policy and the opening clause should be brought more into line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. I recommend accordingly.

14.3.4 In conclusion, the Policy is basically sound but it could be made a little more certain and exacting, as I recommend.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY P3

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR REDEVELOPMENT IN OR ADJOINING POLPERRO CONSERVATION AREA WILL BE GRANTED PROVIDED THAT:

by the deletion of normally in Criteria (ii) and (v), and by the replacement of should by SHALL.
14.4 PROPOSALS MAP INSET 47: POLRUAN

Objection

Re-Deposit

R137/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether Polruan is a sufficiently sustainable settlement to justify the residential development of land at Greenbank and, if not, whether there are any other considerations which outweigh that conclusion.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

14.4.1 This land, about 0.85 ha in extent, is Omission Site (OS) 29. It is in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) of which the whole of Polruan is part.

14.4.2 In its Document CDCP24/A, the Council sets out the community facilities at Polruan. They are a primary school, a post office and a surgery. The Lanteglos Community Transport provides a bus service to Bodmin Asda on the second and fourth Thursday of the month, leaving Polruan at 0930 hrs and arriving back at Polruan at 1345 hrs. I was given additional information at the Inquiry about local community services and I spent some time in both Polruan and Fowey to judge for myself their number and quality. The facilities at Polruan include 2 churches, 2 public houses, a shop which includes a newsagent, 3 other retail outlets, a café, village hall and women’s institute. The Objector says that it is served by excellent local transport links, including a community and local bus service to Bodmin, St Austell, Truro and Tavistock. My impression from the many notices about local events is that there is a thriving community in the village.

14.4.3 There is a regular passenger ferry service across the Harbour to Fowey. As I discovered, the single fare is 90p and it operates up to 1900 hrs Monday to Saturday and up to 1700 hrs on Sunday. In the summer it operates up to 2300 hrs. It is licensed to carry 12 persons and it leaves the Quay and, at the time of the year of my inspection (late March 2007), returns every 10-15 minutes or so. Fowey has more community services than Polruan, including a secondary school, hospital and a greater range of shops. It has no trains, but there are connecting bus services to St Austell main line rail station. There is no supermarket. As I saw at my inspection, the Fowey Town Bus leaves the town centre every 15 minutes on Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays to the main car park and anywhere else in the town.

14.4.4 I have no doubt that community facilities in Fowey, owing to its proximity and the regular ferry service to and from it, supplement those at Polruan. Another ferry, taking cars, operates between Bodinnick and the northern end of Fowey, and I am told that some people who live in Polruan and work in Fowey use it. There is spare capacity at the Primary School, but significantly there is no secondary school, bank, dentist, pharmacy, leisure centre, library, shop large enough to be regarded as a supermarket, petrol filling station or hospital. The village is not served by rail. Some mobile services may be provided, but the absence of the facilities listed substantially reduces the sustainability of the village. There is some employment
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at the local boatyards and at the community facilities mentioned. Certainly the ferries should be taken into account, albeit they should be compared with the greater comfort and convenience of the car in all weathers. Although PPS3 does not rule out the delivery of housing in rural areas, I do not consider that Polruan is a location which offers a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. It is not sufficiently sustainable, and the development as proposed would all too likely result in more travelling, especially by car, on narrow country lanes ill-suited to accommodate it, to main towns for a substantially better range of jobs, shopping, education, leisure and other attractions.

14.4.5 The Objector proposes the erection of about 25 dwellings at a density of about 25 dwellings per hectare. Up to about half the dwellings would be affordable. Open space would be provided within the scheme. The site adjoins built development on 3 sides. To the east and west is residential development, about 30 years old, and to the south is a fire station which was built during the last 5 years or so. The northern boundary is enclosed by a well established bank of trees and a hedgerow. The size, shape, topography and position of the site give it some sense of enclosure, and so it is not prominent in its surroundings. Further screening of a scheme could be achieved with additional planting. These immediate site specific points are considerations in favour of its development.

14.4.6 As in many other parts of the District, Cornwall and, in my experience, a variety of places throughout the country, there is an urgent need for affordable homes. The Caradon Courier of Summer 2004 (Document P040C) reports that the Council has made this issue its top priority. The evidence is that there are 30 households on the Housing Register for the locality. The Housing Needs Survey (2002) shows that Lanteglos Parish, which includes Polruan, needs about 4 new affordable homes every year, or 40 in total during the rest of the plan period up to 2016. The proposed development would therefore provide for no more than 3 years. The draft Housing Needs Survey (2006) identifies a higher District-wide requirement and it is reasonable to presume that there is now a greater need in Lanteglos and Polruan. Owing to the generally close-knit nature of the built-up area, there appears to me to be few, if any, opportunities for infilling within it and, bearing in mind the threshold that would apply, probably even less opportunity for the inclusion of affordable homes in any such scheme.

14.4.7 In my adjudication on the Objections to Policies HO11 and HO13, I conclude that the best way forward in the provision of affordable homes in land use terms is on the basis of those Policies. I therefore recommend against mixed development schemes of market and affordable homes on sites beyond the defined limits of the District’s settlements. That recommendation applies here. In that context, I do not consider that the particular circumstances concerning the site characteristics noted, the scant development opportunities and the need in this Parish for affordable homes outweighs my conclusion about the limited sustainability of Polruan.

14.4.8 There is still the important matter of the AONB. It is possible for development to take place in AONBs but, as with the National Parks, the Broads and the New Forest Heritage Area, the Government has confirmed them as having the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and beauty. Whilst, as I have said, the site is not prominent in its surroundings, it would be the actual presence of the development which would fail to conserve those assets which the Government seeks to protect. In my judgement, the loss of part of the AONB is an assault upon the whole, and in the circumstances of this case it is unjustified.

Looe Area Statements
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan.
14.5  POLICY ALT16: HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT - LOOE

Objections

First Deposit

F16/29  Mr & Mrs R Wilkins  Objection
F233g/225 CPRE - Caradon  Objection
F305/260 Robert S Jay  Objection
F322/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council  Objection
F343/13 English Heritage  Objection
F373/321 Mrs J Wright  Objection
F490/427 Keir Bond  Objection
F544/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited  Objection
F575h/488 Sport England  Objection
F586/3 Cornwall County Council  Objection
F588/3 Cornwall County Council  Objection
F710/545 Philip Shuttleworth  Objection
F712/547 Patrick Saunders  Objection
F752/568 The Co-Operative Group  Objection
F1142/1 Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R25/872 Mrs K J Martin  Objection
R118/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council  Objection
R129/523 House Builders Federation  Objection
R166/225 CPRE - Caradon  Objection
R199/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited  Objection
R284/1 Government Office for the South West  Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether Looe is a sufficiently sustainable settlement for the scale of development which this Policy proposes and, if so, whether the land concerned is suitable in terms of location and topography.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.5.1 The Policy allocates a site of about 7.5 ha to provide for about 100 dwellings in Phase One and 70 dwellings in Phase Two. In 2001 Looe had a population of 5,280, a little over the about 5000 which Structure Plan Policy 25 defines as a main town with an established role and function serving an identifiable hinterland and having well developed transport nodes. Smaller towns and some larger villages, the Structure Plan notes, play an important role as local centres for shopping, employment, community facilities and as leisure and tourist destinations. These centres have the capacity to meet the needs of their surrounding areas as well as their own population. This latter general description applies in the main to Looe. It has all the main community facilities which the Council lists in its Topic Paper 2 Table One, apart from a supermarket and a hospital. Significantly, it provides for primary and secondary education, and in my judgement there is a range of shops in the town centre consistent with a town of this size. It has an hourly or so bus service to Liskeard during weekdays with an admittedly less frequent onward service to Plymouth. There is an hourly or so train service to
Liskeard, taking 25 minutes, where there are connections to Plymouth and the rest of the national main line network.

14.5.2 Important though these transport links are to the people who use them, the emphasis in the allocation of land for housing and other purposes should be to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. Whilst I acknowledge the advantages and attractions of Liskeard for growth, that should not be to the exclusion of the District’s other larger local centres like Looe. Such a strategy would be contrary to Structure Plan Policy 25 of steering some growth to other towns and some larger villages according to their particular roles and local assessment of their varying capacity to support housing and employment growth. The Cornwall County Council raised concerns at the First Deposit stage in terms of the balance and role of the settlement and wider sustainability issues. At that time, a more ambitious proposal was for about 200 dwellings on about 8.6 ha of land. The County Council raises no objection at the Re-Deposit stage and any lingering doubts that it might have are not enough to prevent the issuing of a Certificate of General Conformity of the First Alteration with the Structure Plan. In my judgement, Looe is sufficiently sustainable for the modest and commensurate amount of development which Policy ALT16 proposes for it.

14.5.3 The land has distinct advantages in terms of its location. It adjoins the Secondary School which provides various community facilities. There are small employment areas, recreation and playing fields nearby on the eastern side of Barbican Road. There are several shops within convenient walking distance along the same road. The Policy rightly provides for the creation of a safe, and it should say convenient, pedestrian and cycle network linking all the proposed uses within the site to the Secondary School and beyond, it should say to the town centre. The town centre is at some distance from the site and approached by some routes with steep flights of steps, but not entirely beyond walking distance for the more enthusiastic of the new residents. That disadvantage applies to all sites in this northern part of the town and on other outskirts and should not preclude the development of the allocated land.

14.5.4 Within the site, one hectare is proposed for employment, and to that extent it would be a mixed development. Although it could not be guaranteed that people living in the new residential area would work so close to home, the Policy allows some opportunity for it, if not in the short term then in the longer term. Provided that the employment offered was of a class that could be carried out in any residential area, it should be welcomed. Much of the existing stock of industrial and commercial premises in the town is generally of poor quality with no more than a 60% occupancy rate. There is little that the Council can do to improve it, and I agree that some modern floorspace has the potential to attract more and a wider range of employment uses to the locality.

14.5.5 Many of the Objections refer to the scenic quality of the land, and I do not dispute its attractiveness. It is within an Area of Great Landscape Value, but this is a local designation and does not have the national status of confirmation for its quality as does an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This understandable concern applies to virtually any land on the outskirts of any town in a District with such attractive countryside. The site is prominent in the surroundings but, as the Council says, much of it is on a plateau which allows development to take place without undue damage to the topography. The desire to protect the rural scene and all the qualities of the land is an important consideration, as is the protection of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Nevertheless, they have to be weighed in the balance with the need for more
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housing in the District in line with Structure Plan requirements and the reasonable scale and distribution of that housing to the main centres. In making that judgement, I take into account the scope for a high quality layout and substantial landscaping especially along the more exposed edges of the land. The Council should insist on these provisions as part of the comprehensive masterplan for its development.

14.5.6 There is no objection in this case to the phasing of the development. I recommend against it in the case of land at Addington, Liskeard, essentially because I consider that development there should go ahead without any such constraint so as to ensure the steady supply of land for housing in this main town. Different circumstances apply to Looe. As the pressure for development may be less, and it may be better to retain the phasing here to ensure that development takes place in an orderly fashion, with the second part following the substantial completion of the first. Access would presumably be from the B3253. Inevitably a residential scheme will result in additional traffic on local roads, but there is sufficient frontage to allow for a safe and convenient entrance and I think it significant that the Highways Authority raises no objection in principle to the development.

14.5.7 Careful design and layout should ensure the integrity of the nearby County Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland and a condition on the planning permission(s) could deal with the matter of any archaeological remains on the site. Measures could be introduced to protect historic hedgerows. The Grade 1 Listed Building, the Church of St Martin-by-Looe, is approximately 300 m away and far enough from the site to ensure the protection of its setting. There is an urgent need for affordable homes throughout the District and its southern part which comprises Looe and its surroundings is no exception. The development of this land should include a reasonable amount of affordable homes, in accordance with Policy HO11 and although this requirement by itself does not justify the scheme, it is a point in favour of it.

14.5.8 In conclusion, I realise that this land has scenic quality and that its location and accessibility is not ideal for development. Nevertheless, the Structure Plan’s main policy drive is to reinforce the existing role of centres such as Looe and to strengthen their economic, social and transport infrastructure. I am not convinced that better land could be allocated for the modest amount of growth which should reasonably be promoted in the town in accordance with Structure Plan policies. The deletion of the allocation would not improve the Local Plan.

14.5.9 The Policy would benefit from some minor re-wording, mainly in the light of my conclusions and recommendations elsewhere in my Report. There is no need to refer to Policy HO11. It should be applied to all relevant proposals for residential development and there is no call for duplication. I am doubtful about the provision of community and other facilities based upon an assessment of community need. The inference might be drawn that a developer is being expected to make good any existing shortages. Provision should be reasonable, in accordance with Government policy as set out in the tests in relevant Circulars.
RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT16

A SITE OF ABOUT 7.5 HECTARES IS ALLOCATED FOR DEVELOPMENT AT LOOE AND IS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP. DEVELOPMENT SHALL TAKE PLACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE MASTERPLAN FOR THE WHOLE SITE AND SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

a) ABOUT 100 DWELLINGS IN PHASE ONE AND ABOUT 70 DWELLINGS IN PHASE TWO: PHASE TWO SHALL NOT START UNTIL 2012 OR THEREABOUTS, OR UNTIL SUCH TIME AS PHASE ONE IS SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLETED;

b) ONE HECTARE OF EMPLOYMENT LAND;

c) A SAFE AND CONVENIENT PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLE WAY NETWORK LINKING ALL THE USES ON THE SITE WITH THE ADJOINING SCHOOL AND BEYOND TO THE TOWN CENTRE.

d) COMMUNITY, LEISURE AND PLAY FACILITIES INCLUDING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND OUTDOOR SPORTS AND RECREATION FACILITIES, AS REASONABLY REQUIRED;

e) THE PROTECTION OF IMPORTANT HEDGEROWS, TREES, WATERCOURSES AND FEATURES OF LANDSCAPE OR WILDLIFE IMPORTANCE IDENTIFIED BY SURVEY;

f) OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES AS REASONABLY REQUIRED.

Reason In support of any planning application for the development of this land, the Council will require the submission of a Transport Assessment to determine its effect on existing infrastructure and the potential for maximising the use of modes of transport other than the private car for travelling to and from it.

The Local Plan identifies Looe as the most sustainable location.........
14.6 POLICY ALT16 & OMission Sites OS08, OS26 AND OS27 - Lands at Millendreath And Adjacent to Barbican Road, East Looe

Objections

First Deposit

F3/16    Mr W R Hards      Objection
F11/24   Mr R J Overd      Objection
F147/156 Mr & Mrs F P Marshall Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether one or more of these 3 Omission Sites should be allocated for residential and commercial (OS08) or solely for residential use.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

14.6.1 I note the withdrawal of objections to the First Alteration which were made on the basis that substantial amounts of land at Looe should be allocated for various types of development.

14.6.2 I assess the sustainability credentials of Looe in the foregoing Section of my Report and conclude that the town is sufficiently sustainable to accommodate a modest amount of growth in accordance with Structure Plan housing requirements and its distribution amongst the main settlements of the District. Here, therefore, I concentrate on those matters which relate to the 2 parts of the town and its environs where these Omission Sites are located. Those parts are the north eastern part of Looe along Barbican Road (OS08 and OS26) and the adjoining settlement of Millendreath (OS27).

14.6.3 I deal first with the 2 Omission Sites fronting Barbican Road. A small parcel of land is common to both sites. They comprise open land in the northern parts of East Looe (OS08 and OS26). The nearest stops for buses are close to the shops along Barbican Road and, outside the built up area, at Looe Bay Holiday Park at Great Tree on the B3253 road. Frequency however, is low. Services 80/81 provide only 4 buses daily from the Barbican shops to East Looe Bridge and Service 275 is even less frequent. This limited bus service to the town centre means that more importance should be attached to proximity of sites to the town and ease of access to it by foot and/or cycle.

14.6.4 Mr Hards refers to OS08 which lies to the east of Barbican Road. It is smaller than the Policy ALT16 land and so would not provide enough housing, including affordable housing, which should be found to provide for Structure Plan requirements in the District as a whole and for Looe and its surroundings in particular. Mr Overd refers to the 2 sites comprising OS26. The more northerly site is beyond the land to which Policy ALT16 refers, and so further from the town centre. There is no justification for allocating it in addition to, or as an alternative to, the Council’s preferred option. The land to the east of, and to the rear of existing development along, Barbican Road is of an awkward shape and like OS08 offers little by way of advantage in terms of location over the Policy ALT16 land.
14.6.5 In some respects, there is little to choose between the Omission Sites when compared with each other and with the Policy ALT16 land. On balance, however, I consider that the Council’s preferred option is of a better shape and size, and is thus able to deliver the amount of housing, including affordable housing, which I think should be provided in Looe. Access to it from the B3253 would be better than an access to a site of substantial size fronting Barbican Road where the schools already generate a considerable amount of traffic. From the evidence, including that gathered at my inspections, I am not persuaded that the allocation of any one of the Omission Sites in this part of the town would be preferable to the Council’s proposals. And there is no need for the allocation of additional land.

14.6.6 I turn now to OS27, a small parcel of land at Millendreath which is for the most part obscured from view from the public highway. Like the Policy ALT16 land, it is in an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), a designation of local, albeit not national importance, and to which Policy CL8 applies for its protection. As far as I could see from my inspections, there are few, if any, community facilities in the immediate vicinity, and no evidence from Document CD/69 Public Transport in Cornwall of a good bus service from it to Looe or to any other town or city. There is nothing in the written representations to the contrary, although I accept Mr and Mrs Marshall’s point about access to the County Primary School and the town centre. There is little difference in terms of distance from this Omission Site and the Policy ALT16 land to either the School or the town centre. In my opinion, however, existing and future pedestrian and cycleways from the Policy ALT16 land are more likely to offer a better prospect for access to the combination of town centre and other local amenities, including the Secondary School, than those from the easterly outskirts of the town. With Structure Plan housing requirements met, there is no need to allocate or otherwise identify this site for development, and the Local Plan would not be improved by doing so.

Mr and Mrs Marshall refer to a holiday restriction on “Brambles” which they wish to have lifted as part of their Objection. It would appear from their letter of 01 August 2006 to the Programme Officer that this has been the subject in the past of an application for planning permission, but without success. It remains more a matter for the Council in the exercise of its development control function, however, than for me as an adjudicator on more general local plan issues pertaining to the future use and development of land. Nor is it my role to comment upon the Council’s previous decisions, but I note the Council’s invitation to discuss the Objectors’ points with them. Perhaps at the time of writing this has already taken place.

14.6.8 Finally, I do not agree that the housing land allocation for Looe should comprise a number of small sites. Irrespective of their location, that would not be the best means of securing a suitable proportion of affordable homes as sought by Policy HO11, or of obtaining the community benefits for which Policy ALT16 provides. None of these Omission Sites should be allocated for development.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
15. TORPOINT AREA STATEMENTS

15.1 POLICY M1: SOUTHDOWN BRICKWORKS

Objection

First Deposit

F18k/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether the Policy should be made more exacting

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

15.1.1 This Policy is justified, but it should be brought more into line with advice in the Good Practice Guide. It would be better to refer to harm which, like inconvenience and disruption, must be more than trivial to justify the refusal of planning permission, rather than the somewhat inelegant materially adverse impact.

Recommendation

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY M1

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED ON THE SITE OF THE SOUTHDOWN OR FOSS BRICKWORKS FOR WORKSHOPS FOR CLASS B1 AND B2 USES, SMALL BOAT LANDING FACILITIES AND LEISURE MOORINGS, HERITAGE INTERPRETATION AND AMENITY PLANTING PROVIDED THAT THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT:

a) ADD TO DIFFICULTIES WITH WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE AND SEWAGE TREATMENT AND WATER DISPOSAL;

b) HARM THE VILLAGE OR RURAL ENVIRONMENT IN TERMS OF APPEARANCE, NOISE, EFFLUENT OR FUMES EMITTED;

c) RESULT IN INCONVENIENCE OR DANGER ON THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY;

d) HARM NATURE CONSERVATION INTERESTS;

e) LEAD TO INCONVENIENCE FOR, OR THE DISRUPTION OF, LOCAL ENTERPRISES.
15.2 POLICY SN1: HOUSING - SEATON

Objections

First Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F179/186</td>
<td>S P Davies</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F180/187</td>
<td>Michael Temple Davies</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F184/191</td>
<td>P Carthew</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F795/589</td>
<td>Mrs B B Cattrall</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F796/590</td>
<td>Mr G A Cattrall</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether land west of Mount Briondi should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.2.1 This land is allocated in the adopted Local Plan for not more than 4 houses. The allocation was deleted in the First Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan, and objections to that deletion are essentially on the grounds that the land has always been within the development limits and that it has a current commitment for a holiday development scheme. The allocation is re-instated at the Re-Deposit stage. There are no objections to this re-instatement.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
15.3 POLICY ALT18: HOUSING - MILLBROOK & OMISSION SITE OS30 - LAND ADJACENT TO LOWER HOUNSTER, MILLBROOK

Objections

Objections to this Policy and those concerning the Omission Site are set out in Appendix 9.

Main Issue

a. Whether either of these sites should be allocated for housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.3.1 Policy ALT18, allocating a site of about 1.65 ha for no more than 40 dwellings, was introduced at the First Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan. It attracted the good number of Objections as indicated. Concerns were expressed about various matters including traffic generation, access, the need to improve local facilities to support a development scheme and the impact upon wildlife.

15.3.2 The Policy was deleted at the Re-Deposit stage, one reason being the reduced housing requirements of the adopted Structure Plan which was published between the First Deposit and the Re-D eposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan. That is good reason in itself. Coupled with that, however, is the lack of a good range of community facilities in the village and without the good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure which Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 requires. The Council’s evidence is that it has a primary school, post office, surgery, pharmacy and petrol filling station. Significantly, however, it lacks a secondary school, bank, leisure centre, library, supermarket and hospital. In my judgement, the village is not sufficiently sustainable to take the scale of development which either the Policy or the Omission Site implies.

15.3.3 The main bus service is the 80/81 to and from Plymouth and Polperro. During weekdays there is for the most part an hourly service in both directions, the first bus to Plymouth leaving Millbrook West Street at 0727 and arriving at Plymouth Bretonside Bus Station at 0826. The last bus from Plymouth leaves at 1628 and arrives at Millbrook New Road at 1742. I have no doubt that this service is invaluable to those who use it, but it is unlikely to persuade many new residents to desert the greater convenience of their cars in getting to work and for other journeys. The limited number of community facilities and the low frequency and restricted time span of the buses will in all probability result in an increase in travelling, especially by car.

15.3.4 Mr Colin Breed MP requests the re-instatement of the Policy with a minimum requirement of 50% affordable homes. I do not dispute the urgent need for affordable homes throughout the District, but they should generally be provided in locations which accord with the criteria in PPS3 to which I have referred. Land allocations in line with Structure Plan housing requirements for the District should be made in towns like Liskeard, Looe and Callington where the population can be better served by local community facilities and more jobs are available or more likely to be so. I conclude elsewhere that there are sufficient commitments and other provisions to provide for the Structure Plan requirements for the Plymouth...
Principal Urban Area (PUA). The land should not be allocated for residential development and the Re-Deposit rightly deletes the Policy.

15.3.5 Similar considerations apply to Mr West’s objection concerning land adjacent to Lower Hounster. It is about 1.5 ha in extent and at generally accepted densities it could accommodate up to 75 or so dwellings. Whatever the number of dwellings which might be promoted, a residential scheme on this land would result in a substantial, damaging and unjustified extension of the mainly built up parts of the village into the countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
16. CALLINGTON & GUNNISLAKE AREA STATEMENTS

16.1 POLICIES CA1: MOSS SIDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE & CA5: COMMUNITY RESERVATION

Objections

Further Deposit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cornwall County Council</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E17/3</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18/3</td>
<td>Objection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Issue

a. Whether any change should be made to the Policies at this stage.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

16.1.1 The Cornwall County Council comments that data should be reviewed in the light of both the take up of employment land since 1999 and demand for it. It also notes that the fire station to which the reasoned justification refers has been built elsewhere in Callington. It seems to me that there may be some doubt now whether the land should continue to be reserved for community purposes. The County Council says that its Objections to both Policies can be considered as part of the preparation of the Local Development Framework (LDF), and this is sound advice. No change is needed now.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
16.2 POLICY ALT19: HOUSING AND INDUSTRY

Objections

First Deposit

F66/78 Rev H Curnow Objection
F72/84 Mr Andrew May Objection
F94/106 Jane Griffiths Objection
F154/163 Mr & Mrs T Nettle Objection
F160/169 Mr & Mrs DL Dillow Objection
F204/210 Callington Town Council Objection
F233h/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F288/242 Martin Linnette Objection
F310/265 Desmond Grocott Objection
F365/313 RS Wyatt Objection
F375/323 MC Green Objection
F428/371 David John Perry Objection
F450/387 Mrs Aileen Edwards Objection
F476/413 Mr LJ Garlick Objection
F490d/427 Kier Bond Objection
F513b/448 TTR Developments Ltd Objection
F575k/489 Sport England Objection
F608/492 Cdr FE Astley-Jones Objection
F626/510 NE & P Richards Objection
F719/553 Ian S Farris Objection
F738/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd Objection
F739/567 Jim Morton Objection
F740/567 Jim Morton Objection
F742/567 Jim Morton Objection
F743/567 Jim Morton Objection
F744/567 Jim Morton Objection
F745/567 Jim Morton Objection
F746/567 Jim Morton Objection
F747/567 Jim Morton Objection
F748/567 Jim Morton Objection
F751k/10 Environment Agency Objection
F773/574 Kenneth G Pethick Objection
F831/616 Mr CA McKane Objection
F853/634 J Taylor Objection
F873/648 Mrs J N Hutchings Objection
F1145/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this allocation should be re-instated.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

16.2.1 This Policy concerns the allocation of about 36 ha of land to include about 795 dwellings, 5 ha of employment land and various community facilities. This scale of development is completely out of proportion with the size, needs and character of Callington. The retention of the Policy would, in my judgement, render the Local Plan out of general conformity with the Structure Plan, particularly in the light of its reduced housing requirements for the District. I agree with a
number of additional points which the Objectors make, especially the substantial, damaging and unjustified erosion of the rural setting of this town. The Re-Deposit rightly deletes the Policy and it should not be re-instated.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
16.3 POLICIES ALT19 & ALT21: PROPOSED OMISSION SITES OS03 (LAND AT SOUTH HILL ROAD), OS09 (LAND AT BOWLING GREEN), OS10 (FORMER SOUTH WEST WATER SITE, SOUTH HILL ROAD), OS11 (LAND WEST OF CALLINGTON), OS12 (2 SITES WEST OF CALLINGTON) & OS32 (LAND AT KITT HILL)

Objection

First Deposit

- F425/370 Mr & Mrs I Shovell
- F445/382 F M & S A Tredinnick
- F516/450 Consortium of Landowners on Western Side of Callington
- F734/566 Mr A Shepley
- F737/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd

Re-Deposit

- 24/871 Mr and Mrs M C Bennett
- R40/14 Mr J Bond
- R70/879 Mr Leonard Davies
- R75/881 TTR Developments Ltd
- R87/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd
- R321/523 House Builders Federation

Main Issue

- a. Whether land close to the Newport area of Callington (Policy ALT21) and/or any of these Omission Sites should be allocated for residential development and/or for employment purposes.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

16.3.1 Following the adoption of the Structure Plan in 2004, the housing requirements for the District have been reduced and for that reason Policy ALT19 is deleted at the Re-Deposit stage. In other words, less land needs to be allocated for housing in Callington than was the case at the First Deposit stage of the First Alteration. Nevertheless, the strategy of steering development for the most part to the main towns stays essentially the same. The 1.27 ha site which is subject to Policy ALT21, and is broadly similar to the northern part of OS12, should provide about 50 dwellings. The 2 parts of OS11 together should provide about the same number. These 3 sites are all within the development limits of the town as shown on the Proposals Map Inset 63, and their development would be consistent with Structure Plan requirements for the District in general and the town in particular.

16.3.2 Policy ALT21 was introduced at the Re-Deposit stage. The development of land subject to it would result in the loss of openness which contributes to the attractive rural setting of the town. Mr Bond and Mr Davies are concerned about the additional traffic which would be generated and its likely effect upon the local environment. In view of Structure Plan housing requirements for the District and the policy guidance which it gives for the distribution of future growth, I consider that land should be provided for development in locations best suited to minimise additional travelling, especially by car. This site is on the proverbial doorstep of...
the town centre and I endorse the allocation, subject to some recommended changes to the Policy to make it more exacting and to accord it better with advice in the Good Practice Guide. For example, there is no need for the duplication of a reference to Policy HO11 which would apply in any event, and some clauses relate more to the way in which the Policy would be applied. Any contributions to community facilities and infrastructure must abide by the tests of reasonableness in Circular 05/2005.

16.3.3 In describing the 2 parcels of land to which the Consortium of Landowners on the Western Side of Callington refers, the Council says that these fields referred to are included within the plan and applications for residential development will be judged on their merits. I agree that their extent and location within the defined limits makes them suitable in principle for residential development and, although the Policy ALT21 allocated land is within the defined limits, I see no need for an allocation for these particular lands. All 4 sites the subject of OS11 and OS12 are better located than are OS03 and OS09. In view also of Structure Plan requirements being capable of achievement on better located land in Callington and elsewhere in the District, there is no need for development for market housing to take place on either OS03 or OS09 beyond the defined limits.

16.3.4 F M & S A Tredinnick’s and TTR Developments Ltd’s site (OS09) is an extensive tract of about 3.4 ha of prevailingly open land rising up from the main built-up parts of the lane which coincides with the development limits hereabouts. It could provide for about 100-170 dwellings. Its most westerly part is within the development limits defined on the Proposals Map of the adopted Local Plan, and so its redevelopment as an infilling within the built up area would be acceptable in principle. Indeed, planning permission has been granted for it. On 03 November 2005 the Council resolved to grant planning permission for a larger part of the Omission Site, outlined in red on Drawing No 9910.01, for 31 dwellings including 18 affordable homes.

16.3.5 The affordable homes will be on that part of the site edged red which lies to the north of the playing fields and hence outside the development limits. This part of the scheme thus accords with HO13 concerning Rural Exceptions Housing. These decisions do not oblige me, or the Council, to promote development on the rest of the Omission Site which is visually prominent within the attractive rural surroundings of the town. Development upon this remaining part of the land would result in a damaging extension of the built-up area into the open countryside. It would be unjustified and should not be countenanced.

16.3.6 The Final Report of the Employment Land Assessment (CD14) was published as recently as May 2005. It is comprehensive, thorough and convincing, and there is little that I can add to it. For Callington, it notes that enquiries and past trends in employment indicate that the demand for new employment land and premises has not been significant in the past. But consultations show that there is a need to provide further land for this purpose to enable the expansion of existing firms, primarily for Messrs Ginsters. No employment land of significant size is available in the town at present, a state of affairs which could lead to moves to take jobs to elsewhere in the District or beyond it. That would be likely to be less sustainable and unfortunate.

16.3.7 A modest amount of land should be allocated for employment purposes, consistent with the small size of the town and to allow for a limited level of growth to meet local employment needs and the reasonable expectations of local firms. The Moss Side Industrial Estate is the main employment area in Callington. It has
good access to the A390 road and in this case it makes good sense to extend an existing employment area rather than to promote an alternative or additional one on a detached site in open countryside as at OS10 or in a comparatively remote location as at OS32 at Kitt Hill.

16.3.8 The land to which Mr and Mrs Shovell refer (OS03) comprises mainly agricultural or buildings of similar character and appearance and a forecourt used for the parking of coaches. It is suggested that it could contribute to the economic prosperity of the town particularly if developed for mixed use. They say that it offers good potential for a purpose-built business park which could adopt environmentally sustainable concepts. The site is at an appreciable distance from the built-up parts of the town, being about 1 km from the town centre, and the surroundings are essentially rural. Its allocation would result in an incongruous and damaging consolidation of development in the countryside. The Council is proposing better located sites for both housing and employment, and the Local Plan would not be improved by the allocation of the Objectors’ land for the purposes which they suggest.

16.3.9 The Callington Town Council considers that OS10 should be allocated for industrial development and land between it and Broadmead be allocated for residential development, although this latter part of the Objection is not included in the Hearing Statement. As the Employment Land Assessment points out, the land would require a suitable link to the main road network and it is an untested market location. An indicative flood plain runs through the site roughly west to east, but only its south western edge would appear to be affected. I agree with the Town Council that choice in the size of plots and type of premises is desirable and that this land could provide it, but much the same should apply to the land which the Council proposes to allocate. That land is better located and should be sufficient in area for likely modest needs during the plan period. This Omission Site should not be allocated.

16.3.10 Peninsula Properties Ltd refers to an overall smaller area than OS10 which is shown in its Document WR049 Appendix 1. The Objector says that about 60% of this site can be classed as “brownfield” previously-developed land, as it contains structures and areas of hardstanding (WR049 Appendix 2). As the Company admits, however, much of the site is overgrown and the aerial photographs provide scant evidence of any significant amount of land of this status. I am reminded of the definition of previously-developed land in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 Annex B which excludes land which was previously-developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape in the process of time (to the extent that it can reasonably be considered as part of the natural surroundings). Nevertheless, the presence of these features on some part of it and the closeness of the site to the town centre, bus routes, Community College and other community facilities within the main built up area, give it undeniable advantages. Whether or not it is no more than slightly isolated as the Objector claims, it is for the most part open and makes a valuable contribution to the attractive rural setting of the town. Its development would be a damaging and unjustified incursion into the countryside.

16.3.11 Mr A Shepley requests the allocation of a 2.04 ha site at Kitt Hill (OS32) for employment purposes. Although the site appears to be previously-developed land, that is not the only relevant consideration. It is at some distance from the built-up parts of the town and detached from it. Land subject to Policy ALT22 is better located. As with OS10, I see no need for this land to be allocated for
employment purposes.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan be amended as follows:

POLICY ALT21
A SITE OF ABOUT 1.27 HECTARES IS ALLOCATED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT CALLINGTION AND IS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP. DEVELOPMENT MUST TAKE PLACE IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COMPREHENSIVE MASTERPLAN FOR THE WHOLE SITE AND SHALL INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:

a) ABOUT 50 DWELLINGS;
b) CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS COMMUNITY, LEISURE AND PLAY FACILITIES, AS REASONABLY REQUIRED;
c) A SAFE AND CONVENIENT ACCESS TO AND WITHIN THE SCHEME AND HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS WHERE NECESSARY,

and that the following text be added to the Reason.

In support of any planning application for the development of this land, the Council will require the submission of an assessment of any contamination of the land and of its stability, with proposed remedial measures to the Council’s satisfaction. The Council will also require the preparation of a flood risk assessment and the undertaking of drainage works as appropriate to safeguard the development and to reduce to an acceptable level the risk of flooding elsewhere.
16.4 POLICY ALT20: HOUSING - DRAKEWALLS

Objections

All objections to this Policy are listed in Appendix 10.

Main Issue

a. Whether this Policy should be re-instated.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

16.4.1 This Policy was introduced at the First Deposit stage of the First Alteration to the Local Plan but deleted at the Re-Deposit stage. It allocated about 1.3 ha of land at Drakewalls for a development of no more than 40 dwellings.

16.4.2 This is another allocation which is deleted owing mainly to the reduced housing requirements which the adopted Structure plan allocates to the District. Drakewalls is not a location with a good range of community facilities or with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. For example, its No 79 Downgate-Callington-Tavistock bus service is infrequent in each direction with intervals of one and up to 2 hours or so between buses. There is a primary school and several small shops in the settlement, and a wider range of community facilities nearby in Gunnislake, but more so in Callington where the Council rightly proposes that land should be allocated.

16.4.3 Any significant development in Drakewalls would all too likely result in more journeys, especially by car, for employment, the weekly shop, leisure and other purposes. It is an unsuitable location for development, and especially for dwellings which are not needed owing to a crucial change in planning circumstances. The loss of this part of the countryside would be unjustified. The Policy should not be re-instated.

16.4.4 I understand that, in January 2007, the Devon and Cornwall Housing Association was intending to submit an application for planning permission for affordable housing on part of this land. Presumably this would be for the 15 dwellings to which Mr Bartram of Bartram Deakin Associates Limited refers in his Proof (Document P019). It will be for the Council to determine whether such a scheme should go ahead under Policy HO13 Rural Exceptions Housing.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
16.5 POLICY ALT22: EMPLOYMENT LAND (CALLINGTON)

Objection

Re-Deposit

R316/14  Mr J Bond

Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether, owing to the amount of traffic likely to be generated, this Policy should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

16.5.1 As with all planning decisions, a judgement has to be made on objectives which are often opposed to each other. It is difficult to judge the amount of traffic which development on this site will generate, and that is a matter which the Council would take into account at the planning application stage. The Highways Authority has been consulted and raises no objection to the effect which development may have on local roads. In my view, any concern about this matter is outweighed by the need to allocate land in Callington for employment purposes to sustain the local economy. The Policy should not be deleted.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
17. GENERAL ISSUES

17.1 GENERAL ISSUES

Objections

First Deposit

F28/41 David J Hearnden Objection

Omission Sites

O48/488 Sport England Comment
O71/894 Cornwall Wildlife Trust Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether these Objections should result in any amendment to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

17.1.1 Mr Hearden refers to Policy ALT17 which at the First Deposit stage of the First Alteration proposed development on land at the northern edge of Pelynt. I recommend against the re-instatement of this Policy.

17.1.2 The Council will note the general representations on the Omission Sites. However, apart from land within the existing development limits for Callington, I recommend that they be not allocated for development.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18. OMISSION SITES DOCUMENT

18.1 OMISSION SITE OS01: BROADMOOR FARM, SALTASH

Proposers

Re-Deposit

R16/228 Colin Breed MP Objection

Further Deposit

E38/912 Bond Holdings Ltd & Mr E A Andreae-Jones Objection

Supports

O395/900 Cllr Brian Carter Omission Site Support
O398/171 Saltash Town Council Omission Site Support

Objections

O357/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Objection
O358/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Objection
O359/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Objection
O394/900 Cllr Brian Carter Omission Site Objection
O397/171 Saltash Town Council Omission Site Objection

Comments

O6/12 English Nature Omission Site Comment
O7/12 English Nature Omission Site Comment
O8/12 English Nature Omission Site Comment

Inspector’s Note

18.1.1 I consider the content of these representations in Section 13.2 of my Report, and there is nothing which I can add here. For convenience, however, I repeat my recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan be amended by the inclusion, wherever the Council thinks appropriate, in the reasoned justification of the following:

The Council has, in the past, recognised the potential of land at Broadmoor Farm, Saltash for development. For example, Policy SA1 in the First Deposit of the First Alteration of the Local Plan safeguarded 160 ha of land there as a special site for significant employment-generating business.
development with community services, housing and educational facilities. It was deleted in the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration owing to considerations which included the provisions of the adopted Cornwall Structure Plan.

The allocation of this land at present would not generally conform with the Structure Plan, but the Council accepts that, owing to its scale and location, Broadmoor Farm is one of several options which may be considered for an urban extension to the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA). Should Broadmoor Farm be developed at some time in the future, the Council would expect a scheme to be based upon the 3 following principles. It should be community-led, it should reflect the needs of the community and it should be based upon a comprehensive, holistic approach with a strong emphasis on all relevant aspects of sustainability, including the generation of renewable energy, minimum greenhouse gas emissions and the achievement of the highest environmental standards.
18.2 OMISSION SITE OS02: LAND ADJACENT TO TAVISTOCK RD, CALLINGTON

Proposers

Re-Deposit

R103/893 Walker Developments (SW) Ltd Objection

Supports

O403/210 Callington Town Council Omission Site Support
O413/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support
O414a/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support
O414b/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support

Objections

O123/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O383/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection
O384a/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection
O384b/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection

Comments

O363/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment
O364/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment
O365a/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment
O365b/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for retailing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

18.2.1 The Callington Town Council considers that this Omission Site should be allocated for retail/community development only. It is not convinced that the Co-operative Society’s store near the town centre satisfactorily serves local people and says that Callington needs a good size retail outlet to stop the regular exodus of shoppers to supermarkets in Saltash, Tavistock and other towns. The land is well located, it continues, and its development could include a much needed safe and convenient access to the rear of the Callington Community College and relieve congestion along Launceston Road. Walker Developments (SW) Ltd makes some similar points, and suggests a mixed use development on a 2.83 ha site to include a retail store of 2,787 sq m net floorspace, residential and employment development and the provision of an access to the College. The Company expects that about two-thirds of the floorspace would be dedicated to the sale of convenience goods with the remainder being used for the sale of comparison goods.

18.2.2 For the most part, the land adjoins the main built up area on its eastern, southern and western sides but in my opinion it is too large to be treated as suitable for infilling. Nevertheless, its position within convenient walking distance
of the town centre and its location within the main confines of the town are advantages in favour of its consideration now or in the future for some type or types of development. At present, Policy ALT22 together with the allocation for housing (ALT21), including a percentage of affordable housing, and open land within the defined limits should provide sufficient opportunity for the modest amount of growth in the town which would meet the needs of the local economy and accord with Structure Plan housing requirements for the District. The Local Plan would not be improved by any significant additional provision for these uses.

18.2.3 The objecting Company summarises relevant planning policy as seeking to focus retailing within town centres. Where such opportunities do not exist, it says, policies require that an assessment of the need for the proposed development be carried out as well as a sequential analysis of suitable sites and a consideration of the potential implications of the proposal on existing centres. It considers that both Callington town centre and its retail offer, especially of comparison goods, are limited as is the potential for improvement. Local people, it says, should be given more choice.

18.2.4 I agree with the Council that the Company’s assessment of need is robust, and I take heed of the Council’s statement at the Inquiry that there are no issues of principle between the parties on the retail assessment in terms of pure mathematics and assumptions. But I do have reservations about the possible implications of a number of the assumptions and conclusions. It is assumed that there would be an inflow of 12% for comparison expenditure from the secondary catchment area, an area which extends almost up to Liskeard, Tavistock and Saltash. Even with a third of the floorspace given over to comparison goods, I consider that there would be strong competition with these towns and, more importantly, with nearby Plymouth with the wide range of goods on offer and ample choice available which is to be expected of a city of its size and importance as a service centre. Major city centre redevelopment schemes are likely to consolidate its position in this part of the country. I suspect that 12% is too high an estimate.

18.2.5 The Company says that a sequential test was conducted in accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 6, but it did not highlight any potential development sites within the catchment area. I am inclined to accept this conclusion, but not fully accept it without more compelling evidence. I agree with the Council that the evidence for the conclusion should be more apparent and I am not convinced that there is no better site or site closer to the town centre which could better accommodate a retail store of the size envisaged.

18.2.6 It is suggested that in 2011 Callington town centre would be likely to experience the greatest impact from a new store, and that the estimated diversion of 21.6% would be moderate. The Council says that above 15-18% you get a bit nervous, and that is a fair point. The majority of this effect would be on the Cooperative Society store. As PPS 6 states, it is not the role of the planning system to restrict competition, preserve existing commercial interests or to prevent innovation, but even though this store may be over-trading at present, I am concerned that a diversion of trade of the magnitude suggested would result in a real risk of damage to the vitality and viability of the town centre. No doubt there would be a greater choice of goods on offer, some potential for linked trips and perhaps a better access to the Community College, but in my judgement these benefits would not outweigh the risk identified.

18.2.7 The Council draws attention to what it considers to be the shortcomings of the Indicative Masterplan Option. I agree that the proposed position of the
residential development of 10 affordable homes close to a large car park is less than satisfactory and that much the same applies to an access to the Community College, part of which would be used by shoppers. But the plan is no more than indicative, I have no doubt that it could be improved, and my concerns are a good deal stronger on other aspects of the proposals. There may be a case for a smaller store than is proposed, and the Council is not opposed in principle to a new supermarket in Callington. The parties concerned can have recourse to Policy ALT6 and any other relevant national or local policy in devising proposals for it.

18.2.8 For the above reasons, I do not consider that the allocation of this Omission Site is justified. Relevant policies are sufficiently robust and flexible to provide a sound basis for the consideration of any proposals for a new store in the town. The land should stay outside the development limits.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.3 OMISSION SITE OS03: LAND ADJOINING SOUTH HILL ROAD, CALLINGTON

Proposers

First Deposit

ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS03)
F425/370  Mr & Mrs I Shovell  Objection

Objections

O124/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O381/887  Churchill Property Group Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O404/210  Callington Town Council  Omission Site Objection

Comment

O366/592  Highways Agency  Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.3.1 I deal with this Omission Site at Section 16.3 of my Report and have nothing further to add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.4 OMISSION SITE OS04: TENCREEK FARM, LISKEARD

Proposers

First Deposit

F681/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F848/633 Brook Street Properties Objection

Supports

O150/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Support
O173/143 Mr Victor J Wright Omission Site Support
O174/995 Mr Reginald James Perryman Omission Site Support
O175/650 Mr Keith Wilton Omission Site Support

Objection

O388/167 Mr D N Champion Omission Site Objection

Comments

O9/12 English Nature Omission Site Comment
O360/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development as an addition, or as an alternative, to land at Addington, Liskeard.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

18.4.1 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd and Brook Street Properties submit representations for a mixed use urban extension to Liskeard at Tencreek Farm comprising about 400-500 dwellings together with a range of commercial, retail and employment uses on about 12 ha of land. In total, the site is of about 29 ha. Planning permission for some of them, including road side uses, petrol filling station, hotel and restaurant, has already been granted and presumably from that point of view could be implemented. Owing to the closeness of the A38(T) road, I would expect these facilities to provide more for the travelling public than for existing or any future local residents, and I do not see them as much assisting the Objectors in their proposals.

18.4.2 Bearing in mind my conclusions concerning the number of dwellings which are likely to come forward on committed and potential/windfall land in the District during the plan period, an additional 500 dwellings on this Omission Site would, in my judgement, take the Local Plan out of general conformity with the Structure Plan. Although, as I accept elsewhere in my Report, there is a general direction of travel nationally and locally towards the provision of more land for housing, the Structure Plan and the general conformity of a local plan with it remain vital considerations. Essentially, therefore, the main issue becomes whether or not Tencreek Farm is a better location than Addington for the significant scale of development which, owing to its attributes as a main town, should be promoted in Liskeard. I seek to demonstrate that it is not, and that the
Local Plan would not be improved by the substitution.

18.4.3 Tencreek Farm has undoubted advantages, and the findings of the Strategic Environmental Assessment 2006 (CD/15) should result in closer scores than the Council concludes when this Omission Site is compared with Addington. In terms of Health, for example, I am not sure why development at Tencreek Farm would be bound to increase local air and light pollution any more than it would at Addington, or why Tencreek Farm should not be provided with play areas and open space in much the same way as would be the case at Addington. On Energy, development at either site should include renewable energy generation capacity and measures for energy efficiency, so I do not see why Addington should be awarded +? whilst Tencreek Farm earns no more than a ?. Nor is the latter separated by ... rail infrastructure. That is wrong. Tencreek Farm does score higher than the Council avers. But I still think that Addington has the comparative advantage, and a substantial one, when all relevant considerations are taken into account.

18.4.4 The juxtaposition of housing and other uses on it is an aspect of sustainability, providing the opportunity to minimise the need to travel in the locality, especially by car. Mr Packham, on behalf of Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd, shows the 3 main areas on his Plan P/029/A which he says is of significant material status. The land is in one ownership, although the evidence concerning Addington on matters of ownership convinces me that Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited has sufficient control of land to ensure that its proposals are deliverable in a timely fashion. There is little difference in the frequency of, and places served, by public transport, although some advantage should be accorded here to Tencreek Farm in that the 6 bus routes identified at the Inquiry result in a half hourly or so service to the town centre. As with Addington, routes could possibly be diverted to provide for more convenience in the residential parts of a scheme.

18.4.5 The evidence persuades me that, like Addington, there are no insuperable physical or infrastructure constraints and that a suitable percentage of affordable homes could be provided. These matters, to varying degrees, would contribute towards the creation of a mixed and inclusive community. But my main concerns pertain to location and distance from the town centre and the likely effect of the envisaged scale of development on landscape quality. The supermarket operated by William Morrisons is within convenient walking distance and would provide for all daily, and probably most weekly, purchases. The proposed employment site east of Charter Way, the subject of Policy ALT9, is also conveniently located in relation to the Omission Site. St Martins C of E Primary School is within about 10 minutes walking distance of much of the land.

18.4.6 The capacity of local highways is sufficient to accommodate a significant amount of development. The A38(T) road nearby provides good access to the trunk road network, including to Bodmin and Plymouth, without the need to travel through the town centre. Much the same would appear to apply to Addington, albeit by way of the A390 Callington Road and Charter Way. As Mr Packham says, Liskeard is such a relatively small settlement that anywhere in the town could access the main road, A38, to Plymouth without difficulty. But the proximity to Tencreek Farm to the A38(T) would be especially convenient for those of its residents wishing to travel to Saltash and Plymouth by car.

18.4.7 Addington is, or will be, closer to a wider range of community facilities, including a community college, leisure centre and the proposed playing fields on land subject to Policy ALT15. It is also closer to the town centre with its good
range of shops, banks, public houses, restaurants, offices and other places of employment. Those who accompanied me on my inspections will have noted that it took me about 18 minutes to walk from Addington to The Parade but about 4 minutes longer to walk to it from Tencreek Farm. And gradients from the former are generally more amenable to walking than from the latter. There is therefore a greater opportunity in the case of Addington to minimise travelling by car to the town centre than would be the case with Tencreek Farm. In my judgement, there would be a greater propensity for people to come to the town centre on foot in the case of Addington, whereas from Tencreek Farm with its ease of access to the A38(T) road there would be a greater likelihood of people travelling by car to other centres for shopping and other purposes. Development at Addington, therefore, would be more likely to add to the vitality and viability of Liskeard town centre, in line with Structure Plan Policy 14 of improving and enhancing it.

18.4.8 The Council says that Tencreek Farm is likely to be physically and psychologically isolated from the remainder of the town. There is a good deal of truth in this statement, and it is well illustrated in Document P026 Appendix 10 Plans – Landscape Setting. The Omission Site is to the east of, and beyond, Charter Way which provides a strong limit to the main residential parts of the town. Its development would also be beyond the link road between Charter Way and the A38(T) road, the roundabouts, the retail complex which includes the supermarket and the Focus and Argos buildings on the “Teardrop” site (locally known as “the bubble”), and it would extend yet further from the main built up parts of the town in a south easterly direction along the A38(T). The impression, and the actuality, is of land decidedly beyond the main built up area and separated from it by wide, busy roads and large buildings whose presence is not unexpected at the edge of a town. It is difficult to see how this physical and psychological separation could be substantially reduced and, despite what might be built in accordance with the planning permission, the development would constitute an incursion into open countryside yet more pronounced, intrusive and damaging.

18.4.9 The Company says that broad design guidelines have been prepared, the principal objective of which is to mitigate visual impact. Four areas of strategic landscaping are proposed, and further consideration would be given to reduce the degree of visual sensitivity. All these measures would go some way towards achieving the desired result. But in my judgement they would not outweigh the disadvantages of the land which are due to its location, extent and shape beyond the strong physical boundaries which define the edge of the main built-up area of Liskeard, and the visual prominence of much of it in the often open and exposed landscape. The character of the local area of mainly incised river valley and rolling agricultural downland would be undermined as urban development extended beyond these boundaries in an illogical, unexpected, consolidating and damaging direction. In contrast, development at Addington, whilst having an inevitable and undeniable impact upon the local landscape, benefits from its more enclosed position between 2 roads and its closeness to a substantial amount of residential development on 2, and arguably 3, sides. For that reason alone, development at Addington would have more the form of a logical urban extension to the town.

18.4.10 I have taken account of all the other points raised, including matters concerning ecology, archaeology, agriculture and cultural heritage. I note also the greater weight of local objection to Addington than to Tencreek Farm. These considerations do not, however, outweigh my conclusion that there is no need for 2 or more developments of roughly the same scale as is put forward for Liskeard. The clear advantage lies with Addington and the Local Plan would not be improved by the promotion of yet more development at Tencreek Farm. The Omission Site
should not be allocated and, apart from the site shown on the Proposals Map for a Service Area and Motel, should remain outside the development limits for Liskeard.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.5 OMISSION SITE OS05: LAND AT SOUTHDOWN, EAST OF MILLBROOK

Objections

All representations to this Omission Site are listed in Appendix 11.

Inspector’s Note

18.5.1 The Objection related to the proposed redevelopment of this land for a variety of purposes, including market and affordable homes. As it is now withdrawn, there is no need for me to make any further comment.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.6 OMISION SITE OS06: LAND AT MILLENDREATH, LOOE

Inspector’s Note
18.6.1 As the Companies proposing the allocation of this land for development have withdrawn their representations, there is no need for me to make any comment on them.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.7 OMISSION SITE OS07: LAND AT MILLENDREATH

Objections

O24/922  Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O36/923  Miss Gillian Fenton  Omission Site Objection
O47/926  Michael & Paula Reynolds  Omission Site Objection
O54/928  Mr & Mrs J Richardson  Omission Site Objection
O76/938  MWJ Meaden  Omission Site Objection
O130/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O180/996  Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer  Omission Site Objection
O184/997  Mr Lewis  Omission Site Objection
O193/999  Mr & Mrs Schooling  Omission Site Objection
O240/1035  Susan Gavin  Omission Site Objection
O277/1063  Mrs EM Robson  Omission Site Objection
O278/321  Mrs J Wright  Omission Site Objection
O307/1068  Mrs P Burnside  Omission Site Objection
O308/1069  Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson  Omission Site Objection
O315/1070  Mr & Mrs JD Buckland  Omission Site Objection
O326/1071  Millendreath Owners Association  Omission Site Objection
O336/1073  Gary Oswald  Omission Site Objection
O341/260  Robert S Jay  Omission Site Objection
O356/278  St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council  Omission Site Objection

Comment

O377/592  Highways Agency  Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.7.1  As Mr Walker has withdrawn his representations proposing the development of this land, there is no need for me to make any comment on them.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.8 OMISSION SITE OS08: LAND AT BARBICAN RD, EAST LOOE

Proposers

First Deposit
F3/16 Mr W R Hards and Family Objection

Objections

O25/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill Omission Site Objection
O37/923 Miss Gillian Fenton Omission Site Objection
O131/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O181/996 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer Omission Site Objection
O183/997 Mr Lewis Omission Site Objection
O279/321 Mrs J Wright Omission Site Objection
O298/545 Philip Shuttleworth Omission Site Objection
O314/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O321/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O331/1072 Mr AW & Mrs CR Day Omission Site Objection
O342/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O401/1080 Colin Clark Omission Site Objection
O55/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson Omission Site Objection

Comment

O379/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.8.1 In Section 14.6 I consider the Objection which Mr Hards and Family make to the Council’s decision not to allocate this land in the Local Plan for development. I conclude that it should not be allocated, and I can make no further comment on the matter here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.13 **OMISSION SITE OS09: BOWLING GREEN, CALLINGTON**

**Proposers**

**First Deposit**

ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS09)

F445/382 FM & SA Tredinnick Objection

**Re-Deposit**

ALT21 (Proposed Omission Site OS09)

R75/881 TTR Developments Ltd Objection

**Supports**

O410/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support

O411/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support

**Objections**

O133/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

O385/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection

O386/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection

O405/210 Callington Town Council Omission Site Objection

**Comments**

O367/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

O368/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

**Inspector's Note**

18.9.1 In Section 16.3 of my Report I consider the Objections made to the Council’s decision not to allocate this land in the Local Plan for development. I conclude that it should not be allocated, and I can make no further comment on the matter here.

**RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.10 OMISSION SITE OS10: FORMER SWW SITE, SOUTH HILL ROAD, WEST OF CALLINGTON

Proposers

Re-Deposit

R3/210 Callington Town Council Objection

ALT21 (Proposed Omission Site OS10)

R87/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd Objection

Objections

O387/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection
O406/210 Callington Town Council Omission Site Objection

Comment

O369/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector’s Note

18.10.1 In Section 16.3 of my report I consider the Objections made to the Council’s decision not to allocate this land in the Local Plan for development. I conclude that it should not be allocated, and I can make no further comment on the matter here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.11 OMISSION SITE OS11: LAND WEST OF CALLINGTON

Proposers

First Deposit

ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS11)

F516/450 Consortium of Landowners on the Western side of Callington Objection

Objections

O382/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd Omission Site Objection
O407/210 Callington Town Council Omission Site Objection
O42/265 Desmond Grocott Omission Site Objection

Comment

O370/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector’s Note

18.11.1 In Section 16.3 of my Report I note that this land is within the limits defined for development on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Subject to satisfactory access and other relevant arrangements being put in place, this site is suitable in principle for residential development. Owing to its location, there is no need for it to be allocated.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.12 OMISSION SITE OS12: LAND WEST OF CALLINGTON

Proposers

First Deposit

ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS12)

F737/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd Objection

Comment

O371/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.12.1 I consider this Objection in Section 16.3 of my Report and conclude that the northern site, in so far as it coincides with the land subject of Policy ALT21, should be allocated for residential development. The southern site is also within the defined development limits, but I see no need to allocate it.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.13 OMISSION SITE OS13: LAND TO THE REAR OF FERNCROFT, KELLY BRAY

Proposers

Further Deposit

E7/908 Mrs C & Miss M Durman Objection

Support

O408/210 Callington Town Council Omission Site Support

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development and/or included in any other way within the defined development limits for Kelly Bray.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

18.13.1 Mrs and Miss Durman make similar points as do the Callington Town Council. They refer to the planning permission for 84 dwellings on previously-developed land to the east of the Objection site where construction has started on a scheme for 84 dwellings. This results, they say, in the Objection site adjoining development on 3 sides making it suitable for infilling. Planning permission has also been granted for the erection of a bungalow in the back garden of Ferncroft, but at the time of my inspection no work had been started. As I saw, Ferncroft is at the southern end of a large, elongated garden plot which the Council estimates to be of 0.4 ha. The Objectors say that an extension is sought (to the development limits) on the basis of the character of the land and nature of the surroundings, not on the basis that the land is suitable for estate development. They say that the land no longer has the character of countryside, but in my opinion its extent and its prevailing openness gives it a more rural than urban appearance.

18.13.2 The adopted Structure Plan requires the Council to provide for fewer dwellings than previously in the District, but the strategy for the distribution of this reduced scale of growth remains essentially the same with most development being steered to the main towns and local centres. In the same vein, Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 states that housing developments should be in suitable locations which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. Kelly Bray does not meet that criterion. Although its amenities include a post office, dentist and public house, it has no primary or secondary school, no bank, GP surgery, pharmacy, supermarket or petrol filling station. It is not within convenient walking distance of Callington, especially in inclement weather. The No X8/76 Plymouth-Callington-Launceston bus service is infrequent, apart from the morning peak period when there are 4 buses to Callington between 0819 and 0926 and 4 buses to Launceston between 0729 and 0936. During the rest of the day, buses are at intervals of the order of up to 2 hours or more.

18.13.3 I am not convinced from my inspections of the settlement that there are perhaps about 100 jobs in it. Even if that were the case, Kelly Bray is not a
suitable location for more significant development. Such growth would in all 
probability result in more journeys to larger centres as people travelled to them for 
shopping, work, education, leisure and other purposes. This would be contrary to 
local, Regional and national sustainability policies which include the reduction in 
the need to travel, especially by car. Callington has a better range and closer 
focus of community facilities and the Council rightly seeks to steer the greater part 
of the expected growth in this part of the District to it.

18.13.4 The land the subject of this Objection should not be allocated for 
residential or any other development, nor should the development limits be 
extended to include it. Whilst the Objectors proposals are modest at present in 
terms of the number of dwellings sought, it would be difficult for the Council to 
justify any refusal of planning permission for estate development within any such 
extended limits.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration 
to the Local Plan.
18.14 OMISSION SITE OS14: LAND AT BRAY SHOP

Proposer

First Deposit

F431/372 Mr A R Weatherhead Objection

Objection

O135/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for a mixed use development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

18.14.1 Bray Shop is a small settlement not much larger than a hamlet. At my inspection, I could see little in the way of community services. The No 236 bus service is infrequent almost to the point of being non-existent. Mr Weatherhead proposes no more than 20 dwellings (including affordable homes) on this 3 ha site, together with public open space and premises within Use Classes A1 and A3. The inclusion in a development scheme of a public house or restaurant and a shop would, in my judgement, do little to stop people from travelling by car to larger centres where there is a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure. The allocation of this land for the development proposed would fly in the face of local, Regional and national policies which promote sustainability, and there is no justification for the loss of this attractive area of countryside.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.15 OMISSION SITE OS15: LAND AT SOUTHERN EDGE OF HARROWBARROW

Proposer

First Deposit

H4 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
F406a/353 Reginald Rowe Objection

H10 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
F406b/353 Reginald Rowe Objection

H12 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
F406c/353 Reginald Rowe Objection

Supports

O400a/353 Reginald Rowe Omission Site Support
O400b/353 Reginald Rowe Omission Site Support
O400c/353 Reginald Rowe Omission Site Support

Objections

O70a/73 Calstock Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O70b/73 Calstock Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O70c/73 Calstock Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O136a/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O136b/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O136c/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.15.1 I consider these representations in Section 2.2 of my Report, and conclude that this Omission Site should not be allocated for development or otherwise included in the defined development limits for Harrowbarrow

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.16 OMISSION SITE OS16: FORMER SALTASH SEWAGE WORKS

Proposers

Further Deposit

EV6 (Proposed Omission Site OS16)
E8/909 Red Earth Saltash Ltd Objection

Objections

O16/12 English Nature Omission Site Objection
O393/900 Cllr Brian Carter Omission Site Objection
O396/171 Saltash Town Council Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.16.1 I consider these representations in Section 5.1 of my Report and conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.17 OMISSION SITE OS17: LAND WEST OF ST MELLION

Proposers

First Deposit

HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS17)
F769/571 Mr E Andreae-Jones Objection

Objection

O137/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Inspector's Note

18.17.1 I consider this Objection in Section 2.27 of my Report and conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.18 OMISSION SITE OS18: LAND SOUTH OF HATT

Proposers

First Deposit
HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS18)
F427/370 Mr & Mrs I Shovell Objection

Objections
O138/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Comments
O361/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector’s Note
18.18.1 I consider this Objection in Section 2.27 of my Report and conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.19 OMISSION SITE OS19: LAND AT COMMONMOOR

Proposers

Further Deposit

E4/906 Miss C Mutton, Mr J Mutton and Mr J Scott Objection

Supports

O106/957 Jonathan Mutton Omission Site Support
O107/958 Mr M W & Mrs D Mutton Omission Site Support
O215/310 Mr C Scott Omission Site Support
O216/738 Mrs S Mutton Omission Site Support
O217/1015 Mr Ian Mutton Omission Site Support
O399/1079 Mr & Mrs B D J Wood Omission Site Support

Objection

O139/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

18.19.1 This small village lies entirely in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and in an Area of Great Scientific Value (AGSV). Attendant policies protect it in its entirety. The Omission Site has the character and appearance of a paddock; it adjoins a small chapel and is beyond the main built up area of the village which lies to its south east. It is approached from that direction by a narrow country lane ill-suited to take additional traffic.

18.19.2 The No 574 Western Greyhound (Liskeard – Callington) bus provides an hourly service during the day from Monday to Saturday. There is no rail service. The promotion of development in this village would contravene local, Regional and national policies concerning sustainability which generally seek to ensure that housing is located in settlements which have a good range of community facilities and with good access to employment, shops, leisure opportunities and other attractions. That is not the case here, and more dwellings here would almost inevitably result in more journeys to the towns for shopping, employment, education and other purposes, especially by car.

18.19.3 I have taken into account the points which Mr Colin Scott makes in his letter to me of 10 August 2007, but they do not alter my view. I note, however, the Council’s invitation to discuss with him the possibility of providing an affordable home on the site as an exception to the policies which normally apply to the protection of the countryside. I cannot anticipate the result of that discussion, but in the meantime I maintain that there is no justification for the allocation of this land and/or the expansion of the village development limits to include it. Nor is there any justification for the likely consequent development in the especially protected Areas.
RECOMMENDATION
I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.20 OMISSION SITE OS20: LAND WEST OF ST CLEER

Proposer

First Deposit

F363/311  Mrs H L Lawrence  Objection

Objection

O140/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.20.1 I consider these Objections in Section 2.28 of my Report and conclude that the land should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.21 OMISSION SITE OS21: LAND TO THE REAR OF THE STAG HOTEL, ST CLEER

Proposers

First Deposit

HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS21)
F702/537a Mr C & Mrs J Bolitho Objection

Inspector's Note

18.21.1 I consider this Objection in Section 2.28 of my Report. Briefly, I conclude there that as the land is rightly included within the defined village limits there is no need to allocate it for residential development. Policy HO6 would be a better basis upon which to determine any application for planning permission. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.22 OMISSION SITE OS22: LAND ADJACENT TO QUARRY LANE, PENSILVA

Proposer

First Deposit

F52/64 Andrew Thomas Objection Withdrawn

Objection

O15/12 English Nature Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.22.1 As Mr Thomas has withdrawn his Objection, there is no need for me to conclude on it. I mention this point mainly to keep the numbering consistent!

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.23 OMISSION SITE OS23: LAND AT DODDYCROSS

Proposer

First Deposit

F866/642  Mr J J Maunder Objection

Re-Deposit

R100/642  Mr J J Maunder Objection

Objections

O141/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O241/1036 Allsop Matcham Omission Site Objection

Main Issue

a. Whether this land should be allocated for residential development and/or brought within any development limits which might be defined for Doddycross.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

18.23.1 Doddycross can best be described as a hamlet of generally scattered dwellings. It is in the countryside and of the countryside, and policies for the protection of the countryside rightly apply throughout it. Apart from the infrequent 274 bus service which operates by request and pre-booking, it has few, if any, community facilities and any additional development in it would inevitably result in more journeys by car for shopping, education, leisure and other purposes. This would be contrary to local, Regional and national policies which generally seek to ensure that housing takes place in well-served locations. The land should not be allocated for development, nor should any development limits be defined for the village to include it.

18.23.2 At the Inquiry, Mr Maunder referred to his statement of 09 November 2006 (Document P031) and explained to me his reasons for wanting to build a house on the land. Whether they are so special to justify an exception being made to the policies which normally apply will be for the Council to determine in the first instance. No doubt the parties will refer to Policy HO7 Housing Development in the Countryside, Policy HO13 Rural Exception Housing and any other relevant considerations. It is not for me to anticipate the outcome of their discussions, nor of the Council’s decision.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.24 OMISSION SITE OS24: LANDS NORTH AND SOUTH OF DOBWALLS

Proposer

First Deposit

HO2 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874a/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

HO3 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874b/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

HO4 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874c/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

HO5 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874d/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874e/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

HO7 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874f/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

5.19-5.42 (Proposed Omission Site OS24)  
F874g/649  Mr G Wherry  Objection

Objection

O142/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection

Comment

O362/592  Highways Agency  Omission Site Comment

Inspector’s Note

18.24.1 I consider these Objections in Section 2.14 of my Report and conclude that neither of these sites should be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.25 OMITISSION SITE OS25: LAND EAST OF EAST TAPHOUSE

Proposer

First Deposit

HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS25)
F272/236 W Gubbins

Objection

O143/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

Inspector’s Note

18.25.1 I consider this Objection in Section 2.29 of my Report and conclude that the site should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.26 OMISSION SITE OS26: LAND ADJACENT TO BARBICAN RD, EAST LOOE

Proposer

First Deposit

ALT16 (Proposed Omission Site OS26)
F11/24 R J Overd Objection

Objections

O26/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill Omission Site Objection
O38/923 Miss Gillian Fenton Omission Site Objection
O56/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson Omission Site Objection
O144/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O182/996 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer Omission Site Objection
O239/1035 Susan Gavin Omission Site Objection
O280/321 Mrs J Wright Omission Site Objection
O313/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O320/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O343/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O402/1080 Colin Clark Omission Site Objection

Comment

O380/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.26.1 I consider these Objections in Section 14.6 of my Report and conclude that the site should not be allocated for residential or for any other uses to which Mr Overd refers. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.27 OMISSION SITE OS27: LAND ADJACENT TO MILLENDREATH HOLIDAY VILLAGE

Proposers

First Deposit

ALT16 (Proposed Omission Site OS27)
F147/156 Mr & Mrs FP Marshall Objection

Objections

O27/922  Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O145/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O285/321  Mrs J Wright  Omission Site Objection

Comment

O378/592  Highways Agency  Omission Site Comment

18.27.1 I consider these Objections in Section 14.6 of my Report and conclude that the site should not be allocated for residential development. There is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.28 OMISSION SITE OS28: LAND SOUTH OF PELYNT VILLAGE

Proposer

First Deposit

ALT17 (Proposed Omission Site OS28)
F143/152 Mr John Jolliff Objection

Re-Deposit

PEL1 (Proposed Omission Site OS28)
R31/152 Mr John Jolliff Objection

Supports

O412a/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support
O412b/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support

Objections

O146/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O146b/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O389/1075 Mr David C Horner Omission Site Objection
O389b/1075 Mr David C Horner Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.28.1 I consider these representations in Section 14.2 of my Report and there is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.29 OMISSION SITE OS29: GREENBANK, POLRUAN

Proposers

Re-Deposit

R138/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection

Support

O409/885 Catchfrench Design Omission Site Support

Objection

O147/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection

Inspector’s Note

18.29.1 I consider the content of these representations in Section 14.4 of my Report and there is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.30 OMISSION SITE OS30: LAND ADJACENT TO LOWER HOUNSTER, MILLBROOK

Proposer

First Deposit

HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS30)
F426/376 Peter West Objection

All representations to this Omission Site are listed in Appendix 9.

Inspector’s Note

18.30.1 I consider the content of these representations in Section 2.30 of my Report and there is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.31 OMISSION SITE OS31: LAND ADJACENT TO JACKS LANE, ST JOHN

Proposer

First Deposit

HO3 (Proposed Omission Site OS31)
F412/359 Mr P Keefe Objection

Objections

O1/913 Malcolm Dann Omission Site Objection
O121/972 Mrs JE Barrie Omission Site Objection
O149/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Omission Site Objection
O166/988 Hilda Merlane Omission Site Objection
O17/918 Mr J & Mrs RM Hough Omission Site Objection
O18/919 Mr Karl E Suffell Omission Site Objection
O19/920 MJ & J Stevens Omission Site Objection
O2/914 Mr RA Bryant Omission Site Objection
O20/921 Derek & Sue Richards Omission Site Objection
O238/1034 R Austin Omission Site Objection
O29/23 Brian Jones Omission Site Objection
O3/915 Mr CGF Goodman Omission Site Objection
O390/1076 M & Mrs K Anderson & Lewis Omission Site Objection
O391/1077 Mrs V Tanner Omission Site Objection
O392/1078 David Greenhalgh Omission Site Objection
O4/916 Cdr GP Ramsay Omission Site Objection
O40/924 Pete Goss Omission Site Objection
O41/925 Mr & Mrs M Palmer Omission Site Objection
O49/927 St John Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O5/917 Mrs T Bryant Omission Site Objection
O69/937 Mrs JL Warren Omission Site Objection
O82/941 H Everard Omission Site Objection
O83/942 Vivienne Walker Omission Site Objection

Inspector's Note

18.31.1 I consider the content of these representations in Section 2.16 of my Report and there is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
18.32 OMISSION SITE OS32: LAND AT KITT HILL (SWW RESERVOIR), CALLINGTON

Proposers

First Deposit

F734/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd Objection

Comment

O372/592 Highways Agency Omission Site Comment

Inspector's Note

18.32.1 I consider these representations in Section 16.3 of my Report, and there is nothing which I can add here.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no amendment be made to the Re-Deposit of the First Alteration to the Local Plan.
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NOTES OF, AND ARISING FROM THE PRE-INQUIRY MEETING

CARADON DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN – FIRST ALTERATION

Tuesday 8 August 2006 at 2 pm at the Public Hall, Liskeard, Cornwall.

1. Introduction – Purpose of Meeting and Role of the Inspector

1.1 The Inspector opened the Pre-Inquiry Meeting and welcomed everybody to it.

1.2 He introduced himself. His name was Richard Hollox, a Chartered Town Planner and Chartered Surveyor. He had been appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to hold an Inquiry into objections to the Caradon District Council Local Plan First Alteration and to submit a report to the Council, with binding recommendations concerning any modifications that he considered would have to be made before it was adopted.

1.3 There was no need for people to take notes of this meeting, because a note would be prepared at the end of it and would be sent to everybody who had made a representation. Spare copies would be available from the Programme Officer. People were asked to sign the attendance list which was located at the entrance to the room. There would be a Question and Answer Session at the end of the Meeting, and the Inspector said he would be grateful if people would keep their questions and comments until then.

1.4 A general note on making a case to the inquiry had been sent with the Programme Officer’s letter of 30 June 2006. It was for general guidance. The matters that it covered would be explained and discussed in more detail at this meeting. Decisions made here, particularly concerning the submission of documents, would supersede that general guidance.

1.5 The Inquiry would open at 10.00 am on Tuesday 31 October 2006 here in the Public Hall, Liskeard. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an opportunity for procedural and administrative matters relating to the inquiry to be explained and discussed. The Inspector said that he did not intend to consider the substance (ie the planning merits) of any particular objection. He would do that at the Inquiry.

1.6 The Inspector’s task was to consider the representations which had been made on the Local Plan. In more detail, those representations comprised:

   a) Objections to the First Deposited Plan which had not been unconditionally withdrawn in writing;

   b) Objections to the Re-Deposited Plan which had not been unconditionally withdrawn in writing;

   c) Any outstanding issues of objection that were only partly resolved between the those two deposit stages;
d) He understood that the Council would be asking him to adjudicate on other objections to the further deposit of the Local Plan. The Council confirmed that that was the case in so far as was relevant to the Alteration.

e) The Council also confirmed that they wished the Inspector to adjudicate on objections to the Omission Sites Document published July 2005.

f) In considering objections to the Plan, the Inspector would also have regard to representations in support of the Local Plan at its various stages. It had to be borne in mind, however, that the Inquiry was to be held to consider objections to the plan (Regulation 26 of the Regulations 1999).

1.7 Following the close of the Inquiry the Inspector would prepare a Report to the Council with binding recommendations as to any action which the Inspector considered it should take to progress the Plan to its Adoption.

2. **Programme Officer & Planning Officer**

2.1 The Inspector introduced Mr Bob Young to the meeting. He had been appointed as Programme Officer to the Inquiry. Essentially his duties included the arrangement of the inquiry programme, supervision of the inquiry library, cataloguing and distributing all the inquiry documents and assisting all those making representations, other members of the public and the Council in all matters concerning the smooth running of the inquiry. Based on his past experience of development plan inquiries, the Inspector said that he might have to ask him to chase various parties to make sure that proofs and responses etc were submitted by the due dates, but he was confident that that will not be a problem in Caradon (!!).

2.2 Mr Young would be impartial in all matters concerning the representations and the issues that they raised. He would assist everybody in an even-handed manner. Any queries should first be raised with him. He was a temporary employee of the Council for the duration of the inquiry, although he would be responsible to the Inspector during that time.

2.3 The Council confirmed that Mr Young had had no part in the preparation at any stage of the Local Plan nor in any negotiations or discussions with objectors on the actual content, ie planning merits, of any objection. There was no objection to Mr Young’s appointment from those present.

2.4 Mr Young’s office was here in the Public Hall on the ground floor. The office would normally be open every week from Monday to Friday between 10:00 am and 1:00 pm, and again from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm. However, it was likely that he would be away from the office from time to time, so if anyone wished to visit the office it was advisable to contact him in advance to confirm a time for a visit. His telephone number was 01579 346519. His email address was byoung@caradon.gov.uk

2.5 Every effort would be made to keep to the inquiry programme. However, there might be unavoidable changes throughout the course of the Inquiry. It was the responsibility of objectors intending to appear at the inquiry to keep in touch with the Programme Officer about the progress of the inquiry and thus ensure that they were at the inquiry, at the appropriate time, to present their case. The same applied to those people who simply wish to come to listen. In other words it was up to objectors, once they had been allotted a slot in the programme, to ensure they
were there in good time. The Programme Officer would keep in contact with objectors affected by any changes and would send out the initial Draft Programme with notes of this meeting. After that it would be up to people wishing to attend a particular session to contact the Programme Officer for up to date information.

2.6 A Planning Officer from the Inspectorate’s Office in Bristol had been appointed to assist the Inspector at this Inquiry. He was Mr Mike Hale. Mr Hale would provide professional support under the Inspector’s direction, and his duties were likely to include the initial drafting of some parts of the Inspector’s Report. The costs associated with his duties would be borne by the Planning Inspectorate.

2.7 A number of objections had been lodged by Mr Christopher Jarvis. Mr Jarvis, like the Inspector, was a Consultant Planning Inspector and the Inspector said that they had known each other for many years. Whilst they knew each other in a purely professional, rather than social, capacity, the Inspector said that it would be true to say that they had always been on exceptionally good terms. Bearing in mind the guiding principles of openness, fairness and impartiality according to which the Inspectorate operates, and that those principles must be seen to be applied, the Inspector had decided that it would be quite wrong for him to adjudicate on Mr Jarvis’s site specific objections. Consequently, another Inspector would be appointed to deal with them.

2.8 Nevertheless, after further discussions since the Pre-Inquiry Meeting between Mr Jarvis and the Programme Officer, it was decided that it would be unfair to Mr Jarvis to deny him the opportunity to take part in any Round Table Session set up to deal with any of Mr Jarvis’ more general objections at which other objectors would attend. There was a clear distinction between these general matters in which a number of objectors were interested, and a site-specific objection which concerned Mr Jarvis alone.

3 Number and Scope of Representations

3.1 The Inspector was informed by the Council that the first deposit draft of the Local Plan had given rise to a total of 1637 representations of which 1526 were objections and 101 were in support. 7 objections were ruled not to have been “duly made”. The Council had asked the Inspector not to consider them.

3.2 In response to the Re-Deposit there had been 328 representations, of which 210 were objections, and 108 in support.

3.3 The Council was currently carrying out a consultation exercise on a Sustainability Report on the Omission Sites Document. Representations had to be received by 25 August 2006 and the Council would advise the Programme Officer of any that were received by that date. The Council confirmed that it wished the Inspector to adjudicate on them as if they were duly made objections in so far as was relevant to the Alteration.
4 Introduction of the Caradon Council Team

4.1 The Council’s representative introduced the Council’s Inquiry team as follows- Colin Cresswell, Planning Policy Team Leader James Hills, Planning Policy Officer Zoe Bernard-John, Planning Policy Officer Don Alder, Principal Planning Consultant

4.2 Mr Cresswell confirmed that the Council had complied with all the statutory formalities so far, and no-one was of a contrary opinion. The Council would produce a list of names of their witnesses, their positions within the Authority and their qualifications. The list would be made available to the Inquiry and displayed in the Inquiry Library. The Inspector asked the Council to prepare a “Compliance Report” by the end of August 2006 to include copies of all relevant advertisements etc. It would show how the Council had complied with all the statutory formalities concerning the deposit of the Local Plan at its various stages for representations to be made to it.

4.3 The appearances of other participants at the Inquiry would be noted when they presented their cases. Their qualifications and appointments should be included on their submissions/proofs.

5 Pre-Inquiry Procedures, Objections, Written Representations, Round Table Sessions, Formal and Informal Hearings

5.1 The Inspector drew attention to the Green Book – “Local Plans and Unitary Development Plans – A Guide to Procedures”. A limited number of copies were available from the Programme Officer on a “first come, first served” basis. Six copies would be retained permanently in the Inquiry Library for reference purposes. For those people not familiar with development plan inquiries it should answer all or most of their questions. At paragraph 60 it said that it was for the Inspector to decide how to conduct the proceedings and to ensure that the inquiry was conducted in accordance with well-established principles of impartiality, openness and fairness. That would be the Inspector’s guiding light. In that context, there had been an increasing trend towards more informality in these public inquiries, and of the Inspector taking a more positive, inquisitorial role. That was essentially for two purposes, to use inquiry time more efficiently and to assist those appearing at an inquiry for the first time by providing a more relaxed atmosphere. That would be the Inspector’s general approach.

5.2 The Programme Officer had already contacted all Objectors, asking whether they wished to appear at the Inquiry, that is, by explaining their objection in person at the Inquiry with the aid of additional evidence in the form of a statement, or whether they intended to rely solely on a written statement. On the basis of the responses received the Programme Officer had drawn up a draft programme as far as is possible at this stage. At present the Programme Officer and the Inspector were suggesting a programme of two weeks of Inquiry followed by two weeks of adjournment. There was no objection to this proposed course of action.

6 General and Daily Programme

6.1 The Inquiry would usually start every week at 10.00 am on the Tuesday morning. There might be an earlier start on other days, depending upon the progress made in the programme. The day would normally finish at about 5.00 pm with one hour for lunch and with 10-15 minute breaks at mid morning and mid afternoon. The Inspector said he would like to finish earlier on a Friday, perhaps at lunch time or early afternoon.
6.2 Following the Inspector’s formal opening of the Inquiry on October 31st, the Council would be invited to make a brief opening statement of no more than about 20 minutes to outline the context of the Local Plan, the stages through which it had progressed and the main changes that had taken place in the light of the requirements of the new Cornwall Structure Plan. The statement should be in writing, so it could be an Inquiry document and available in the Inquiry Library. It would be useful to have confirmed the number of objections withdrawn.

6.3 The Council would then to introduce the various documents on which it would be relying, and to which the Objectors were likely to refer. These were the Core Documents and they should include Planning Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes (these were statements of national planning policy) and possibly relevant Committee Reports. Councils usually produced background Topic Papers on the main areas of dispute well before the start of the Inquiry. Those that the Council intended to produce concerned Housing Supply, Housing Distribution, Housing Site Allocations, Affordable Housing, Sustainability, Employment Land, Town Centre and Retail, and Infrastructure.

6.4 The Council confirmed that they should all be available before Tuesday 22 August 2006.

6.5 The new procedures for conducting the Inquiry were designed to speed up the development plan process. They required the Inspector to adopt an inquisitorial approach in both informal and in any formal sessions which might take place. Inspectors had been doing so already, so this was not a fundamental change in approach. Round Table Sessions (RTS) might be arranged for discussions on certain topics where this would result in an efficient use of inquiry time. These sessions would cover Housing Numbers, Housing Distribution and Sustainability, Affordable Housing, and Policy ALT11 and associated topics. Neither the Council nor anybody else present suggested any other topic that would be appropriate for a Round Table Session.

6.6 In drawing up the Inquiry Programme, the Programme Officer would as far as possible follow the order in which topics appeared in the Local Plan, but making the best use of the time available would be the main consideration.

6.7 Where Objectors wished to appear at the inquiry outside a RTS, it would normally be by means of an Informal Hearing unless the Inspector could be persuaded to hold a formal session in order to test evidence. In those Formal sessions, each advocate would bring a witness or witnesses who could be cross-examined by the other side. There would then be re-examination followed by closing submissions.

6.8 The Council preferred Informal Hearings. Apart from the Round Table Sessions, the Inspector agreed that the best method of dealing with objections would be by way of Informal Hearings, for the reasons already given. Maybe there would be no formal sessions at this Inquiry. In the Inspector’s experience, the main differences between a Round Table Session and an Informal Hearing was that there were usually more people at the former, whilst at the latter there was usually a more detailed consideration of site specific matters.

7. Submission of Documents

7.1 The dates of submission of further statements/submissions would be set out in the draft programme. There would be a strict limit on the size of any statements submitted. None should
be more than 3000 words (excluding appendices) unless the Inspector could be persuaded that this limit was unreasonable in particular cases. Technical evidence should be limited to appendices. Generally, statements would be taken as read, but where members of the public were present, the Inspector might ask that the main points of the case be outlined, and/or the conclusions be stated. Hence the Inspector would not insist on the preparation of a summary, but would have no objection if that was preferred. Objectors should set out:

i) briefly and precisely what part of the plan was objected to;
ii) what was wrong with the plan in that respect;
iii) what change was being sought e.g how a policy should be redrafted;
iv) why the change would improve the plan.

7.2 Objectors must set out the precise wording that they were suggesting that the Inspector should recommend to the Council for inclusion in the Adopted Plan. They should also explain how the plan and their proposed changes related to national, regional and strategic guidance. Lengthy extracts from Planning Policy Statements, Planning Policy Guidance and other guidance should not be included. Copies of these would normally be available as Core Documents. Statements should focus on the main issues and arguments on which a case relied. The Council would be subject to the same limit on length in its individual response.

7.3 Written objections carried the same weight as those presented orally at the Inquiry. The Council was required to respond to all objections whatever method was chosen to pursue them. If the Inspector needed to have any matters about a written objection clarified, he would ask the Programme Officer to write to the party concerned with a copy to the other side. All replies would be registered as Inquiry documents and placed in the Library. The Inspector stressed that he would not see any document that was not placed in the public domain. This was an important aspect of the guiding principles of openness, fairness and impartiality, on which the proceedings of the inquiry would be based. Although, typically, a large majority of objectors to local plans opted to pursue their objection in writing, often in the order 85-95%, they did have a right to present their case orally if they so wished.

7.4 The Inquiry would be concerned solely with matters of land use in principle, and not matters of detail unless the Local Plan itself included that detail. It was not a means to promote a particular development proposal with elevations, colour of bricks etc. That should be done by way of a planning application.

7.5 Objectors’ Written Statements for Written Representations and Proofs of Evidence for Inquiry sessions (including Position Statements for Round Table Sessions) must be submitted to the Programme Officer not later than 6 weeks before the start of the relevant 2 week Inquiry block. The Council would respond within 4 weeks of that start. Any objectors’ responses to the Council’s response must be received within 2 weeks of that start. Six copies of all documents would be required.
8 Site Visit Arrangements

8.1 The Inspector would be making a series of site inspections before, during and after the close of the Inquiry. They would normally be unaccompanied. Where either the Council or an Objector considered that it was necessary or desirable for the Inspector to inspect land accompanied by representatives of both parties, they should inform the Programme Officer in writing. It was expected that the vast majority of the inspections would be unaccompanied. The Inspector must be given permission to enter private land. The Inspector stressed that a site inspection would not be an opportunity to discuss the merits or otherwise of an objection. The Inquiry session was the place for that.

9 Facilities and Availability of Information

9.1 The Inquiry Library would be in the same room as that allocated to the Programme Officer. It was on the ground floor of the Public Hall entrance. It would include all the duly made and other objections and representations, Core Documents, copies of all proofs and responses and everything else which had been submitted.

9.2 The Programme Officer had been asked to prepare a skeleton report for the Inspector. This would consist of a template for chapter, policy and proposal headings, objectors’ and objections’ reference numbers and paragraph headings. No information would be supplied to the Inspector which would influence his consideration of the objections.

9.3 Facilities were available to enable those with mobility difficulties to reach and enter the inquiry room. Access was available from street level. If there were any other difficulties, for example people being hard of hearing or suffering from poor eyesight, they should contact the Programme Officer as soon as possible and all would be done to make the necessary arrangements.

9.4 Limited photocopying facilities would be available during the inquiry. A commercial copy shop was adjacent to the Public Hall for large volumes of copying. No dedicated public car parking would be available for those attending the inquiry, but public car parking was available nearby.

9.5 Water would be available during Inquiry sessions, but there were no other catering facilities on these premises. The Inspector said he would be grateful if people would resist the temptation of bringing snacks into the Inquiry sessions.

10 Questions and Answers

10.1 Mr Colin Breed MP asked how strict the 3000 word limit was for statements and whether it included appendices etc. The Inspector confirmed that within reason appendices in addition to the 3000 word limit may be included.

10.2 Mr Breed then asked if the inquiry would maintain dedicated web page(s) to keep the public informed and updated. The Council explained it would be adding additional information to the Council web pages including the Topic Papers that were being prepared. Requests for other information to be added to the web site would also be considered.
10.3 Mr Ray Packham (Turner Holden) commented that they would inform the Programme Officer as soon as possible as to whether they would be requesting a Formal Inquiry session and asked whether the Inspector would be considering representations in light of the ‘tests of soundness’ in the preparation of a Local Development Framework. The Inspector explained that the tests would be taken into account to the extent that the Council’s policies would need to accord with national guidance contained in PPSs and PPGs unless local circumstances indicated otherwise.

10.4 Mr Alan Cook asked if further comments could be submitted in addition to the representations made so far. The Inspector explained that additional material could be submitted where it elaborated on earlier material eg on the form for a duly made objection to the Local Plan.

10.5 Mr Graham Clark (Sunnybank Homes) expressed surprise that there would be a binding report and queried if that was not something associated with the Council’s preparation of a Local Development Framework. The Inspector confirmed that transitional arrangements were in place and his recommendations would be binding on the Council.

10.6 Mr Keith Wilton asked if representations needed to be resubmitted prior to the inquiry. The Inspector suggested that further comments were necessary only if the objector wanted to elaborate on the earlier representations made.

10.7 Ms Lynne Taylor asked what would happen if the Inspector produced his binding report and recommended against an objection. The Inspector explained that Development Plans were constantly the subject of monitoring and review and could be altered in the light of changing planning circumstances.

10.8 Mr Wilton asked how the Local Plan related to the Cornwall Framework Plan. The Inspector presumed that his query related to the Cornwall Structure Plan. Although reporting on the Caradon Local Plan Alteration, the Inspector explained that the Local Plan was part of a two tier system and it had to be in general conformity with the Structure Plan.

10.9 Mr Breed asked if the Inspector would be considering the Local Plan in light of the draft South West Regional Spatial Strategy. The Inspector confirmed that, in view of its status as a draft document, it would be given limited weight in his deliberations on the Local Plan.

11 Any Other Business
None

Thanks and Close
The Inspector asked everybody to sign the attendance list before they left. He thanked everybody for coming to the meeting, and looked forward to meeting everybody again during the course of the Inquiry. The meeting closed at 3:00pm.

RICHARD E HOLLOX
(Inquiry Inspector)
## Compliance Report: Caradon Local Plan

### Issues Report
- Agreed by Council October 2000
- Published 23rd November 2000
- Copies sent to 106 national and local organisations
- Key points in Winter 2000 edition of Caradon Courier (free paper)

### First Deposit
- Agreed by Council 25th March 2003
- Statement of Conformity received from Cornwall County Council on 22nd May 2003
- Placed on Deposit 20/6/03 to 1/08/03.
- Statement of Publicity and Consultation issued.
- Also published Sustainability Appraisal and Three Local Plan Background Papers.
- Summary leaflet produced.
- Public Notices in Cornish Times 20/06/03 and 27/06/03. London Gazette 20/06/03.
- Article in Caradon Courier
- 9 exhibitions in towns and villages where development proposed 02/0703- 12/07/03.

### Re-Deposit
- Agreed by Council 30th March 2005
- Statement of Conformity received from Cornwall County Council 25th April 2005.
- Placed on Deposit 24/06/05 - 5/08/05.
- Statement of Publicity and Consultation issued.
- Also published updated Sustainability Appraisal and updated Local Plan Background Papers.

### Further Deposit
- Deposit period 24/06/05 - 05/08/05. Extended by 2 weeks due to notice not appearing in local paper.
- Noticed placed in London Gazette 24th June 2005
- Notice placed in Cornish Times (8th and 15th July 2005).

### Omission Sites
- Consultation Period 26/08/05-7/10/05.
- Notices placed in Cornish Times: 26/8/05 and London Gazette 26/8/05

### SEA Consultation
- Stakeholder workshop for Scoping Report held in October 2006.
- Consultant’s final Sustainability Appraisal and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Inquiry Meeting</th>
<th>Notices placed in Cornish Times: 21st &amp; 28th July 2006, and in London Gazette 25/7/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scoping Report received in January 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Consultation period 22/3/06 – 5/5/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Notice Placed in Cornish Times 24/3/06 and London Gazette 22/3/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Sustainability Appraisal of Omission Sites received from consultants June 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Consultation period: 22/3/06 – 5/5/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; Notices placed in Cornish Times: 24/3/06 and London Gazette: 22/3/06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

POLICY HO11: AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TOWNS AND VILLAGES,
POLICY HO13: RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING &
PARAGRAPHS 5.68, 5.69 AND 5.72

Objections

POLICY HO11 - AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN TOWNS AND VILLAGES

First Deposit

F18g/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F228a/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F236/227 Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd Objection
F247/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F281/239 Jonathan Hall – NHS Estates Objection
F381a/329 Ms N J Ammar Objection
F436/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
F497/433 Sunnybanks Homes Objection
F546c/475 Phil Smith Objection
F560/486 BT plc Objection
F567/487 South West RSL Objection
F640/523 House Builders Federation Objection
F675/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F735/566 Peninsula Properties Ltd Objection
F761/570 Midas Homes Ltd Objection
F857/634 J Taylor Objection
F1118/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R11/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis Objection
R22/870 McCarthy & Stone Ltd Objection
R93/889 Philip Sanders Objection
R106/487 South West RSL Objection
R193/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
R204/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Ltd Objection
R265/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
R307/433 Sunnybanks Homes Objection

POLICY HO13 - RURAL EXCEPTION HOUSING

First Deposit

F18h/31 Steve & Vanessa Killops Objection
F212/215 Duloe Parish Council Objection
F249/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
F411/358 Linkinhorne Parish Council Objection
F433/372 Mr AR Weatherhead Objection
F435/377 Rosemullion Homes Objection
F498/433 Sunnybanks Homes Objection
F546d/475 Phil Smith Objection
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F597/3  Cornwall County Council  Objection
F760/570  Midas Homes Ltd  Objection
F770/571  Mr E Andreae-Jones  Objection
F792/586  Country Land and Business Association - South  Objection
F1120/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R20/228  Colin Breed MP  Objection
R96/890  CB Ellis  Objection
R97/890  CB Ellis  Objection
R101/892  L Winn  Objection
R136/377  Rosemullion Homes  Objection
R153/899  Mrs Sue Daniel  Objection
R266/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection
R299/3  Cornwall County Council  Objection
R308/433  Sunnybanks Homes  Objection

PARAGRAPHS 5.68, 5.69 AND 5.72

First Deposit

F1116/1  Government Office for the South West  Objection
POLICY ALT10 - HOUSING: LAMELLION

Objections

First Deposit

F4a/17  Mr MJ & Mrs JA Thomas  Objection
F8a/21  Mr & Mrs G Mitchell     Objection
F41/54  Mr & Mrs P Cummins      Objection
F62/74  G Potter                Objection
F74a/86 NA Pampling             Objection
F96a/108 RW & EM Balloch        Objection
F136a/147 Sheila M Guyler       Objection
F137/148 Mrs FE Lee             Objection
F141/150 Mr Nicholas Brewer     Objection
F157/166 Ann Elisabeth Gray     Objection
F166/174 Mrs Mary L Snell       Objection
F167/175 Barry Matthews         Objection
F168/176 Johanna Matthews       Objection
F181/188 B Wooster              Objection
F183/190 Elizabeth Saudek       Objection
F188a/195 Mr & Mrs E Sharp      Objection
F189a/196 Mrs M Simpson         Objection
F192/199 JH Gliddon            Objection
F205/211 Anne Sandercock        Objection
F206a/212 Mr & Mrs JD Crago     Objection
F211/216 PNB Stephens           Objection
F214a/217 Liskeard Town Council Objection
F217/219 HJ Kendall            Objection
F233d/225 CPRE - Caradon        Objection
F235/226 Malcolm Mort           Objection
F257/228 Colin Breed MP         Objection
F263/230 Alan Cook             Objection
F275/238 Judith Markes          Objection
F283/240 Jane Owen             Objection
F287/241 Paul and Margaret Eglin Objection
F291/245 Lynne and Denis Harding Objection
F292/246 Mrs VM & Miss AM Carr  Objection
F299/254 Mrs EC Cook            Objection
F300/255 RTJ Putnam            Objection
F301/256 Mrs Janet Putnam       Objection
F307a/262 Robin & Susan Gibson & Hainton Objection
F314/270 Mr & Mrs AR Barrett   Objection
F315/271 George Vaughan Ellis Objection conditionally withdrawn
F317/273 SC Hoskins            Objection
F333/289 RB Hawken             Objection
F353/301 Mrs EI Davis          Objection
F357/305 LJ Eberle             Objection
F370/318 Lamellion Residents Action Group Objection
F376/324 Lamellion Association Objection
F377/325 JH Roseveare          Objection
F378/326 RJ Roseveare          Objection
F382a/329 Ms NJ Ammar          Objection
F383/330 JD & CW Black         Objection
F384/331 Mr CJ Lee             Objection
F388a/335 TA Copplestone       Objection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name and Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F389a/336</td>
<td>Mrs G Copplestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F390a/337</td>
<td>Miss F Copplestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F391a/338</td>
<td>Mr AH Copplestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F392a/339</td>
<td>JH Cock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F393a/340</td>
<td>SM Cock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F404/351</td>
<td>Ian Hackworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F407/354</td>
<td>Mr AJ Parnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F408/355</td>
<td>Mrs M Parnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F409/356</td>
<td>Miss Jessica Parnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F415/360</td>
<td>Mr Gilbert Woolcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F421/366</td>
<td>Mr C &amp; Miss J Crabb &amp; James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F422/367</td>
<td>Susan Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F423/368</td>
<td>Miss G Derrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F441a/378</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Howe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F443a/380</td>
<td>AAH Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F444a/381</td>
<td>Mrs DM Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F456/393</td>
<td>Mrs Sarah J Burrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F457/394</td>
<td>Mr Julian Burrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F472/409</td>
<td>Mrs J Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F483/420</td>
<td>Mrs M Worthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F484/421</td>
<td>Mr Peter Worthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F485/422</td>
<td>Mr Matthew Worthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F489/426</td>
<td>Ms Elaine Lewis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F490c/427</td>
<td>Kier Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F494/430</td>
<td>Mr A Atkinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F495/431</td>
<td>Miss D Beswetherick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F499/434</td>
<td>Ian Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F500/435</td>
<td>Julie Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F508/443</td>
<td>Mrs Dorothy Woolcock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F512/447</td>
<td>Nicola Jago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F528/462</td>
<td>Joanne Hosking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F529/463</td>
<td>John Hosking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F537/471</td>
<td>Mrs Julie Cawrse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F538/472</td>
<td>Rev Martin Sellix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F554/480</td>
<td>Mrs S M Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F556/482</td>
<td>Mrs VC Hosking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F557/483</td>
<td>John S Hosking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F558b/484</td>
<td>Mrs B Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F559b/485</td>
<td>PS Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F575c/488</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F609a/493</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs G Teasdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F611/495</td>
<td>Sandra M Preston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F616/500</td>
<td>Elizabeth M Henslowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F618/502</td>
<td>Mrs E Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F619/503</td>
<td>Mrs M Herbert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F620/504</td>
<td>Richard Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F621/505</td>
<td>Rosemary Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F622/506</td>
<td>Ian Pollard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F623/507</td>
<td>MJ Truran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F624/508</td>
<td>M Truran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F630/514</td>
<td>VL Lockwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F631/515</td>
<td>Mr A &amp; Mrs L Perryman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F634/518</td>
<td>Sabina Eberle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F685/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F694/529</td>
<td>Suzanne Dixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F705/540</td>
<td>Elaine Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F706/541</td>
<td>Mrs B Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F711/546</td>
<td>John Causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F713/547</td>
<td>Patrick Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F714/548</td>
<td>Diana Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F715/549</td>
<td>John Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F722/556</td>
<td>Michael Denny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F723/557</td>
<td>L Denny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F726/560</td>
<td>Catherine Causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F727/561</td>
<td>Tristan Causer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F733/566</td>
<td>Mrs Janet Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F751h/10</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F777/577</td>
<td>Mrs CB Thorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F807/595</td>
<td>Mrs M Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F815/601</td>
<td>Mr G Beswetherick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F816/602</td>
<td>Mrs S Beswetherick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F824/609</td>
<td>Jim Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F825/610</td>
<td>Adrian Dawson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F826a/611</td>
<td>Mr J Willcocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F828a/613</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs P Ferris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F829/614</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Hallam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F830/615</td>
<td>Mr B &amp; Mrs L Turney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F836a/621</td>
<td>Carol Calder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F860/636</td>
<td>G Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F861/637</td>
<td>J Hanns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F862/638</td>
<td>Mrs KM Hanns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F863/639</td>
<td>John Rudkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F864/640</td>
<td>G Hanns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F865/641</td>
<td>Peter Hockin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F867/643</td>
<td>Mrs M Duffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F869/644</td>
<td>Tamsin Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F871/646</td>
<td>Paul AR Dunbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F872/647</td>
<td>Paul &amp; Sally West &amp; Pestell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F913a/688</td>
<td>A &amp; J Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1085/857</td>
<td>Robert &amp; Estelle Pears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1136/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Re-Deposit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name(s)</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R120/895</td>
<td>Messrs Blamey, Cross and Gregory</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objections

First Deposit

F13a/26  Mrs Ruth Cozens
F168/176 Johanna Matthews
F182a/189 John Martin
F188b/195 Mr & Mrs E Sharp
F189b/196 Mrs M Simpson
F214b/217 Liskeard Town Council
F218/219 HJ Kendall
F233e/225 CPRE - Caradon
F261/230 Alan Cook
F264/230 Alan Cook
F307b/262 Robin & Susan Gibson & Haighton
F388b/335 TA Copplestone
F389b/336 Mrs G Copplestone
F390b/337 Miss F Copplestone
F391b/338 Mr AH Copplestone
F392b/339 JH Cock
F393b/340 SM Cock
F434a/373 Vincent Cacchione
F443b/380 AAH Phillips
F444b/381 Mrs DM Phillips
F446a/383 Mr & Mrs Booth-Clibborn
F490b/427 Kier Bond
F515/371 David John Perry
F553a/479 Jim & Kate Pearce
F555/481 Mrs B Moss
F558c/484 Mrs B Moss
F559c/485 PS Moss
F575d/488 Sport England
F684/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd
F716a/550 Alison Peake
F717a/551 Martin John Peake
F724a/558 Mr F J Daw
F725a/559 Muriell Daw
F729/563 Mr & Mrs AJ Groves
F731/563 Mr & Mrs AJ Groves
F751i/10 Environment Agency
F753a/569 Mrs S Cacchione
F798i/592 Highways Agency
F819a/605 Barry Niles
F820a/606 Mrs SA Niles
F837a/622 Mr D Rowe
F838a/623 Mrs VJ Rowe
F839a/624 Miss CP Rowe
F875a/650 Keith Wilton
F877a/652 Mr & Mrs BJ Hine
F878a/653 Mr & Mrs Ivor Symons
F880a/655 Gwyneth & Jason Crocker
F881a/656 Mr & Mrs Lindsey
F882a/657 Hayley & Mark Taylor & Snell
F883a/658 Mrs Laura & Miss L Dawson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name and Name</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F884a/659</td>
<td>Simon &amp; Sue Dance &amp; Hawken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F886a/661</td>
<td>Mr JD &amp; Mrs PMA Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F887a/662</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs T Puckey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F890a/665</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F892a/667</td>
<td>SP &amp; HP Hine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F893a/668</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs CA Broad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F894a/669</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A Menditta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F895a/670</td>
<td>CP &amp; LA Hine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F896a/671</td>
<td>Mr RFK &amp; Mrs M Wilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F897a/672</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F898a/673</td>
<td>Graham &amp; Jeannine Wheeler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F899a/674</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs PD Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F900a/675</td>
<td>David &amp; Joan Pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F902a/677</td>
<td>Mr Gordon &amp; Mrs Elizabeth Mease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F903b/678</td>
<td>Frank &amp; Sidonie Driburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F904a/679</td>
<td>Mr D &amp; Mr M Russell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F905a/680</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs D Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F906a/681</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs S Morfett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F907a/682</td>
<td>Alan &amp; Julie Bilsby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F908a/683</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Wykes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F909a/684</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Libby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F911a/686</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs B Oliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F912a/687</td>
<td>Mr J &amp; Mrs T Willcocks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F913b/688</td>
<td>A &amp; J Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F914a/689</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs M Webber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F916a/691</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs CH Blair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F917a/692</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Pöppelmann</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F918a/693</td>
<td>Mr J &amp; Mrs D Hake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F919a/694</td>
<td>Mr M &amp; Mrs S Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F920a/695</td>
<td>MD &amp; DJ Bartlett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F921a/696</td>
<td>A McLean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F922a/697</td>
<td>Mrs J Martin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F923a/698</td>
<td>Tamzin French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F924a/699</td>
<td>Mr JL Moir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F925a/700</td>
<td>Ruth Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F926a/701</td>
<td>Ian Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F927a/702</td>
<td>Mr AM Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F928a/703</td>
<td>Rebecca Marshall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F929a/704</td>
<td>S Umbridge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F930a/705</td>
<td>Mrs DM Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F932a/707</td>
<td>Steve Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F933a/708</td>
<td>Ms D Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F934a/709</td>
<td>Mr E Hollies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F935a/710</td>
<td>T Unger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F936a/711</td>
<td>Clyve Ugalde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F937a/712</td>
<td>Hannah Rowe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F938a/713</td>
<td>Tony Libby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F939a/714</td>
<td>Mrs EG Crouch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F940a/715</td>
<td>MA West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F942a/717</td>
<td>Mrs RF Stoneman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F945b/720</td>
<td>Janet Owen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F947b/722</td>
<td>Jane Luiten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F948b/723</td>
<td>Anthony Luiten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F949b/724</td>
<td>David Van Meurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F950b/725</td>
<td>Mrs MA Van Meurs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F951b/726</td>
<td>M Hambly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F952b/727</td>
<td>Eileen Hambly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

F953b/728 John Hambly Objection
F956a/731 Mr GR Horne Objection
F957a/732 Sheila Chisholm Objection
F959a/734 Mrs L Fentiman Objection
F962a/737 Nigel Brewer Objection
F964a/739 Mrs VL Richardson Objection
F965a/740 Mrs A Taylor Objection
F966a/741 S Bryant Objection
F968a/743 Mrs RJ Reay Objection
F969a/744 Doreen Parker Objection
F970a/745 Tanya Brockett Objection
F972a/747 Mrs ME Jackson Objection
F973a/748 Carolyn Bridge Objection
F974a/749 Mr JG Jackson Objection
F975a/620 William Douglas Fisher Objection
F976a/750 Mrs H Ford Objection
F977a/751 Mrs T Cummings Objection
F978a/752 Miss C Worrall Objection
F980a/754 JE Butcher Objection
F982a/756 KJ Stead Objection
F983a/757 RN Olver Objection
F984a/758 Mrs Beryl Brodie Objection
F985a/759 R Manning Objection
F986a/760 Gail Marshall Objection
F987a/761 Ian Marshall Objection
F989a/763 Mrs Vera Ruth Richards Objection
F990a/764 Mrs JB Roper Objection
F991a/765 JV Smith Objection
F992a/766 AJ Trembeth Objection
F993a/767 Mrs C Goodman Objection
F996a/770 Stephen Patey Objection
F997a/771 Sally Patey Objection
F998a/772 Mrs RA Jones Objection
F999a/773 JE Lejeune Objection
F1000a/774 S Reid Objection
F1001a/775 GH Wakeham Objection
F1002a/776 DE Reid Objection
F1004a/778 Paul Rowe Objection
F1005a/779 Colin Witton Objection
F1006a/780 D Whitton Objection
F1007a/781 AJ Ponejels Objection
F1008a/782 Mrs Benney Objection
F1009a/783 Lynne Rodda Objection
F1010a/784 Morley Gilbert Objection
F1011b/785 Mrs PM Aldworth Objection
F1012b/786 AJ Aldworth Objection
F1013b/787 B Woodman Objection
F1014b/788 WA Woodman Objection
F1015a/789 Mrs J Ussher Objection
F1016a/790 Mr T Firth Objection
F1017a/791 Mrs ND Firth Objection
F1019a/793 Mrs DK Stephens Objection
F1020a/794 Louisa Ussher Objection
F1022a/796 Dr JH Ussher Objection
F1023a/797 Mrs LA Philp Objection
F1024a/798 Mrs J Cutler Objection
F1025a/799 R Cutler Objection
APPENDIX 5

F1027a/801 Ms L Losty Objection
F1029a/803 Mrs PM Ford Objection
F1030a/804 James Andrew Collins Objection
F1031a/805 Mr IL Gilbert Objection
F1032a/806 Carmen Hunt Objection
F1033a/807 Stephen Hunt Objection
F1034a/808 Miss K Olver Objection
F1035a/809 GH Gilbert Objection
F1037a/811 Mrs B Ford Objection
F1038a/812 Ian Pook Objection
F1039a/813 Mrs T King Objection
F1041a/815 A Todd Objection
F1042a/816 Mr A Bent Objection
F1045a/819 Mr BJ Hill Objection
F1046a/820 Mrs KA Hill Objection
F1047a/821 Mr F King Objection
F1048a/822 Mrs I King Objection
F1049a/823 Teresa E Lewis Objection
F1050a/824 Mr Roger Toulouse Objection
F1051a/825 Olive Mary Davis Objection
F1052a/826 MJ Brewer Objection
F1056a/830 Doreen Johnson Objection
F1057a/831 Mr MDJ Knight Objection
F1059a/833 MR Lawrence Objection
F1060a/834 Mrs H Bilsborough Objection
F1061a/835 Miss Gail Angela Woolfenden Objection
F1062a/836 Bryan Ugalde Objection
F1063a/837 Karen Ugalde Objection
F1064a/838 Simon Awgrave Objection
F1065a/839 Bernard Angrave Objection
F1066a/840 Sally Glover Objection
F1068a/842 Mrs M Sharp Objection
F1069a/240 Jane Owen Objection
F1070a/540 Elaine Ford Objection
F1071/843 Mr & Mrs Smith Objection
F1073a/845 Klaudia van Goal Objection
F1074/846 Mr A Dyos Objection
F1075/847 Mrs A Dyos Objection
F1076b/848 Mrs JV Aldworth Objection
F1077b/849 James Lockyer Objection
F1078b/850 GC Aldworth Objection
F1079a/851 Y Manicom Objection
F1080/852 Luke Woolfenden Objection
F1081a/853 Carolyn Angrave Objection
F1137/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R17/228 Colin Breed MP Objection
R43/877 Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon Objection
R44/877 Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon Objection
R45/877 Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon, Mr and Mrs R Peake, Dr and Mrs Ussher Objection
R46/877 Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon, Mr and Mrs R Peake, Dr and Mrs Ussher Objection
R74/880 Alison & Colin Cox & Butler Objection
R91/650 Keith Wilton Objection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R102/563</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs AJ Groves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R168/225</td>
<td>CPRE - Caradon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R174/592</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R195/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R196/525</td>
<td>Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R198/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R202/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R277/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R312/877</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon, Mr and Mrs R Peake, Dr and Mrs Ussher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R313/877</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs M Peake, Mr and Mrs Burdon, Mr and Mrs R Peake, Dr and Mrs Ussher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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POLICIES ALT12, ALT13 & ALT14: HOUSING - BRAMBLE LANE END, WESTERN AVENUE & ROSEMELLEN TERRACE

Objections

POLICY ALT12 - HOUSING: BRAMBLE LANE END

First Deposit

F4b/18    Mr MJ & Mrs JA Thomas  Objection
F12a/25   Mr & Mrs JH Scott      Objection
F13b/27   Mrs Ruth Cozens        Objection
F15a/28   Miss EL & Mr PO Causer & Stallard  Objection
F22a/35   Maureen Segold         Objection
F31a/44   DI Gundry              Objection
F36/49    Mr LJ Pine             Objection
F37/50    Mrs P Pyne             Objection
F46a/59   Mr & Mrs GF Johnson    Objection
F56a/68   Mr Roger John Gill     Objection
F73/85    Mr S & Mrs B Jerrom    Objection
F75/87    LE Few                 Objection
F76/88    RWG Few                Objection
F146/155  Mr AJ Deacon           Objection
F150/159  Mr & Mrs Killeen       Objection
F167/175  Barry Matthews         Objection
F168/176  Johanna Matthews       Objection
F174a/182 Mrs Tina Sanford        Objection
F176a/184 Mrs M Collings         Objection
F192/199  JH Gliddon             Objection
F200/206  Eunice Folkard         Objection
F206b/212 Mr & Mrs JD Crago      Objection
F207a/213 Mrs Joyce Coad         Objection
F208a/214 Mr Roger & Mrs Amanda Griffiths Objection
F224b/223 Mr T Mitchell          Objection
F284/240  Jane Owen              Objection
F316a/272 Miss G & Mr P McCarthy & Terry Objection
F335/289  RB Hawken              Objection
F360/308  Mr J Vincent           Objection
F362/310  Mr C Scott             Objection
F369a/317 Mr NE Wade             Objection
F379a/327 Mrs Ann Heath          Objection
F380a/328 Miss Sharon Fisher     Objection
F387a/334 Mr Glyn Fradley        Objection
F388c/335 TA Copplestone         Objection
F389c/336 Mrs G Copplestone      Objection
F390c/337 Miss F Copplestone     Objection
F391c/338 Mr AH Copplestone      Objection
F392c/339 JH Cock                Objection
F393c/340 SM Cock                Objection
F395a/342 Mrs Jackie Fradley     Objection
F397a/344 Brian Hutchings        Objection
F398a/345 IS Hoyle               Objection
F399a/346 TE Hoyle               Objection
F405a/352 Mrs Anne Hutchings     Objection
F417/362 Mr CJ Penwarden         Objection
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F446b/383  Mr & Mrs Booth-Clibborn            Objection
F459a/396  Mr & Mrs T Runnalls                Objection
F468a/405  Mr AE & Mrs C Richards            Objection
F469/406   CE Hoyle                             Objection
F487/424   Mrs TV McEvoy                        Objection
F493/429   Mr Andrew Palmer                    Objection
F496a/432   Helen Kemp                           Objection
F501/436   Lt Col GVR Paget                      Objection
F502/437   Mrs EM Paget                         Objection
F504/439   Mr B & Mrs J Waters                  Objection
F534/468   Mrs J Lovewell                        Objection
F535a/469  Trevor Andrew                        Objection
F558d/484  Mrs B Moss                            Objection
F559d/485  PS Moss                               Objection
F575e/488  Sport England                        Objection
F612/496   Andrew Ellis                           Objection
F628b/512  VL Lockwood                           Objection
F632/516   Mrs B Harvey                           Objection
F633/517   Mrs E Leach                            Objection
F635a/519  Heather Calvert                       Objection
F638/521   LM Phillips                            Objection conditionally withdrawn
F639/522   VM Sandy                               Objection conditionally withdrawn
F683a/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd            Objection
F701/536   Judith Grayston                       Objection
F718a/552  Mr & Mrs R Edwards                    Objection
F728a/562  Mrs Jane Rowsell                      Objection
F732a/564  Mrs Lindsey Wild                       Objection
F810a/598  G Facey                                Objection
F811a/599  Mrs P Brodey                           Objection
F826b/611  Mr J Willcocks                         Objection
F828b/613  Mr & Mrs P Ferris                      Objection
F832/617   Selina Jolly                           Objection
F833/618   Mrs PM Thompson                        Objection
F835b/620  William Douglas Fisher                Objection
F840/625   Christopher & Elizabeth Taylor & Furnell Objection
F1084/856  TM Hoyle                               Objection
F1138/1   Government Office for the South West  Objection

Re-Deposit

R245/223  Mr T Mitchell                        Objection

POLICY ALT13 - HOUSING: WESTERN AVENUE

First Deposit

F4c/19     Mr MJ & Mrs JA Thomas                 Objection
F8b/22     Mr & Mrs G Mitchell                Objection
F12b/25    Mr & Mrs JH Scott                   Objection
F15b/28    Miss EL & Mr PO Causer & Stallard  Objection
F22b/35    Maureen Segold                      Objection
F31b/44    DI Gundry                            Objection
F56b/68    Mr Roger John Gill                  Objection
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Mr & Mrs GF Johnson

JG & E Smith

Mr Victor J Wright

Mr & Mrs RT Penney

Mrs C Hay

Barry Matthews

Johanna Matthews

Mrs Tina Sanford

Mr & Mrs RT Penney

Mrs M Collings

Mrs M Simpson

JH Gliddon

Mr DA Pote

Mr & Mrs JD Crago

Mrs Joyce Coad

Mr Roger & Mrs Amanda Griffiths

Mrs M Solomon

Malcolm Mort

Jane Owen

Miss G & Mr P McCarthy & Terry

RB Hawken

Mr & Mrs MJ Howard

Mr NE Wade

Mrs Ann Heath

Miss Sharon Fisher

Mr RJ Berryman

Mr Glyn Fradley

TA Copplestone

Mrs G Copplestone

Miss F Copplestone

Mr AH Copplestone

JH Cock

SM Cock

Mrs Jackie Fradley

Brian Hutchings

Mrs Anne Hutchings

Mr & Mrs Booth-Clibborn

Mr & Mrs T Runnalls

Mr AE & Mrs C Richards

Mr Andrew Palmer

Helen Kemp

Trevor Andrew

Mrs MA Sleeman

Mrs B Moss

PS Moss

Sport England

VL Lockwood

Heather Calvert

Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

Mr & Mrs R Edwards

Mrs Jane Rowsell

Mrs Lindsey Wild

Mr & Mrs TM Sleeman

Arthur B Pope

G Facey

Mrs P Brodey

Mr J Willcocks

Mr & Mrs P Ferris
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F836b/621 Carol Calder Objection
F1088/860 Mr K Rogers Objection
F1139/1 Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R246/222 Mrs M Solomon Objection

POLICY ALT14 - HOUSING: ROSEMELLEN TERRACE

First Deposit

F7/20 Mrs A Hutcheson Objection conditionally withdrawn
F74b/86 NA Pampling Objection
F96b/108 RW & EM Balloch Objection
F136b/147 Sheila M Guyler Objection
F168/176 Johanna Matthews Objection
F216/219 HJ Kendall Objection
F286/240 Jane Owen Objection
F307c/262 Robin & Susan Gibson & Haighton Objection
F331/287 Mr & Mrs DB Arscott Objection
F334b/289 RB Hawken Objection
F446d/383 Mr & Mrs Booth-Clibborn Objection
F449/386 Mr & Mrs D Pryor Objection
F486/423 Mr Roger Beck Objection
F558f/484 Mrs B Moss Objection
F559f/485 PS Moss Objection
F575g/488 Sport England Objection
F609b/493 Mr & Mrs G Teasdale Objection
F627/511 Mrs PM Morcom Objection
F683c/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd Objection
F1140/1 Government Office for the South West Objection
APPENDIX 7

POLICY ALT15 - OPEN RECREATION: ST CLEER ROAD

Objections

First Deposit

F13c/28 Mrs Ruth Cozens Objection
F182b/189 John Martin Objection
F188c/195 Mr & Mrs E Sharp Objection
F189d/196 Mrs M Simpson Objection
F233f/225 CPRE - Caradon Objection
F382b/329 Ms NJ Ammar Objection
F434b/373 Vincent Cacchione Objection
F446e/383 Mr & Mrs Booth-Clibborn Objection
F490a/427 Kier Bond Objection
F553b/479 Jim & Kate Pearce Objection
F558g/484 Mrs B Moss Objection
F559g/485 PS Moss Objection
F716b/550 Alison Peake Objection
F717b/551 Martin John Peake Objection
F724b/558 Mr F J Daw Objection
F725b/559 Muriell Daw Objection
F730/563 Mr & Mrs AJ Groves Objection
F753b/569 Mrs S Cacchione Objection
F819b/605 Barry Niles Objection
F820b/606 Mrs SA Niles Objection
F837b/622 Mr D Rowe Objection
F838b/623 Mrs VJ Rowe Objection
F839b/624 Miss CP Rowe Objection
F875b/650 Keith Wilton Objection
F877b/652 Mr & Mrs BJ Hine Objection
F878b/653 Mr & Mrs Ivor Symons Objection
F880b/656 Gwyneth & Jason Crocker Objection
F881b/656 Mr & Mrs Lindsey Objection
F882b/657 Hayley & Mark Taylor & Snell Objection
F883b/658 Mrs Laura & Miss L Dawson Objection
F884b/659 Simon & Sue Dance & Hawken Objection
F886b/661 Mr JD & Mrs PMA Rowe Objection
F887b/662 Mr & Mrs T Puckey Objection
F890b/665 Mr & Mrs Brown Objection
F892b/667 SP & HP Hine Objection
F893b/668 Mr & Mrs CA Broad Objection
F894b/669 Mr & Mrs A Menditta Objection
F895b/670 CP & LA Hine Objection
F896b/671 Mr RFK & Mrs M Wilton Objection
F897b/672 Mr & Mrs Martin Objection
F898b/673 Graham & Jeannine Wheeler Objection
F899b674 Mr & Mrs PD Brown Objection
F900b/675 David & Joan Pine Objection
F902b/677 Mr Gordon & Mrs Elizabeth Mease Objection
F903c/678 Frank & Sidonie Driburgh Objection
F904b/679 Mr D & Mr M Russell Objection
F905b/680 Mr & Mrs D Rowe Objection
F906b/681 Mr & Mrs S Morfett Objection
F907b/682 Alan & Julie Bilsby Objection
F908b/683 Mr & Mrs Wykes Objection
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F909b/684 Mr & Mrs Libby Objection
F911b/686 Mr & Mrs B Olver Objection
F912b/687 Mr J & Mrs T Willcocks Objection
F913c/688 A & J Harris Objection
F914b/689 Mr & Mrs M Webber Objection
F915b/690 Mr & Mrs Mortimore Objection
F916b/691 Mr & Mrs CH Blair Objection
F917b/692 Mr & Mrs Pöppelmann Objection
F918b/693 Mr J & Mrs D Hake Objection
F919b/694 Mr M & Mrs S Rowe Objection
F920b/695 MD & DJ Bartlett Objection
F921b/696 A McLean Objection
F922b/697 Mrs J Martin Objection
F923b/698 Tamzin French Objection
F924b/699 Mr JL Moir Objection
F925b/700 Ruth Gilbert Objection
F926b/701 Ian Marshall Objection
F927b/702 Mr AM Scott Objection
F928b/703 Rebecca Marshall Objection
F929b/704 S Umbridge Objection
F930b/705 Mrs DM Scott Objection
F932b/707 Steve Scott Objection
F933b/708 Ms D Adam Objection
F934b/709 Mr E Hollies Objection
F935b/710 T Unger Objection
F936b/711 Clyve Ugalde Objection
F937b/712 Hannah Rowe Objection
F938b/713 Tony Libby Objection
F939b/714 Mrs EG Crouch Objection
F942b/717 Mrs RF Stoneman Objection
F945c/720 Janet Owen Objection
F947c/722 Jane Luiten Objection
F948c/723 Anthony Luiten Objection
F949c/724 David Van Meurs Objection
F94b0/715 MA West Objection
F950c/725 Mrs MA Van Meurs Objection
F951c/726 M Hambly Objection
F952c/727 Eileen Hambly Objection
F953c/728 John Hambly Objection
F956b/731 Mr GR Horne Objection
F957b/732 Sheila Chisholm Objection
F959b/734 Mrs L Fentiman Objection
F962b/737 Nigel Brewer Objection
F964b/739 Mrs VL Richardson Objection
F965b/740 Mrs A Taylor Objection
F966b/741 S Bryant Objection
F968b/743 Mrs RJ Reay Objection
F969b/744 Doreen Parker Objection
F970b/745 Tanya Brockett Objection
F972b/747 Mrs ME Jackson Objection
F973b/748 Carolyn Bridge Objection
F974b/749 Mr JG Jackson Objection
F975b/620 William Douglas Fisher Objection
F976b/750 Mrs H Ford Objection
F977b/751 Mrs T Cummings Objection
F978b/752 Miss C Worrall Objection
F980b/754 JE Butcher Objection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Objection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F982b/756</td>
<td>KJ Stead</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F983b/757</td>
<td>RN Olver</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F984b/758</td>
<td>Mrs Beryl Brodie</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F985b/759</td>
<td>R Manning</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F986b/760</td>
<td>Gail Marshall</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F987b/761</td>
<td>Ian Marshall</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F989b/763</td>
<td>Mrs Vera Ruth Richards</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F990b/764</td>
<td>Mrs JB Roper</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F991b/765</td>
<td>JV Smith</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F992b/766</td>
<td>AJ Trembeth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F993b/767</td>
<td>Mrs C Goodman</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F996b/770</td>
<td>Stephen Patey</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F997b/771</td>
<td>Sally Patey</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F998b/772</td>
<td>Mrs RA Jones</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F999b/773</td>
<td>JE Lejeune</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1000b/774</td>
<td>S Reid</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1001b/775</td>
<td>GH Wakeham</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1002b/776</td>
<td>DE Reid</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1004b/778</td>
<td>Paul Rowe</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1005b/779</td>
<td>Colin Witton</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1006b/780</td>
<td>D Whitton</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1007b/781</td>
<td>AJ Poniejels</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1008b/782</td>
<td>Mrs Benney</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1009b/783</td>
<td>Lynne Rodda</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1010b/784</td>
<td>Morley Gilbert</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1011c/785</td>
<td>Mrs PM Aldworth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1012c/786</td>
<td>AJ Aldworth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1013c/787</td>
<td>B Woodman</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1014c/788</td>
<td>WA Woodman</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1015b/789</td>
<td>Mrs J Ussher</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1016b/790</td>
<td>Mr T Firth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1017b/791</td>
<td>Mrs ND Firth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1019b/793</td>
<td>Mrs DK Stephens</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1020b/794</td>
<td>Louisa Ussher</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1022b/796</td>
<td>Dr JH Ussher</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1023b/797</td>
<td>Mrs LA Philp</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1024b/798</td>
<td>Mrs J Cutler</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1025b/799</td>
<td>R Cutler</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1027b/801</td>
<td>Ms L Losty</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1029b/803</td>
<td>Mrs PM Ford</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1030b/804</td>
<td>James Andrew Collins</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1031b/805</td>
<td>Mr IL Gilbert</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1032b/806</td>
<td>Carmen Hunt</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1033b/807</td>
<td>Stephen Hunt</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1034b/808</td>
<td>Miss K Olver</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1035b/809</td>
<td>GH Gilbert</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1037b/811</td>
<td>Mrs B Ford</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1038b/812</td>
<td>Ian Pook</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1039b/813</td>
<td>Mrs T King</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1041b/815</td>
<td>A Todd</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1042b/816</td>
<td>Mr A Bent</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1045b/819</td>
<td>Mr BJ Hill</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1046b/820</td>
<td>Mrs KA Hill</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1047b/821</td>
<td>Mr F King</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1048b/822</td>
<td>Mrs I King</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1049b/823</td>
<td>Teresa E Lewis</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1050b/824</td>
<td>Mr Roger Toulouse</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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F1051b/825 Olive Mary Davis Objection
F1052b/826 MJ Brewer Objection
F1056b/830 Doreen Johnson Objection
F1057b/831 Mr MDJ Knight Objection
F1059b/833 MR Lawrence Objection
F1060b/834 Mrs H Bilsborough Objection
F1061b/835 Miss Gail Angela Woolfenden Objection
F1062b/836 Bryan Ugalde Objection
F1063b/837 Karen Ugalde Objection
F1064b/838 Simon Awgrave Objection
F1065b/839 Bernard Angrave Objection
F1066b/840 Sally Glover Objection
F1068b/842 Mrs M Sharp Objection
F1069b/240 Jane Owen Objection
F1070b/540 Elaine Ford Objection
F1073b/845 Klaudia van Goal Objection
F1076c/848 Mrs JV Aldworth Objection
F1077c/849 James Lockyer Objection
F1078c/850 GC Aldworth Objection
F1079b/851 Y Manicom Objection
F1081b/853 Carolyn Angrave Objection

Re-Deposit

R128/523 Home Builders Federation Objection
POLICY PEL1: Land south of Pelynt village (Proposed Omission Site OS28) & POLICY ALT17: HOUSING - PELYNT

Objections

First Deposit

F28/41  David J Hearnden
F47/60  Mr P R Evans
F49/62  J E Philp
F53/65  Ian & Ann Rescorle
F55/67  Mr & Mrs A Raynor
F59/71  Mr M Dawson
F70/82  Major J G Spreckley
F143/152 John Jolliff
F172/180 Mrs J R Nyman
F199/205 Mr G Jones
F201/207 Mr K R Evans
F202/208 Mr M E Moss
F265/232 Mrs S Dennis
F266/233 Mr J A Dennis Objection conditionally withdrawn
F289/243 J M Philp
F312/267 Pelynt FC
F320/276 Pelynt Parish Council
F321/277 Pelynt Parish Council
F350/298 Mr J & Mrs E Trewin
F359/307 Michael Harvey
F401/348 Mr & Mrs R J Lang
F402/349 Mrs J Wilkinson
F403/350 David Wilkinson
F439b/377 Rosemullion Homes
F482/419 Godfrey Tucker
F488/425 Mrs Hayes-James
F517/451 Mrs S K Merrifield-Philp
F518/452 Mrs F Hertland
F519/453 Mrs E A Harris
F520/454 Miss M D Burns
F521/455 DJ Lewis
F522/456 Miss Emma Louise Emery
F523/457 Jayne Scattergood
F526/460 Mrs B J Lonsdale
F527/461 Mr C Wakeham
F546e/475 Phil Smith
F575i/489 Sport England
F703/538 Miss Sue Cave
F704/539 John Mason
F794/588 Mr C Shellard
F1143/1 Government Office for the South West

Re-Deposit

R31/152  Mr John Jolliff
R78/882  Poltair Developments
R200/473 Persimmon Homes (South West) Limited
R305/3  Cornwall County Council
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POLICY ALT18: HOUSING: MILLBROOK & OMISSION SITE OS30 - LAND ADJACENT TO LOWER HOUNSTER, MILLBROOK

Objections

First Deposit

F17/30    Mrs EA Williams          Objection
F21/34    Peter Bailey            Objection
F23/36    Mary Peters             Objection
F133/144  Mr & Mrs AC Hancock     Objection
F142/151  Mr DM Hewitt            Objection
F177/185  RM & DJ Tetley          Objection
F185/192  Mr & Mrs B Luxton       Objection
F186/193  Mr & Mrs GS Evans       Objection conditionally withdrawn
F194/200  Millbrook Parish Council Objection
F293/247  Mrs NE Bennett          Objection
F294/248  Ms S Ball               Objection
F294/249  Mr Trethewey            Objection
F306/261  Mr R Fisher             Objection
F339/293  Mrs J Baker             Objection
F346/294  David John Ellison      Objection
F347/295  Mrs HA Ellison          Objection
F351/299  Robert Woffenden        Objection
F352/300  Mr & Mrs Jones          Objection
F354/302  Carolyn Tucker          Objection
F426/376  Mr P West               Objection
F473/410  Brian Tucker            Objection
F480/417  Mrs Diane Rowe          Objection
F481/418  Mr Michael G Rowe       Objection
F530/464  Mrs C Bone              Objection
F531/465  Mr S Bone               Objection
F547/476  Mrs Claire Richards     Objection
F548/477  Mr Chris Richards       Objection
F575j/489 Sport England           Objection
F751f/10  Environment Agency      Objection
F793/587  Claire Voss-Bark        Objection
F845/630  Malcolm Powell          Objection
F846/631  Mrs Susan Powell        Objection
F1087/859 Ken Gale                Objection
F1144/1  Government Office for the South West Objection

Re-Deposit

R15/228  Colin Breed MP          Objection
R247/220 Downderry Construction   Objection
R286/1   Government Office for the South West Objection
OMISSION SITE OS30 - Land adjacent to Lower Hounster, Millbrook

Supports

O347/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O348/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O350/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O351/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn

Objections

O31/23  Brian Jones  Omission Site Objection
O44/859  Ken Gale  Omission Site Objection
O58/302  Carolyn Tucker  Omission Site Objection
O59/410  Brian Tucker  Omission Site Objection
O61/929  Robert Kysh  Omission Site Objection
O62/930  JL & DE Evans & Pritchard  Omission Site Objection
O63/931  Mr BJ Major  Omission Site Objection
O64/932  Mr Whittle  Omission Site Objection
O65/933  Patrick EM Howard  Omission Site Objection
O66/934  Mr & Mrs LI Fieldhouse  Omission Site Objection
O67/935  Mr Graham John Hales  Omission Site Objection
O68/936  Mr G J Crocker  Omission Site Objection
O77/261  Mr R Fisher  Omission Site Objection
O78/939  Mrs I Worth  Omission Site Objection
O79/940  Michael Graham  Omission Site Objection
O80/875  Mr I Morais  Omission Site Objection
O86/944  Mr & Mrs H Isaacs  Omission Site Objection
O88/854  Maker with Rame Parish Council  Omission Site Objection
O89/945  John Horsley  Omission Site Objection
O90/946  Mr & Mrs Raymont  Omission Site Objection
O91/947  David Last  Omission Site Objection
O92/948  Mr J Balch  Omission Site Objection
O93/949  Peggy Tetley  Omission Site Objection
O94/950  Mr John Hartley  Omission Site Objection
O95/951  CP Shingler  Omission Site Objection
O98/417  Mrs Diane Rowe  Omission Site Objection
O100/418  Mr Michael G Rowe  Omission Site Objection
O101/952  Peter Saunders  Omission Site Objection
O102/953  Mr & Mrs M Mills  Omission Site Objection
O103/954  Gary Mann  Omission Site Objection
O104/955  Dr & Mrs K Matthole  Omission Site Objection
O105/956  MJ Edmonds  Omission Site Objection
O108/959  Christopher Johnson  Omission Site Objection
O109/960  Mrs Mather  Omission Site Objection
O110/961  Mrs Norma Stratton  Omission Site Objection
O111/962  Mrs S Arnold  Omission Site Objection
O112/963  Mr & Mrs PJ Holden  Omission Site Objection
O113/964  Mr MJL Frost  Omission Site Objection
O114/965  Mr A Terry  Omission Site Objection
O115/966  Michael & Gillian Charman  Omission Site Objection
O116/967  Mr BWE & Mrs AFC Burdon  Omission Site Objection
O117/968  Mr K & Mrs J Atherton  Omission Site Objection
O118/969  Mrs Susan Horwood  Omission Site Objection
O119/970  Ms R Young  Omission Site Objection
O120/971  Michael John Wright  Omission Site Objection
| O148/525 | Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd | Omission Site Objection |
| O151/973 | Ms Saffron Tye | Omission Site Objection |
| O152/974 | Deborah Bacon | Omission Site Objection |
| O153/975 | Ian S Chillias | Omission Site Objection |
| O154/976 | Ian & Jocelyn Brabner | Omission Site Objection |
| O155/977 | Jason Butler | Omission Site Objection |
| O155/978 | Joanne Lumbard | Omission Site Objection |
| O157/979 | LD Forward | Omission Site Objection |
| O158/980 | Mr & Mrs Kenneford | Omission Site Objection |
| O159/981 | Mr MN & Miss S Findlay & Orme | Omission Site Objection |
| O160/982 | Mrs Karenza J Heald | Omission Site Objection |
| O161/983 | K Williams | Omission Site Objection |
| O162/984 | Mr & Mrs AP Stock | Omission Site Objection |
| O163/985 | Mr D & Mrs C Kenneford | Omission Site Objection |
| O164/986 | Philip G & Delia L E Hayes | Omission Site Objection |
| O165/987 | Mr R Bews | Omission Site Objection |
| O198/1000 | Bernard Sanderson | Omission Site Objection |
| O199/1001 | Mr HM & Miss JEA Perry & Clarke | Omission Site Objection |
| O200/1002 | Mr Roger & Mrs Patricia Butler | Omission Site Objection |
| O201/1003 | Rosie Brooks | Omission Site Objection |
| O202/1004 | Alex Keating | Omission Site Objection |
| O203/1005 | Mrs Geraldine Keating | Omission Site Objection |
| O204/1006 | BA Hancock | Omission Site Objection |
| O205/1007 | Robert William Hancock | Omission Site Objection |
| O206/1008 | Judith Shepherd | Omission Site Objection |
| O207/1009 | John Shepherd | Omission Site Objection |
| O208/1010 | Richard Neville Evans | Omission Site Objection |
| O209/1011 | Clare Dwyer | Omission Site Objection |
| O210/1012 | Mrs MG Bright | Omission Site Objection |
| O211/200 | Millbrook Parish Council | Omission Site Objection |
| O218/1016 | Sheila A Taylor | Omission Site Objection |
| O219/1017 | Chris Spicer | Omission Site Objection |
| O220/1018 | Mrs C Amphlett | Omission Site Objection |
| O222/185 | RM & DJ Tetley | Omission Site Objection |
| O223/1019 | Sylvia Valerie Gregory | Omission Site Objection |
| O246/1037 | Mr J Hatton | Omission Site Objection |
| O247/1038 | Dr R Evens | Omission Site Objection |
| O248/1039 | Dr C S Evens | Omission Site Objection |
| O249/1040 | Mr Gareth Andrew Owens | Omission Site Objection |
| O250/1041 | KR & EK Braun & Brown | Omission Site Objection |
| O251/1042 | Mr & Mrs T Spencer | Omission Site Objection |
| O252/1043 | Robert Gibson | Omission Site Objection |
| O253/1044 | Sarah Morris | Omission Site Objection |
| O254/1045 | Mr R Perrens | Omission Site Objection |
| O255/1046 | Michael John Collins | Omission Site Objection |
| O256/1047 | D Thomas | Omission Site Objection |
| O257/1048 | Stewart Brend | Omission Site Objection |
| O258/630 | Malcolm Powell | Omission Site Objection |
| O260/631 | Mrs Susan Powell | Omission Site Objection |
## APPENDIX 10

### POLICY ALT20 - HOUSING: DRAKEWALLS

#### Objections

**First Deposit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F32/45</td>
<td>Phillip Riozzi</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F38/51</td>
<td>Mr L Dewson</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F51/63</td>
<td>Mary Swallow</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F61/73</td>
<td>Calstock Parish Council</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F78/90</td>
<td>Mrs Linda Evans</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F79/91</td>
<td>Anthony D Evans</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F80/92</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs HE Whear</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F81/93</td>
<td>Sue Keast</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F82/94</td>
<td>Phyllis Paige</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F83/95</td>
<td>Mrs J Jelley</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F84/96</td>
<td>Mr Graham Raddon</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F85/97</td>
<td>Mrs J Aggett</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F86/98</td>
<td>Mrs V Predham</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F87/99</td>
<td>Mrs Evelyn E Verdier</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F88/100</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs FJ Staff</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F89/101</td>
<td>J Massey</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F90/102</td>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F91/103</td>
<td>Graham Aggett</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F92/104</td>
<td>Paul Edward Raddon</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F93/105</td>
<td>Mrs J Worth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F97/109</td>
<td>Mrs FH Burch</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F98/110</td>
<td>P James</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F99/111</td>
<td>C James</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F100/112</td>
<td>Andrew Reed</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F101/113</td>
<td>Mrs M Reed</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F102/114</td>
<td>Rita Curtis</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F103/115</td>
<td>Mr MA House</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F104/116</td>
<td>Derek Jimmy House</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F105/117</td>
<td>Mrs CV House</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F106/118</td>
<td>Kingsley Baker</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F107/119</td>
<td>Mary Raddon</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F108/120</td>
<td>Roger Croxson</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F109/121</td>
<td>Brenda Woodward</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F110/122</td>
<td>Richard R Woodward</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F111/123</td>
<td>Tom Baker</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F112/124</td>
<td>GM Elliot</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F113/125</td>
<td>Mrs A Elliot</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F114/126</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Worth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F115/127</td>
<td>Mr WHL Seale</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F116/128</td>
<td>Mrs Irene Seale</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F117/129</td>
<td>CD Ward</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F118/130</td>
<td>M Harris</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F120/132</td>
<td>Mrs MA Nix</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F121/133</td>
<td>A Brockington</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F122/134</td>
<td>C Hynes</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F123/135</td>
<td>J Hynes</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F124/136</td>
<td>Francis Cole</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F125/137</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs F Cole</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F126/138</td>
<td>Mrs J House</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F127/139</td>
<td>Janette Baker</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F128/140</td>
<td>Mrs Judith Peel</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F129/141</td>
<td>Mr CA Nix</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F134/145</td>
<td>Mrs M Mortimore</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F135/146</td>
<td>Mrs C Warne</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F152/161</td>
<td>Mr S Clarke</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F171/179</td>
<td>Ms Carlena Eddisford</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F196/202</td>
<td>Mrs D Stephens</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F209/209</td>
<td>Mrs REM Woolcock</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F349/297</td>
<td>Ms A E Darby</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F366/314</td>
<td>Graham Kelly</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F371/319</td>
<td>EG Clarke</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F463/400</td>
<td>Rev VF Honey</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F466/403</td>
<td>DA Harlow</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F477/414</td>
<td>Jeremy Smyth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F478/415</td>
<td>Jennifer Smyth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F479/416</td>
<td>Mrs Patricia J Smyth</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F503/438</td>
<td>Mr FJ Lovell</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F540/473</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F575/489</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F582/3</td>
<td>Cornwall County Council</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F637/520</td>
<td>Tamar Valley AONB Service</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F709l/544</td>
<td>Ken Horsley</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F751/10</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F771/572</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs W Franz</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F789/583</td>
<td>Mrs RA Farquharson</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F790/584</td>
<td>Kenneth Farquharson</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F791/585</td>
<td>Miss KA Boylan</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1146/1</td>
<td>Government Office for the South West</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14/228</td>
<td>Colin Breed MP</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R41/520</td>
<td>Tamar Valley AONB Service</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R49/197</td>
<td>Mr P Henwood</td>
<td>Objection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R57/127</td>
<td>Mr WHL Seale</td>
<td>Objection conditionally withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OMISSON SITE OS05 - Southdown, East of Millbrook

Objections

O14/12 English Nature
O30/23 Brian Jones
O43/859 Ken Gale
O57/302 Carolyn Tucker
O60/410 Brian Tucker
O81/875 Mr I Morais
O84/943 Robert Reid
O85/944 Mr & Mrs H Isaacs
O87/854 Maker with Rame Parish Council
O96/951 CP Shingler
O97/417 Mrs Diane Rowe
O99/418 Mr Michael G Rowe
O122/959 Christopher Johnson
O125/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd
O167/989 Bruce Selkirk
O168/990 Mr M Bacon
O169/991 Christine Cornick
O170/992 Neil Obee
O171/993 Jean Mary Knight
O172/994 Denise Owen
O212/200 Millbrook Parish Council
O213/1013 John Shepherd
O214/1014 Mrs Lynne C Oxford
O221/1018 Mrs C Amphlett
O222/1020 Mr PG & Mrs FL Brennan
O225/1021 Mrs D Blagdon
O226/1022 Mrs D Le Baigue
O227/1023 Peter Walker
O228/1024 Eddie Northcott
O229/1025 Natasha Taylor
O230/1026 Mr M & Miss J Treweeks & Day
O231/1027 Mrs C Treweeks
O232/1028 E Schmitt
O233/1029 M Elliott
O234/1030 Colin Taylor
O235/1031 Olive Gibbens
O236/1032 Claire Duerten
O237/1033 Mr & Mrs PW Frost
O259/630 Malcolm Powell
O261/631 Mrs Susan Powell
O262/1049 Jim Duerten
O263/1050 Mrs L Reid
O264/1051 Laurence Watkins
O265/1040 Mr Gareth Andrew Owens
O266/1052 Robert John Buss
O267/1053 Ralph Winsor
O268/1054 RN Thorpe
O269/1055 Lesley Bailey
O270/1056 Shaun McMahon
O271/1057 Voyager Yachts Ltd
O272/1058 Nigel Trubody
O273/1059 Mr & Mrs GF Rundle
O274/1060 Miss Susan Hill
O275/1061 Christopher John Gaulton
O276/1062 Mrs GP Gaulton

Omission Site Objection
Omission Site Objection
OMISSION SITE OS06 - Land at Millendreath, Looe

Supports

O347/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O348/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O350/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn
O351/1074 Williamson Associates  Omission Site Support Withdrawn

Objections

O21/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O22/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O23/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O28/922 Mr & Mrs GA & SD Gill  Omission Site Objection
O32/923 Miss Gillian Fenton  Omission Site Objection
O33/923 Miss Gillian Fenton  Omission Site Objection
O34/923 Miss Gillian Fenton  Omission Site Objection
O35/923 Miss Gillian Fenton  Omission Site Objection
O45/926 Michael & Paula Reynolds  Omission Site Objection
O46/926 Michael & Paula Reynolds  Omission Site Objection
O50/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson  Omission Site Objection
O51/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson  Omission Site Objection
O52/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson  Omission Site Objection
O53/928 Mr & Mrs J Richardson  Omission Site Objection
O72/938 MWJ Meaden  Omission Site Objection
O73/938 MWJ Meaden  Omission Site Objection
O74/938 MWJ Meaden  Omission Site Objection
O75/938 MWJ Meaden  Omission Site Objection
O126/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O127/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O128/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O129/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd  Omission Site Objection
O176/996 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer  Omission Site Objection
O177/096 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer  Omission Site Objection
O178/996 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer  Omission Site Objection
O179/996 Dr Peter & Mrs Andrea Brewer  Omission Site Objection
O185/997 Mr Lewis  Omission Site Objection
O186/997 Mr Lewis  Omission Site Objection
O187/997 Mr Lewis  Omission Site Objection
O188/997 Mr Lewis  Omission Site Objection
O189/998 Mr & Mrs JL Richmond  Omission Site Objection
O190/998 Mr & Mrs JL Richmond  Omission Site Objection
O191/998 Mr & Mrs JL Richmond  Omission Site Objection
O192/998 Mr & Mrs JL Richmond  Omission Site Objection
O194/999 Mr & Mrs Schooling  Omission Site Objection
O195/999 Mr & Mrs Schooling  Omission Site Objection
O196/999 Mr & Mrs Schooling  Omission Site Objection
O197/999 Mr & Mrs Schooling  Omission Site Objection
O241/1035 Susan Gavin  Omission Site Objection
O242/1035 Susan Gavin  Omission Site Objection
O243/1035 Susan Gavin  Omission Site Objection
O244/1035 Susan Gavin  Omission Site Objection
O281/321 Mrs J Wright  Omission Site Objection
O282/321 Mrs J Wright  Omission Site Objection
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O283/321 Mrs J Wright Omission Site Objection
O284/321 Mrs J Wright Omission Site Objection
O286/1064 Mrs Janet Ward Omission Site Objection
O287/1064 Mrs Janet Ward Omission Site Objection
O288/1065 Mr & Mrs FT Brooks Omission Site Objection
O289/1065 Mr & Mrs FT Brooks Omission Site Objection
O290/1066 Mr & Mrs R Leggett Omission Site Objection
O291/1066 Mr & Mrs R Leggett Omission Site Objection
O292/1066 Mr & Mrs R Leggett Omission Site Objection
O293/1066 Mr & Mrs R Leggett Omission Site Objection
O294/545 Philip Shuttleworth Omission Site Objection
O295/545 Philip Shuttleworth Omission Site Objection
O296/545 Philip Shuttleworth Omission Site Objection
O297/545 Philip Shuttleworth Omission Site Objection
O299/1067 Paula Harvey Omission Site Objection
O300/1067 Paula Harvey Omission Site Objection
O301/1067 Paula Harvey Omission Site Objection
O302/1067 Paula Harvey Omission Site Objection
O303/1068 Mrs P Burnside Omission Site Objection
O304/1068 Mrs P Burnside Omission Site Objection
O305/1068 Mrs P Burnside Omission Site Objection
O306/1068 Mrs P Burnside Omission Site Objection
O309/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O310/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O311/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O312/1069 Mr I & Mrs N Edmondson Omission Site Objection
O316/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O317/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O318/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O319/1070 Mr & Mrs JD Buckland Omission Site Objection
O322/1071 Millendreath Owners Association Omission Site Objection
O323/1071 Millendreath Owners Association Omission Site Objection
O324/1071 Millendreath Owners Association Omission Site Objection
O325/1071 Millendreath Owners Association Omission Site Objection
O327/1072 Mr AW & Mrs CR Day Omission Site Objection
O328/1072 Mr AW & Mrs CR Day Omission Site Objection
O329/1072 Mr AW & Mrs CR Day Omission Site Objection
O330/1072 Mr AW & Mrs CR Day Omission Site Objection
O332/1073 Gary Oswald Omission Site Objection
O333/1073 Gary Oswald Omission Site Objection
O334/1073 Gary Oswald Omission Site Objection
O335/1073 Gary Oswald Omission Site Objection
O337/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O338/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O339/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O340/260 Robert S Jay Omission Site Objection
O352/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O353/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O354/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council Omission Site Objection
O355/278 St Martin-by-Looe Parish Council Omission Site Objection
## Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Comment Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O10/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O11/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O12/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O13/12</td>
<td>English Nature</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O373/592</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O374/592</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O375/592</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O376/592</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Omission Site Comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

OBJECTORS' PROOFS

P 001  Callington Town Council
O403/210   OS02

P 002  Callington Town Council
O408/210   OS13

P 003  Colin Breed M.P  SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats
R16/228    SA1(Proposed Omission Site OS01)

P 004  Rosemullion Homes
R130/377    5.10
R131/377    Table 1
P 004A    Summary for RTS1

P 005  Rosemullion Homes
F437/377    HO3  Housing allocations
F439a/377   HO3  Housing allocations
F440b/377   HO2  The sequential approach
R133/177    HO3  Housing allocations
R134/377    HO6  Housing in villages
P 005A    Summary for RTS2

P 006  Alan Cook
F261/230    ALT11  Housing: Addington
F263/230    ALT10  Housing: Lamellion
F264/230    ALT11  Housing: Addington

P 007  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
F806/594    HO1  Housing requirement
R4/594    HO1  Housing requirement
P 007R    Rebuttal to CDCP1
P 007A    Addition 1 to RTS1
P 007B    Addition 2 to RTS1
P 007C    Summary for RTS1 & 2

P 008  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
F801/594    HO6  Housing in villages
R9/594    HO6  Housing in villages
P 008R    Rebuttal to CDCP5

P 009  TTR Developments Ltd represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design
R76/881    SA2  Housing
P 009A    Submission on PPS3

P 010  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
R216/473    HO1  Housing requirement
R217/473    Table 2
R218/473    Table 1- Windfall figures
P 010A   Comment on RTS1 Caradon District Council response
P 010B   Revised Housing Supply table

P 011  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
F543/473    HO3  Housing allocations
R211/473    5.25 - 5.31
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R212/473  HO4  Phasing strategy
R213/473  5.24
R214/473  HO3  Housing allocations
R215/473  HO2  The sequential approach

P 012  Mr J.A. Flashman
F410/357  CL4  Removal of occupancy conditions

P 013  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham Turner Holden
F688/525  HO1  Housing requirement
R182/525  5.10
R183/525  5.12
R184/525  Table 1- Windfall figures
R197/525  5.05

P 014  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham Turner Holden
E16/525  5.24
F677/525  HO6  Housing in villages
R185/525  HO3  Housing allocations
R186/525  HO4  Phasing strategy

P 015  Colin Breed M.P  SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats
F245/228  5.38
F246/228  HO8  Conversion of buildings
F248/228  HO12  Small dwellings and town centres
F250/228  HO14  Wheelchair housing
F252/228  CL4  Removal of occupancy conditions
F254/228  R2  Playing pitch provision
F256/228  ALT6  Large scale retail development
R14/228  ALT20  Housing: Drakewalls
R15/228  ALT18  Housing: Millbrook
R18/228  CL4  Removal of occupancy conditions
R19/228  HO15  Gypsies and travellers

P 017  Rosemullion Homes
R136/377  HO13  Rural exception housing
P 017A  Addition to Proof
P 017B  Summary for RTS3

P 018  Sunnybanks Homes
F497/433  HO11  Affordable housing in towns & villages
F498/433  HO13  Rural exception housing
R307/433  HO11  Affordable housing in towns & villages
R308/433  HO13  Rural exception housing
P 018R  Rebuttal to CDCP10
P 018A  Includes part of objections to HO13
P 018B  Summary for RTS3 and reply to ID 020
P 018C  Comments on CDCP10B

P 019  Mr P. Henwood represented by Peter Bartram  Bartram Deakin Associates
R49/197  ALT20  Housing: Drakewalls

P 020  Messrs Blamey, Cross and Gregory represented by Mr I R Robertson
R120/895  ALT10  Housing: Lamellion
P 020R  Rebuttal to CDCP18
P 020A  Letter re late Caradon District Council response
P 020B  Dobwalls Bypass/Liskeard plan
P 020C  Liskeard station figures

P 021  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
R11/594  HO11  Affordable housing in towns & villages
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P 021R  Rebuttal to CDCP10
P 021A  Summary for RTS3

P 022  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
F544/473 ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
R199/473 ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
R203/473 R2 Playing pitch provision
P 022A  Closing Statement

P 023  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
R204/473 HO11 Affordable housing in towns & villages
R205/473 5.63 - 5.65
R206/473 5.52 - 5.53
R207/473 5.50 - 5.51
R208/473 5.49

P 024  Mrs B.J. Lonsdale
F526/460 ALT17 Housing: Pelynt

P 025  Members of Addington Environmental Action Group
F1015a/789 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F1015b/789 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F875a/650 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F875b/650 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F886a/661 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F886b/661 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F890a/665 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F890b/665 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F898a/673 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F898b/673 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F926a/701 ALT11 Housing: Addington
F926b/701 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
R91/650 ALT11 Housing: Addington
P 025A  RTS4 AEAG closing statement

P 026  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
R198/473 ALT11 Housing: Addington
R202/473 ALT11 Housing: Addington
P 026A  Alteration to figures
P 026B  Statement of Common Ground with Cornwall CC
P 026C  Liskeard School figures
P 026D  Comments for RTS5 PPS3
P 026E  RTS4 closing statement
P 026F  Letter to Cornwall CC re school capacities
P 026G  Cornwall CC Liskeard School figures

P 027  Mr & Mrs J Earle represented by Laurence Osborne  Laurence Associates
NDM F707/542 NDM EV6
P 027A  Supplementary Proof
P 027B  Letter 1
P 027C  Letter 2

P 028  Poltair Developments represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design
R78/882 PEL1 Housing: Pelynt
P 028A  Supplementary document handed in to the Inspector at Hearing 1/12/06
P 028B  Submission on PPS3
P 028C  Submission from Poltair Developments

P 029  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden
F681/525 Proposed Omission Site OS04
F684/525 ALT11 Housing: Addington
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O150/525   OS04
R195/525   ALT11 Housing: Addington
R196/525   ALT11 Housing: Addington
P 029R    Rebuttal to CDCP16
P 029A    Tencreek site layout
P 029B    Bus route map
P 029C    Closing statement
P 029D    Covering letter
P 029E    Proposed new policy
P 029F    Closing statement Addendum

P 030      Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
          E11/594   H2 Housing development in towns
          F802/594  5.38
          R12/594   EM4 Craft Homes
          R8/594    5.38
P 030R    Rebuttal to CDCP20
P 030A    Appendices to P 030
P 030B    Supplementary Statement re PPS3
P 030C    Email re H2/H3
P 030D    Letter re Hearing 19/12/06
P 030E    Letter re Colin Breed Hearing and Caradon District Council
P 030F    Response to CDCP20A
P 030G    Email response to CDCP20B
P 030H    Email from Colin Cresswell and Mr Jarvis response

P 031      Mr J J Maunder
          F866/642 Proposed Omission Site OS23
          R100/642 Proposed Omission Site OS23

P 032      Mrs H L Lawrence represented by Ms Ruth Lawrence
          F363/311 Proposed Omission Site OS20
          P 032A    Information re Pelynt School
          P 032B    Information re planning history

P 033      John Jolliff
          F143/152 ALT17 (Proposed Omission Site OS28)
          R31/152   PEL1 (Proposed Omission Site OS28)
P 033A    Information re Pelynt School
P 033B    Information re planning history

P 034      Mr P Keefe
          F412/359 HO3 (Proposed Omission Site OS31)
P 034A    Rebuttal to CDCP25
P 034B    Email from Cornwall CC re planning application

P 035      Red Earth Saltash Ltd represented by John Eaton
          E8/909   EV6 (Proposed Omission Site OS16)
P 035A    Appendix to P 035
P 035B    Landscape Report to P 035
P 035C    Site plans
P 035D    Site access plan

P 039      Mrs C & Miss M Durman represented by Francis Bettison Francis Bettison (Surveyors) Ltd
          E7/908   Proposed Omission Site OS13
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P 040  Rosemullion Homes
R137/377  Proposals Map
R138/377  Proposed Omission Site OS29
P 040A  Proposal Appendix
P 040B  OS map extract
P 040C  Caradon Courier extract

P 041  Walker Developments (SW) Ltd represented by Mark Scoot  DTZ Consulting
R103/893  Proposed Omission Site OS02
P 041A  Appendices to Proof
P 041B  Letter to Caradon District Council

P 042  Callington Town Council
R3/210  Proposed Omission Site OS10

P 043  TTR Developments Ltd represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design
R75/881  ALT21 (Proposed Omission Site OS09)
P 043A  Submission on PPS3
P 043B  Letter from Stags
OBJECTORS’ WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

P 016  Colin Breed M.P  SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats
F240/228  HO1  Housing requirement

P 036  Mr & Mrs I Shovell represented by John Wakeham  Kivells
F425/370  ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS03)

P 037  Mr & Mrs I Shovell represented by John Wakeham  Kivells
F427/370  HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS18)
P 037R  Rebuttal to CDCWR32
P 037A  Confirmation re Mr Jarvis request OS18 Hatt

P 038  Peter West Esq represented by John Wakeham  Kivells
F426/376  HO6 (Proposed Omission Site OS30)
P 038R  Rebuttal to CDCP 27

WR 001  Mr & Mrs F.P. Marshall
F147/156  ALT16 (Proposed Omission Site OS27)
WR 001R  Rebuttal to CDCWR34

WR 002  Mr and Mrs Jackson  Addington Environmental Action Group
F972a/747  ALT11  Housing: Addington
F972b/747  ALT15  Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F974a/749  ALT11  Housing: Addington
F974b/749  ALT15  Open recreation: St Cleer Road

WR 003  Colin Scott
O215/310  OS19

WR 004  Linkinhorne Parish Council
F411/358  HO13  Rural exception housing

WR 005  Mrs Julie Cawrse
F537/471  ALT10  Housing: Lamellion

WR 006  Mr & Mrs J.H. Scott
F12a/25  ALT12  Housing: Bramble Lane End
F12b/25  ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue

WR 007  Mr & Mrs Killeen
F150/159  ALT12  Housing: Bramble Lane End

WR 008  Mr & Mrs R.T. Penney
F145/154  ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue

WR 009  Reginald Rowe
F406a/353  H4 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
F406b/353  H10 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
F406c/353  H12 (Proposed Omission Site OS15)
O400a/353  OS15
O400b/353  OS15
O400c/353  OS15
WR 009R  Rebuttal to CDCWR35

WR 010  Home Builders Federation
F641/523  5.46-5.72
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Author/Representative</th>
<th>Document Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WR 011</td>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td>F646/523 HO3 Housing allocations R124/523 HO3 Housing allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 012</td>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td>F645/523 HO4 Phasing strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 013</td>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td>F640/523 HO11 Affordable housing in towns &amp; villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 014</td>
<td>Home Builders Federation</td>
<td>R123/523 5.11 - 5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 015</td>
<td>V L Lockwood</td>
<td>F628a/512 ALT13 Housing: Western Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 016</td>
<td>Paul and Margaret Eglin</td>
<td>F287/241 ALT10 Housing: Lamellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 017</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A J Groves</td>
<td>F730/563 ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 018</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs A J Groves</td>
<td>R102/563 ALT11 Housing: Addington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 018R</td>
<td>Rebuttal to CDCWR22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 019</td>
<td>Ms Carlena Eddisford</td>
<td>F171/179 ALT20 Housing: Drakewalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 020</td>
<td>English Heritage</td>
<td>F345/13 HO8 Conversion of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 021</td>
<td>Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd represented by Simon Metcalf White Young Green</td>
<td>F842/627 ALT6 Large scale retail development R95/627 ALT6 Large scale retail development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 021R</td>
<td>Rebuttal to CDCWR28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 022</td>
<td>Landrake with St Erney Parish Council</td>
<td>NDM F1083/855 NDM General issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 023</td>
<td>Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design</td>
<td>R83/885 HO6 Housing in villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 023R</td>
<td>Rebuttal to CDCWR5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 024</td>
<td>Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design</td>
<td>NDM R84/885 NDM EMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 024R</td>
<td>Rebuttal to CDCWR2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 025</td>
<td>Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design</td>
<td>NDM R81/885 NDM EM7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 025R</td>
<td>Rebuttal to CDCWR3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 026</td>
<td>Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey Turley Associates</td>
<td>R209/473 HO6 Housing in villages R210/473 HO12 Small dwellings and town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR 026A</td>
<td>Response to CDCWR46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WR 027  Peter Bailey  
F21/34  ALT18  Housing: Millbrook

WR 028  Mary Peters  
F23/36  ALT18  Housing: Millbrook

WR 029  Miss Lynne Taylor  
F372/320  ALT9  Industrial land allocation  
R32/320  ALT9  Industrial land allocation

WR 030  C B Ellis  
R96/890  HO13  Rural exception housing  
R97/890  HO13  Rural exception housing

WR 031  C B Ellis  
R98/890  HO7  Housing in the countryside

WR 032  Mark Simon  Dragon Housing Coop/Orchard Land Trust  
F5/18  HO7  Housing in the countryside

WR 033  Mr William John Knight  
F451/388  HO7  Housing in the countryside

WR 034  Teresa Patterson  
R90/888  HO8  Conversion of buildings

WR 035  Mr A R Weatherhead represented by Graham Wrigglesworth  Bond Pearce  
F429/372  HO6  Housing in villages  
F430/372  HO3  Housing allocations  
F431/372  Proposed Omission Site OS14

WR 036  Highways Agency  
F798b/592  ALT9  Industrial land allocation  
F798i/592  ALT11  Housing: Addington  
R174/592  ALT11  Housing: Addington

WR 037  R.J. Parsons  
F822/607  SA1  Broadmoor Farm

WR 038  Cornwall County Council  
F594/3  ALT6  Large scale retail development  
F597/3  HO13  Rural exception housing  
F600b/3  HO6  Housing in villages  
F601/3  HO4  Phasing strategy  
R290/3  CL4  Removal of occupancy conditions  
R292/3  HO2  The sequential approach  
R293/3  HO3  Housing allocations  
R294/3  HO6  Housing in villages  
R295/3  HO7  Housing in the countryside  
R299/3  HO13  Rural exception housing  
R300/3  HO15  Gypsies and travellers  
R305/3  PEL1  Housing: Pelynt

WR 039  Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates  
R200/473  PEL1  Housing: Pelynt

WR 040  Brook Street Properties represented by Jonathan Buckwell  DHA Planning  
F848/633  Proposed Omission Site OS04  
F849/633  ALT9  Industrial land allocation
WR 041  Mr & Mrs M J Howard  
F367/315  ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue

WR 042  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden  
E14a/525  CL9  Development within AGLVs  
E15/525  CL5  Agricultural land  
F689/525  5.04

WR 043  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden  
F675/525  HO11  Affordable housing in towns & villages  
R191/525  5.50  
R193/525  HO11  Affordable housing in towns & villages

WR 044  Mr & Mrs R.J. Lang  
F401/348  ALT17  Housing: Pelynt

WR 045  Mrs CB Thorne  
F777/577  ALT10  Housing: Lamellion

WR 046  Mr T Mitchell represented by Alan Prisk  
F224b/223  ALT12  Housing: Bramble Lane End  
R245/223  ALT12  Housing: Bramble Lane End

WR 047  Mrs M Solomon represented by Alan Prisk  
F222b/222  ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue  
R246/222  ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue

WR 048  Southern Properties represented by John Eaton  
E10/911  St Cleer Statement Para 19.02  
WR 048A  Addendum to WR 048

WR 049  Peninsula Properties Ltd represented by Andrew Shepley  GL Hearn  
R87/566  ALT21 (Proposed Omission Site OS10)

WR 050  Mr J D & Mrs R M Hough  
O17/918  OS31

WR 051  Mr Jarvis Proof P 030 duplicated as a  Written Rep for Mr Hollox and as Supplementary to Kivells P 037

WR 052  Mr C Johnson  
O108/959  OS30  
O122/959  OS05  
WR 052A  Addendum re Lower Hounster

WR 053  Michael Temple Davies represented by David Lobban  Penrilla Consultants Ltd  
F180/187  SN1  Housing: Seaton  
WR 053A  Addendum re BC approval
CARADON DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONSES TO OBJECTORS' PROOFS

CDCP 1  responding to -
P 004    Rosemullion Homes
P 007    Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
P 010    Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
P 013    Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden
CDCP 1A  Caradon District Council Corrections to Topic paper 1
CDCP 1B  Examples of Windfall Sites
CDCP 1C  Maps and Descriptions of Previous Local Plan Allocations
CDCP 1D  Amended Housing Supply Table
CDCP 1E  Summary for RTS1
CDCP 1F  RTS5 Housing Supply figures

CDCP 2  responding to -
P 009    TTR Developments Ltd represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design

CDCP 3  responding to -
P 012    Mr J.A. Flashman

CDCP 4 & CDCP13  responding to -
P 006    Alan Cook

CDCP 5  responding to -
P 005    Rosemullion Homes
P 008    Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
P 011    Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
P 014    Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden
CDCP 5A  Summary for RTS2
CDCP 5B  RTS2 Committee minute re LDF resources

CDCP 6  responding to -
P 015    Colin Breed M.P  SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats

CDCP 7  responding to -
P 003    Colin Breed M.P  SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats

CDCP 8  responding to -
P 019    Mr P. Henwood represented by Peter Bartram  Bartram Deakin Associates

CDCP10  responding to -
P 017    Rosemullion Homes
P 018    Sunnybanks Homes
P 021    Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
P 023    Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
CDCP10A  Summary for RTS3
CDCP10B  RTS3 Affordable Housing figures

CDCP11  responding to -
P 024    Mrs B.J. Lonsdale

CDCP12  responding to -
P 028    Poltair Developments represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design
CDCP12A  PEL1 Outline Planning consent Hamblys Garage

CDCP13  responding to -
P 025    Various members of  Addington Environmental Action Group
P 026    Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates
P 029    Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden
CDCP13A  RTS4 LISK7 primary school notes
CDCP13B  Summary for RTS4
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CDCP14 responding to -
P 002 Callington Town Council
P 039 Mrs C & Miss M Durman represented by Francis Bettison  Francis Bettison

CDCP15 responding to -
P 001 Callington Town Council
P 041 Walker Developments (SW) Ltd represented by Mark Scoot  DTZ Consulting

CDCP16 responding to -
P 029 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham  Turner Holden

CDCP16A Closing Statement Tencreek Farm

CDCP17 responding to -
P 022 Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey  Turley Associates

CDCP17A Closing Statement ALT16 Looe Persimmon Homes

CDCP18 responding to -
P 020 Messrs Blamey, Cross and Gregory represented by Mr I R Robertson

CDCP18A ALT10 Caradon District Council/Highways Agency telecon re Dobwalls Bypass

CDCP19 responding to -
P 030 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis

CDCP20 responding to -
P 030 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis

CDCP20A Supplementary Statement to Mr Jarvis

CDCP20B email response to Mr Jarvis P 030E

CDCP21 responding to -
P 031 Mr J J Maunder

CDCP22 responding to -
P 042 Callington Town Council

CDCP23 responding to -
P 032 Mrs H L Lawrence represented by Ms Ruth Lawrence

CDCP24 responding to -
P 040 Rosemullion Homes

CDCP24A Facilities at Fowey checklists

CDCP25 responding to -
P 034 Mr P Keefe

CDCP25A OS31 St John services and facilities

CDCP26 responding to -
P 043 TTR Developments Ltd represented by Mr J Wilks  Catchfrench Design

CDCP28 responding to -
P 033 John Jolliff

CDCP28A Planning history re ALT17 OS28

CDCP29 responding to -
P 035 Red Earth Saltash Ltd represented by John Eaton

ID 014 & ID 015 responding to -
P 027 Mr & Mrs J Earle represented by Laurence Osborne  Laurence Associates
CARADON DISTRICT COUNCIL RESPONSES TO OBJECTORS' WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

CDCP 9 responding to -
P 016 Colin Breed M.P SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats

CDCP19 responding to -
P 036 Mr & Mrs I Shovell represented by John Wakeham Kivells

CDCP27 responding to -
P 038 Peter West Esq represented by John Wakeham Kivells

CDCWR 1 responding to -
WR 022 Landrake with St Erney Parish Council

CDCWR 2 responding to -
WR 024 Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design

CDCWR 3 responding to -
WR 025 Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design

CDCWR 4 responding to -
WR 020 English Heritage

CDCWR 5 responding to -
WR 023 Mr J Wilks Catchfrench Design

CDCWR 6 responding to -
WR 014 Home Builders Federation

CDCWR 7 responding to -
WR 013 Home Builders Federation

CDCWR 8 responding to -
WR 011 Home Builders Federation

CDCWR 9 responding to -
WR 010 Home Builders Federation

CDCWR10 responding to -
WR 019 Ms Carlena Eddisford

CDCWR11 responding to -
WR 015 V L Lockwood

CDCWR12 responding to -
WR 005 Mrs Julie Cawrse

CDCWR13 responding to -
WR 016 Paul and Margaret Eglin

CDCWR14 responding to -
WR 002 Mr and Mrs Jackson Addington Environmental Action Group

CDCWR15 responding to -
WR 006 Mr & Mrs J.H. Scott

CDCWR16 responding to -
WR 034 Teresa Patterson

CDCWR17 responding to -
WR 030 C B Ellis
WR 031 C B Ellis
| CDCWR18 | responding to - | WR 029 | Miss Lynne Taylor |
| CDCWR19 | responding to - | WR 007 | Mr & Mrs Killeen |
| CDCWR20 | responding to - | WR 008 | Mr & Mrs R.T. Penney |
| CDCWR21 | responding to - | WR 041 | Mr & Mrs M J Howard |
| CDCWR22 | responding to - | WR 017 | Mr & Mrs A J Groves |
| CDCWR23 | responding to - | WR 018 | Mr & Mrs A J Groves |
| CDCWR24 | responding to - | WR 032 | Mark Simon Dragon Housing Coop/Orchard Land Trust |
| CDCWR25 | responding to - | WR 033 | Mr William John Knight |
| CDCWR26 | responding to - | WR 027 | Peter Bailey |
| CDCWR27 | responding to - | WR 028 | Mary Peters |
| CDCWR28 | responding to - | WR 037 | R.J. Parsons |
| CDCWR29 | responding to - | WR 036 | Highways Agency |
| CDCWR30 | responding to - | WR 021 | Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd represented by Simon Metcalf White Young Green |
| CDCWR31 | responding to - | WR 038 | Cornwall County Council |
| CDCWR32 | responding to - | WR 044 | Mr & Mrs R.J. Lang |
| CDCWR33 | responding to - | WR 045 | Mrs CB Thorne |
| CDCWR34 | responding to - | WR 037 | Mr & Mrs I Shovell represented by John Wakeham Kivells |
| CDCWR35 | responding to - | P 037 | Response to Kivells/Shovell OS18 Hatt |
| CDCWR36 | responding to - | WR 049 | Peninsula Properties Ltd represented by Andrew Shepley GL Hearn |
| CDCWR37 | responding to - | WR 041 | Mr & Mrs F.P. Marshall |
| CDCWR38 | responding to - | WR 009 | Reginald Rowe |
| CDCWR39 | responding to - | WR 003 | Colin Scott |
| CDCWR40 | responding to - | WR 004 | Linkinhorne Parish Council |
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CDCWR38 responding to -
WR 050 Mr J D & Mrs R M Hough

CDCWR39 responding to -
WR 038 Cornwall County Council
WR 039 Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey Turley Associates

CDCWR40 responding to -
WR 048 Southern Properties represented by John Eaton

CDCWR41 responding to -
WR 040 Brook Street Properties represented by Jonathan Buckwell DHA Planning

CDCWR42 responding to -
WR 046 Mr T Mitchell represented by Alan Prisk
WR 047 Mrs M Solomon represented by Alan Prisk

CDCWR43 responding to -
WR 043 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham Turner Holden

CDCWR44 responding to -
WR 042 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd represented by Ray Packham Turner Holden

CDCWR45 responding to -
WR 012 Home Builders Federation

CDCWR46 responding to -
WR 026 Persimmon Homes represented by Peter Stacey Turley Associates

No response required to -
WR 035 Mr A R Weatherhead represented by Graham Wrigglesworth Bond Pearce
WR 053 Michael Temple Davies represented by David Lobban Penrilla Consultants Ltd
## ADDITIONAL INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Void - registered by Caradon District Council as Core Document 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Inquiry opening Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>RTS1 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>RTS2 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>RTS3 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>RTS1 Inspector’s Draft Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006A</td>
<td>RTS1 Inspector’s Notes - Barratt Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006B</td>
<td>RTS1 Inspector’s Notes - Mr Jarvis’ comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006C</td>
<td>RTS1 Inspector’s Notes - Cornwall County Council comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006D</td>
<td>RTS1 Inspector’s Notes - Persimmon Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007A</td>
<td>RTS2 - Policy HO2 - Mr Jarvis comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007B</td>
<td>RTS2 - Policy HO2 - Rosemullion Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007C</td>
<td>RTS2 - Policy HO2 - Persimmon Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007D</td>
<td>RTS2 - Policy HO2 - Caradon District Council comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007E</td>
<td>RTS2 - Policy HO2 - Barratt Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Policy CL4 - Inspector’s draft proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008A</td>
<td>Policy CL4 - Caradon District Council response to Inspector’s draft proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>RTS2 Inspector’s Draft Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011A</td>
<td>RTS2 Inspector’s Notes - Barratt Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011B</td>
<td>RTS2 Inspector’s Notes - Mr Jarvis’ comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011C</td>
<td>RTS2 Inspector’s Notes - Persimmon Homes comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Policy EV6 - Caradon District Council email re Mr &amp; Mrs Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Policy SA1 - Inspector’s letter to Mr Breed &amp; Mr Cresswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013A</td>
<td>Policy SA1 - Mr Breed’s response to Inspector’s letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013B</td>
<td>Policy SA1 - Caradon District Council response to Inspector’s letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Policy EV6 - Caradon District Council letter to Inspector re Laurence Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Policy EV6 - Caradon District Council Hearing Statement re Mr &amp; Mrs Earle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>RTS4 Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Mr Jarvis map &amp; correspondence re viewing position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Policy ALT11 - Inspector’s letter to Mr McIntosh - Cornwall CC Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018A</td>
<td>Policy ALT11 - Persimmon Homes reponse to ID 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018B</td>
<td>Policy ALT11 - Mr Cook reponse to ID 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018C</td>
<td>Policy ALT11 - Caradon District Council reponse to ID 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018D</td>
<td>Policy ALT11 - Mr Renowden Cornwall CC response to ID 018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Policy R2 - Inspector’s letter to Don Alder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019A</td>
<td>Policy R2 - Persimmon reponse to ID 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019B</td>
<td>Policy R2 - Caradon District Council reponse to ID 019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Policy HO11 - Inspector’s letter to Colin Cresswell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020A</td>
<td>Policy HO11 - Caradon District Council response to ID 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020B</td>
<td>Policy HO11 - Mr Jarvis response to ID 020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 13

ID 020C  Policy HO11 - Rosemullion response to ID 020
ID 021  Policy ALT11 - Inspector's letter to Colin Cresswell
ID 022  RTS3 Inspector's Draft Notes
ID 022A  RTS3 Inspector's Notes - Rosemullion Homes comments
ID 022B  RTS3 Inspector's Notes - Mr Jarvis' comments
ID 023  Policy CAL X - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 023A  Policy CAL X - DTZ response to ID 023
ID 023B  Policy CAL X - Caradon District Council response to ID 023
ID 024  RTS4 Inspector's Draft Notes
ID 024A  RTS4 Inspector's Notes - Persimmon Homes comments
ID 025  RTS5 Agenda
ID 026  RTS5 Inspector's points for discussion
ID 027  RTS5 - Caradon District Council Closing Statement
ID 027A  RTS5 - Mr Jarvis Closing Statement
ID 027B  RTS5 - Sunnybank Homes Closing Statement
ID 027C  RTS5 - Persimmon Homes Closing Statement
ID 027D  RTS5 - Rosemullion Homes Closing Statement
ID 027E  RTS5 - Caradon District Council rejoinder to ID 027C Persimmon Homes
ID 027F  RTS5 - Persimmon Homes response to Caradon District Council ID 027E
ID 027G  RTS5 - Barratt Homes Closing Statement
ID 027H  RTS5 - Barratt Homes re Plymouth Examination
ID 027I  RTS5 - Persimmon Homes re Plymouth Examination
ID 027J  RTS5 - Caradon District Council re Plymouth Examination
ID 027K  RTS5 - Inspector's response re Plymouth Examination
ID 028  RTS5 Inspector's Draft Notes
ID 028A  RTS5 Inspector's Notes - Sunnybanks Homes comments
ID 028B  RTS5 Inspector's Notes - Rosemullion Homes comments
ID 028C  RTS5 Inspector's Notes - Persimmon Homes comments
ID 028D  RTS5 Inspector's Notes - Mr Jarvis comments
ID 028E  RTS5 Inspector's Notes - Barratt Homes comments
ID 029  Policy ALT3 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 029A  Policy ALT3 - Caradon District Council response to ID 029
ID 029B  Policy ALT3 - GOSW response to ID 029
ID 029C  Policy ALT3 - DTZ response to ID 029
ID 030  Duly Made objections - Inspector's query
ID 030A  Duly Made objections - Caradon District Council response to Inspector's query
ID 031  Policy CO5 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 031A  Policy CO5 - Caradon District Council response to ID 031
ID 031B  Policy CO5 - Adams Holmes response to ID 031
ID 031C  Policy CO5 - Mono Consultants response to ID 031
ID 031D  Policy CO5 - GOSW response to ID 031
ID 032  Policy ALT5 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 032A  Policy ALT5 - Caradon District Council response to ID 032
ID 032B  Policy ALT5 - letter to the Environment Agency re ID 032A
ID 033  Omission Site OS25 - Inspector's query East Taphouse
ID 033A  Omission Site OS25 - Caradon District Council response to ID 033
ID 033B  Omission Site OS25 - letter to Graham Savage
ID 033C  Omission Site OS25 - Graham Savage response to ID 033B
ID 033D  Omission Site OS25 - Caradon District Council response to ID 033C
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ID 034  Lower Case Text - Caradon District Council query
ID 034A Lower Case Text - Inspector's response to ID 034
ID 035  Policy LISK3 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 035A Policy LISK3 - Caradon District Council response to ID 035
ID 036  Policy SA4 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 036A Policy SA4 - Caradon District Council response to ID 036
ID 036B Policy SA4 - Highways Agency response
ID 036C Policy SA4 - Highways Agency plan
ID 036D Policy SA4 - letter to Barton Willmore
ID 036E Policy SA4 - Barton Willmore response
ID 037  Omission Site OS11 - Inspector's query Callington
ID 037A Omission Site OS11 - Caradon District Council response to ID 037
ID 038  Policy ALT21 - Inspector's draft proposal
ID 039  Policy ALT21 - Inspector's query re Persimmon Homes
ID 039A Policy ALT21 - Caradon District Council response to ID 039
ID 040  Inquiry closing Agenda
ID 040A Inquiry closing Agenda - Caradon District Council information
ID 040B Inquiry closing Agenda - Inspector's response to ID 040A
ID 041  Policy HO6 - Inspector's suggestion
ID 041A Policy HO6 - Caradon District Council response to ID 041
CARADON DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN
FIRST ALTERATION

PUBLIC INQUIRY

PROGRAMME OF HEARINGS

31 October 2006 - 26 June 2007
**SESSION 1**
31 October – 10 November 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUESDAY 31 OCTOBER 2006</th>
<th>10.00 am</th>
<th>Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry officially opened by the Inspector Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening Statement by Caradon District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry adjourns until 10:00 am Wednesday 1 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ROUND TABLE SESSION 1**

**HOUSING SUPPLY**

**Wednesday 1 November 2006, Quimperle Room, Public Hall, Liskeard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Caradon District Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colin Cresswell</strong> BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Hills</strong> BSc(T&amp;CP) BTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoe Bernard-John</strong> BSc(Hons) MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Alder</strong> FRICS MRTPI MRSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Anstey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southernhay Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter EX1 1NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alan Chaplin</strong> MSc Dip TP DMS MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entec UK Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading RG2 0TD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Cornwall County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steve Havers</strong> MRTPI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Colin Breed M.P** SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats |
| Barras Street |
| Liskeard |
| PL12 6AD |

| **Ray Packham** BSc(Hons) DipEP MEnvSc MRTPI |
| Turner Holden representing Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd |
| Hawkridge House |
| Chelston Business Park |
| Wellington |
| Somerset TA21 8YA |

| **Christopher Jarvis** LLB MRTPI Solicitor |
| Cross Farmhouse |
| Hatt |
| Saltash |
| PL12 6PL |

| **Mike Kerton** BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI |
| Rosemullion Homes |
| 57 Lemon Street |
| Truro |
| PL12 6PL |

| **Peter Stacey** BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI |
| Turley Associates representing Persimmon Homes |
| 10 Queen Square |
| Bristol |
| BS1 4NT |
INFORMAL HEARING

F410/357 CL4 Removal of occupancy conditions

Mr J.A. Flashman
West Prince Farm
Sevenstones
Callington
PL17 8HZ

For Caradon District Council
Mr Don Alder FRICS MRTPI MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
## ROUND TABLE SESSION 2
### HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

**Thursday 9 November 2006, The Guildhall, Fore Street, Liskeard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Caradon District Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colin Cresswell</strong> BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Hills</strong> BSc(T&amp;CP) BTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoe Bernard-John</strong> BSc(Hons) MBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Alder</strong> FRICS MRTPI MRSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Anstey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southernhay Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter EX1 1NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Cornwall County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steve Havers</strong> MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Wilks</strong> Architect RIBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catchfrench Design representing TTR Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treluelfoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall PL12 5BY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Ray Packham BSc(Hons) DipEP MIEnvSc MRTPI |
| Turner Holden representing Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd |
| Hawkridge House |
| Chelston Business Park |
| Wellington |
| Somerset TA21 8YA |

| Christopher Jarvis LLB MRTPI Solicitor |
| Cross Farmhouse |
| Hatt |
| Saltash |
| Cornwall PL12 6PL |

| Mike Kerton BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI |
| Rosemullion Homes |
| 57 Lemon Street |
| Truro |
| Cornwall TR1 2PE |

| Peter Stacey BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI |
| Turley Associates representing Persimmon Homes |
| 10 Queen Square |
| Bristol |
| BS1 4NT |
#Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 2006</th>
<th>Session 2 / Week 3 / Day 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.00 am</strong></td>
<td>Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMAL HEARING**

**R16/228**  
SA1(Proposed Omission Site OS01)  
Broadmoor Farm, Saltash

**Colin Breed MP**  
SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats  
Barras Street  
Liskeard  
PL12 6AD

For Caradon District Council  
**Colin Cresswell**  
BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

**Don Alder**  
FRICS MRTP MRSH  
Foot Anstey  
Senate Court  
Southernhay Gardens  
Exeter EX1 1NT

| **2.00 pm** | Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard |

**INFORMAL HEARING**

**R49/197**  
ALT20 Housing: Drakewalls

**Peter C Bartram**  
Dip Arch (Leics) RIBA  
Bartram Deakin Associates Ltd  
Lisandra House  
Fore Street  
East Looe  
PL13 1AD  
representing Mr P. Henwood

For Caradon District Council  
**James Hills**  
BSc(T&CP) BTP

**Don Alder**  
FRICS MRTP MRSH  
Foot Anstey  
Senate Court  
Southernhay Gardens  
Exeter EX1 1NT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Cresswell</td>
<td>BSc(Hons) MA MRTPi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hills</td>
<td>BSc(T&amp;CP) BTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Lunn</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Alder</td>
<td>FRICS MRTPi MRSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Anstey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southmehay Gardens</td>
<td>Exeter EX1 1NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Couttie</td>
<td>FCIB DMS FRSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckden Mount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Thornhill Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD3 3AU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Kerton</td>
<td>BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Carson</td>
<td>FRICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemullion Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Lemon Street</td>
<td>Truro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>Cornwall TR1 2PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Clark</td>
<td>BA(Hons) DMS MRTPi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnybanks Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmead Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valliards Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td>Cornwall PL12 6PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Jarvis</td>
<td>LLB MRTPi Solicitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Farmhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltash</td>
<td>Cornwall PL12 6PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMAL HEARING

F707/542 EV6 Open Areas of Local Significance

Mr & Mrs J Earle
Represented by
Mr Laurence P Osborne DipTP MRTP
Laurence Associates
Trevithick House
Trafalgar Wharf
Malpas Road
Truro
TR1 1QH

For Caradon District Council
Mr Don Alder FRICS MRTP MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
**INFORMAL HEARINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F526/460</td>
<td>ALT17 Housing: Pelynt</td>
<td>Mrs B J Lonsdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R78/882</td>
<td>PEL1 Housing: Pelynt</td>
<td>TTR Developments Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs B J Lonsdale

For Caradon District Council

Colin Cresswell  BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI

TTR Developments Ltd
Represented by
Mr John Wilks Architect RIBA
Catchfrench Design
Trerulefoot
Saltash
Cornwall  PL12 5BY

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell  BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI
# Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

**Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi**

---

## ROUND TABLE SESSION 4

**Land At ADDINGTON and ST CLEER ROAD**

**Tuesday 5 December 2006, Main Hall, Public Hall, Liskeard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Caradon District Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colin Cresswell</strong> BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Hills</strong> BSc(T&amp;CP) BTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Don Alder</strong> FRICS MRTPI MRSH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Anstey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southernhay Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter EX1 1NT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Addington Environmental Action Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fred Brown</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Rowe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graham Wheeler</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bunny Ussher</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alan Cook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Woodgate Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liskeard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall PL14 6DY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ray Packham</strong> BSc(Hons) DipEP MIEnvSc MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Holden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawridge House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelston Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset TA21 8YA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Persimmon Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Stacey</strong> BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turley Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Queen Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS1 4NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clare Brockhurst</strong> BSc(Hons) DipLA MLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akeman Barns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirencester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL7 5AW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INFORMAL HEARINGS

F544/473 ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
R199/473 ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
R203/473 R2 Playing pitch provision

For Persimmon Homes
Peter Stacey BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI
Turley Associates
10 Queen Square
Bristol
BS1 4NT

Clare Brockhurst BSc(Hons) DipLA MLI
Waterman CPM
Akeman Barns
Coln St Aldwyns
Cirencester
GL7 5AW

For Caradon District Council
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Don Alder FRICS MRTPI MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
INFORMAL HEARING

F681/525 Proposed Omission Site OS04 Tencreek Farm, Liskeard
O150/525 OS04 Tencreek Farm, Liskeard

Ray Packham BSc(Hons) DipEP MIEnvSc MRPTI
Turner Holden representing Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd
Hawkridge House
Chelston Business Park
Wellington
Somerset TA21 8YA

For Caradon District Council
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Don Alder FRICS MRPTI MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
INFORMAL HEARING

Assistant Inspector – Dr D Robins  BA PhD FRTPi

F802/594 para 5.38
R8/594 para 5.38
R12/594 EM4 Craft Homes
E11/594 H2 Housing development in towns
F800/594 HO7 Housing in the countryside
R10/594 HO7 Housing in the countryside

Christopher Jarvis  LLB  MRTPi Solicitor
Mrs J M Jarvis
Cross Farmhouse
Hatt
Saltash
Cornwall  PL12 6PL

For Caradon District Council

James Hills  BSc(T&CP)  BTP
Don Alder  FRICS MRTPi MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter  EX1 1NT
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi

TUESDAY 9 JANUARY 2007

10.00 am
Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

INFORMAL HEARING

R75/881 ALT21 (Proposed Omission Site OS09) Bowling Green, Callington

TTR Developments Ltd
Represented by
John Wilks Architect RIBA
Catchfrench Design
Trerulefoot
Saltash
Cornwall PL12 5BY

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MRTPi
Don Alder FRICS MRTPi MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT

2.00 pm
Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

INFORMAL HEARING

R3/210 Proposed Omission Site OS10 Former SWW Site, South Hill Rd West of Callington

Callington Town Council
Represented by
Lynda Small, Town Clerk
Callington Town Council
Town Hall
New Road
Callington
PL17 7BD

For Caradon District Council
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Don Alder FRICS MRTPi MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTP

WEDNESDAY 10 JANUARY 2007

10.00 am
Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

INFORMAL HEARINGS

O403/210 OS02 Land adj. Tavistock Rd, Callington

Callington Town Council
Represented by
Cllr Chris Thomas
Cllr Denise Winfindale
Cllr Kath Pascoe
Callington Town Council
Town Hall
New Road
Callington
PL17 7BD

R103/893 Proposed Omission Site OS02 Land adj. Tavistock Rd, Callington

Walker Developments (SW) Ltd
Represented by
Richard Walker
Walker Developments (SW) Ltd
Scotland Road
Hendra Croft
Newquay
TR8 5QR
Mark Scoot MRTPI MRICS
DTZ Consulting and Research
1 Colmore Square
Birmingham
B4 6AJ

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI
Bryan Smith BSc DipTP MRTPI
Bryan Smith Associates
Planning & Development Consultants
33 The Dell
Bristol
BS9 3UE
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi

THURSDAY 11 JANUARY 2007

1.00 pm Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

INFORMAL HEARING

F263/230 ALT10 Housing: Lamellion
Alan Cook
44 Woodgate Road
Liskeard
Cornwall PL14 6DY

R120/895 ALT10 Housing: Lamellion
Messrs Blamey, Cross and Gregory
Represented by
Mr I R Robertson MA DipTP MRTPi
54 Northfield Drive
Truro
Cornwall TR1 2BT

John Wombwell FSB
Wombwell Homes
23-25 Brunel Quays
Great Western Village
Lostwithiel
PL22 0JB

For Caradon District Council
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Don Alder FRICS MRTPi MSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
## INFORMAL HEARINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F245/228</td>
<td>para 5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15/228</td>
<td>ALT18 Housing: Millbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14/228</td>
<td>ALT20 Housing: Drakewalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F256/228</td>
<td>ALT6 Large scale retail development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F252/228</td>
<td>CL4 Removal of occupancy conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18/228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F248/228</td>
<td>HO12 Small dwellings and town centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F250/228</td>
<td>HO14 Wheelchair housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19/228</td>
<td>HO15 Gypsies and travellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F246/228</td>
<td>HO8 Conversion of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F254/228</td>
<td>R2 Playing pitch provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colin Breed MP**  
SE Cornwall Liberal Democrats  
Barras Street  
Liskeard  
Cornwall  
PL12 6AD

For Caradon District Council  
**Colin Cresswell** BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI  
**Don Alder** FRICS MRTPI MRSH  
Foot Anstey  
Senate Court  
Southernhay Gardens  
Exeter EX1 1NT
INFORMAL HEARINGS

E7/908  Proposed Omission Site OS13  Land r/o Ferncroft, Kelly Bray
Mrs C & Miss M Durman
Represented by
Francis Bettison  FRICS
Francis Bettison (Surveyors) Ltd
4 The Square
The Millfields
Plymouth
PL1 3JX

John Eaton  BA  DipTP  DMS  MRTPI  MCMI
The Threshing Barn
Diptford
Totnes
TQ9 7PG

O408/210  OS13  Land r/o Ferncroft, Kelly Bray
Callington Town Council
Represented by
Cllr Andrew Long
Callington Town Council
Town Hall
New Road
Callington
PL17 7BD

For Caradon District Council
James Hills  BSc(T&CP)  BTP

INFORMAL HEARING

F866/642  Proposed Omission Site OS23  Land adj. Doddcross
R100/642  Proposed Omission Site OS23  Land adj. Doddcross

Mr J J Maunder
Treway Cottage
Pengover
Liskeard
PL14 3NH

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell  BSc(Hons)  MA  MRTPI
### INFORMAL HEARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R137/377</td>
<td>Proposals Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R138/377</td>
<td>Proposed Omission Site OS29 Greenbank, Polruan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rosemullion Homes**
Represented by **Roger Carson** FRICS
Managing Director, Rosemullion Homes
57 Lemon Street
Truro
TR1 2PE

**Phil Smith** BSc(Hons) FCIH
Managing Director, Ocean Services
Stennack House
Stennack Road
St Austell
PL25 3SW

**Cllr Martin Akerman**
Lanteglos Parish Council

---

For Caradon District Council
**James Hills** BSc(T&CP) BTP
**Don Alder** FRICS MRTPi MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
INFORMAL HEARING

F143/152   ALT17 (Proposed Omission Site OS28)   Land south of Pelynt village
R31/152   PEL1   (Proposed Omission Site OS28)   Land south of Pelynt village

John Jolliff
Halwyn
Winsor
Pelynt
Cornwall
PL13 2JY

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell  BSc(Hons)  MA  MRTPi
James Hills  BSc(T&CP)  BTP
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi

FRIDAY 19 JANUARY 2007 Session 3 / Week 6 / Day 25

10.00 am Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

INFORMAL HEARING

F363/311 Proposed Omission Site OS20 Land West of St Cleer

Mrs H L Lawrence
10 Trecarne View
St Cleer
Liskeard
PL14 5BS
Represented by

Ms Ruth Lawrence
2 Trethey Close
St Cleer
Liskeard
PL14 6NE

Mr Paul Drew
5 Greenbank Terrace
Yelverton
Devon
PL20 6DR

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MRTPi
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUESDAY 23 JANUARY 2007</th>
<th>Session 3 / Week 7 / Day 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00 am</td>
<td>Refreshment Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INFORMAL HEARING**

F412/359 HO3 (Proposed Omission Site OS31) Land adj. Jacks Lane, St John
Mr P Keefe
Langwood
Lower Anderton Road
Millbrook
Torpoint
PL14 IDJ

For Caradon District Council
James Hills BSc(T&CP) BTP
Don Alder FRICS MRTPI MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
INFORMAL HEARING

E8/909 EV6 (Proposed Omission Site OS16) Former Saltash Sewage Works
Red Earth Saltash Ltd
Represented by
John Eaton BA DipTP DMS MRTPI MCMI
The Threshing Barn
Elwell
Diptford
Totnes
TQ9 7PG
Simon Friend MRICS
Director, Red Earth Saltash Ltd
11 South Street
South Molton
Devon
EX36 4AA

For Caradon District Council
Colin Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI
Don Alder FRICS MRTPI MRSH
Foot Anstey
Senate Court
Southernhay Gardens
Exeter EX1 1NT
### THURSDAY 25 JANUARY 2007

#### Session 3 / Week 7 / Day 28

**1.00 pm**  
Quimperle Room, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard

---

**INFORMAL HEARING**

**R76/881**  
SA2 Housing  
TTR Developments Ltd

Represented by  
**John Wilks**  
Architect RIBA  
Catchfrench Design  
Trerulefoot  
Saltash  
PL12 5BY

For Caradon District Council  
**James Hills**  
BSc(T&CP) BTP

**Don Alder**  
FRICS MRTPi MRSH  
Foot Anstey  
Senate Court  
Southernhay Gardens  
Exeter EX1 1NT
### ROUND TABLE SESSION 5 – PPS 3 and OUTSTANDING TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Caradon District Council</th>
<th>For Cornwall County Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colin Cresswell BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI</td>
<td>Steve Havers MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Hills BSc(T&amp;CP) BTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Lunn Affordable Housing Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Alder FRICS MRTPI MRSH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Anstey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate Court</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southernhay Gardens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter EX1 1NT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Carson FRICS</td>
<td>Graham Clark BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemullion Homes</td>
<td>Sunnybanks Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Lemon Street</td>
<td>Fairmead Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>Vallards Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall TR1 2PE</td>
<td>Hatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL12 6PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Jarvis LLB MRTPI Solicitor</td>
<td>John Wilks Architect RIBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross Farmhouse</td>
<td>Catchfrench Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt</td>
<td>Trerulefoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltash</td>
<td>Saltash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall PL12 6PL</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL12 5BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Packham BSc(Hons) DipEP MIEnvSc MRTPI</td>
<td>Peter Stacey BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner Holden representing Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd</td>
<td>Turley Associates representing Persimmon Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawridge House</td>
<td>10 Queen Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelston Business Park</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>BS1 4NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset TA21 8YA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Wilton</td>
<td>Alan Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington Environmental Action Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Moorland View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liskeard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL14 3TQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liskeard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall PL14 6DY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caradon District Council Local Plan Alteration – Public Inquiry

Inspector - Mr Richard Hollox BA(Hons) BSc(Econ) MPhil FRICS FRTPi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUESDAY 26 JUNE 2007</th>
<th>Day 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Council Chamber, Public Hall, West Street, Liskeard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSPECTOR’S AGENDA**

1. Introduction
2. Confirmation from the Council that it wants the Inspector to deal with all the Objections referenced on the Skeleton Report unless he is told that any are not duly-made.
3. Confirmation of plans relating to Mr Gubbins' land at East Taphouse.
4. Policy ALT21
   (The Council may wish to explain to any members of the public present the procedures that will happen when the Council receives the Inspector’s Report).
6. Archiving the Inspector’s documents.
7. AOB - Does the Council want to add anything?
8. Thanks, and formal close of the Inquiry.

Public Inquiry ends
CARADON DISTRICT COUNCIL LOCAL PLAN
FIRST ALTERATION

PUBLIC INQUIRY

HEARING ATTENDANCE LISTS

31 October 2006 - 26 June 2007

Please refer to Caradon District Council
Spatial Planning team
SUPPORTING REPRESENTATIONS

EM1  Retention of employment premises
E25/3  Cornwall County Council

EM2  Employment development in towns
E26/3  Cornwall County Council

EM4  Craft Homes
F1123/1  Government Office for the South West
R269/1  Government Office for the South West

EM11  Workplace Crèche facilities
E29/3  Cornwall County Council

Para 5.04
R181/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

HO1  Housing requirement
R161/225  CPRE - Caradon
R291/3  Cornwall County Council

HO2  The sequential approach
R107/487  South West RSL
R170/592  Highways Agency
R5/594  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
R251/1  Government Office for the South West

HO3  Housing allocations
F242/228  Colin Breed MP
F413a/37  Mr P Stephens
R6/594  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis

HO4  Phasing strategy
R253/1  Government Office for the South West
R7/594  Mr & Mrs C Jarvis

Para 5.27
R108/487  South West RSL

Para 5.29
F565/487  South West RSL

Paras 5.29 & 5.32
R318/487  South West RSL

Para 5.29 - 5.34
F664/524  Persimmon Homes

Paras 5.30 - 5.34
F243/228  Colin Breed MP
Para 5.32
F279/239  Jonathan Hall
F680/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd
R188/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

Paras 5.35 - 5.36
F244/228  Colin Breed MP

HO5  Housing in towns
F662/524  Persimmon Homes
F678/525  Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

HO6  Housing in villages
F277/239  Jonathan Hall

HO7  Housing in the countryside
F552/478  National Farmers’ Union
F566/487  South West RSL

HO8  Conversion of buildings
F551/478  National Farmers’ Union

HO10  Replacement dwellings
F780/578  Cllr Mrs JM Sneyd

Paras 5.48/5.51/ 5.64 - 5.66
R110/487  South West RSL

Para 5.51
F18f/31  Steve & Vanessa Killops

Para 5.52
F278/239  Jonathan Hall

Para 5.53
F1113/1  Government Office for the South West

Paras 5.70 - 5.72
F1117/1  Government Office for the South West

Para 5.74
F568/487  South West RSL

Para 5.75
F569/487  South West RSL

HO11  Affordable housing in towns &
R122/896  Trelowen Sustainable Living Project

HO13  Rural exception housing
F276/239  Jonathan Hall
F571/487  South West RSL
F779/578  Cllr Mrs JM Sneyd
R113/487  South West RSL
HO14  Wheelchair housing  
R111/487  South West RSL

HO15  Gypsies and travellers  
F229/225  CPRE - Caradon

ALT2  General design principles  
F253a/22  Colin Breed MP  
F505d/44  Ms TM Thompson  
F782/578  Cllr Mrs JM Sneyd  
R105/487  South West RSL  
R139/10  Environment Agency  
R171/592  Highways Agency

ALT3  Sustainable design  
F253b/22  Colin Breed MP  
F505e/44  Ms TM Thompson  
R115/894  Cornwall Wildlife Trust  
R317/487  South West RSL  
R322/10  Environment Agency

ALT24  Density  
R104/487  South West RSL  
R256/1  Government Office for the South West

ALT1  Protection of rail infrastructure  
F251/228  Colin Breed MP  
F474/411  Saltash Waterfront Association  
F596/3  Cornwall County Council  
F821/171  Saltash Town Council

CL4  Removal of occupancy conditions  
F573/487  South West RSL  
F758/570  Midas Homes Ltd

R2  Playing pitch provision  
F574/488  Sport England  
R306/3  Cornwall County Council

CO5  Telecommunications equipment  
F255/228  Colin Breed MP

ALT4  Management of flood risk  
F505f/440  Ms TM Thompson  
F50b/12  English Nature  
R140/10  Environment Agency

ALT5  Management of surface water  
F50c/12  English Nature  
F505g/44  Ms TM Thompson  
R117/894  Cornwall Wildlife Trust
ALT6 Large scale retail development
F798a/59 Highways Agency
R172/592 Highways Agency

ALT7 Protection of shopping cores
F162/171 Saltash Town Council
F280/239 Jonathan Hall

ALT8 Food and drink premises
F549/478 National Farmers’ Union

ALT9 Industrial land allocation
F139/148 Mrs FE Lee
R194/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd
R275/1 Government Office for the South West
R99/891 Mr Rob Arnold

ALT10 Housing: Lamellion
F238/227 Network Rail
F297/252 Mr P Cross
R173/592 Highways Agency
R276/1 Government Office for the South West

ALT11 Housing: Addington
F20/33 Mr Alan JF Bradley
F295a/25 North East Liskeard Consortium
R35/876 Mr and Mrs Bradley

ALT12 Housing: Bramble Lane End
F138a/14 Mrs FE Lee
F225/223 Mr T Mitchell
R279/1 Government Office for the South West
R329/592 Highways Agency

ALT13 Housing: Western Avenue
F138b/14 Mrs FE Lee
F223/222 Mrs M Solomon
R280/1 Government Office for the South West
R330/592 Highways Agency

ALT14 Housing: Rosemellen Terrace
F138c/14 Mrs FE Lee
F237/227 Network Rail
R281/1 Government Office for the South West
R331/592 Highways Agency

ALT15 Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F295b/25 North East Liskeard Consortium
SA1 Broadmoor Farm
F178/5 South Hams District Council
F258/228 Colin Breed MP
F868/433 Sunnybanks Homes
R142/897 Saltash Partnership & Gateway to Cornwall MCTI
R155/900 Cllr Brian Carter
R176/592 Highways Agency

SA2 Housing
R282/1 Government Office for the South West

SA3 Broadmoor Park and Ride
R80/884 Mr R Hills

ALT23 Saltash Employment Allocation
R144/897 Saltash Partnership & Gateway to Cornwall MCTI
R148/171 Saltash Town Council
R157/900 Cllr Brian Carter
R180/343 South West of England Regional Development Agency
R315/886 Saltash Chamber Of Commerce
R77/881 TTR Developments Ltd

LO8 Development affecting C.A.
R301/3 Cornwall County Council

P3 Development affecting C.A.
R304/1 Cornwall County Council

ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
F1147/86 Mr and Mrs Spry
F273/237 Truro Diocesan Board Of Finance
F400/347 Looe Development Trust
R21/869 Cllr Armand Jean Toms

ALT17 Housing: Pelynt
F226/224 Mr J Walker
F337/291 L & P Pooley
F413b/37 Mr P Stephens
F470/407 Mr PM Crocker
R13/60 Mr PR Evans
R42/168 WER Philp
R48/207 Mr KR Evans
R61/46 Miss PS Cudlipp
R63/233 Mr JA Dennis
R65/22 Richard Stevens
R66/309 Mrs Bettinson
R67/82 Major JG Spreckley
R68/162 Mr & Mrs PS Spreckley
R159/274 Pelynt Parish Council
R285/1 Government Office for the South West
R314/878 Mr John Trewin

M1 Southdown Brickworks
F193/200 Millbrook Parish Council
SN1 Housing: Seaton
F44/57 Hayel G Fullerton
F45/58 MJ Laxton
F57/69 Miss Lyndsey Pengelly
F58/70 Mrs Barbara Bird
F67/79 John Pengelly
F68/80 Mrs Marion Pengelly
F158/167 Mr DN Champion
F191/198 Mr & Mrs DK Hall
F221/221 Mr & Mrs D Hall
F267/234 David J Rowlandson
F268/235 Patricia L Rowlandson
F328/284 Mrs R Barnard
F329/285 Mr P Barnard
F336/290 Steve Soames
F338/292 Seaton Residents Association
F356/304 Sir Anthony Vireall
F460/397 Fiona Barnard
F461/398 Tim Barnard
F475/412 Mr DCW Stonley
F1091/86 B Hiller
F1092/86 Dr KJ George
F1094/86 James Ogilvie
F1095/86 Mr Whittle

ALT18 Housing: Millbrook
F24/37 Adrian Hawke
F25/38 Downderry Group Ltd
F220/220 Downderry Construction
F259/228 Colin Breed MP
R23/193 Mr & Mrs GS Evans
R27/874 Ms R Young
R33/875 Mr I Morais
R34/144 Mr & Mrs AC Hancock
R36/410 Brian Tucker
R37/302 Carolyn Tucker
R47/859 Ken Gale
R50/464 Mrs C Bone
R51/465 Mr S Bone
R52/293 Mrs J Baker
R56/200 Millbrook Parish Council
R58/151 Mr DM Hewitt
R59/248 Ms S Ball
R60/249 Mr Trehewey
R62/37 Adrian Hawke
R64/247 Mrs NE Bennett
R311/630 Malcolm Powell

ALT19 Housing and Industry
F274/237 Truro Diocesan Board Of Finance
F691/526 Trustees of the Labouring Poor
F754/570 Midas Homes Ltd
R177/592 Highways Agency
R287/1 Government Office for the South West
ALT20 Housing: Drakewalls
F190/197 Mr P Henwood
R28/121 Brenda Woodward
R29/122 Richard R Woodward
R30/94 Phyllis Paige
R38/132 Mrs MA Nix
R39/141 Mr CA Nix
R53/415 Jennifer Smyth
R54/416 Mrs Patricia J Smyth
R55/63 Mary Swallow
R69/403 DA Harlow
R71/133 A Brockington
R94/96 Mr Graham Raddon
R121/114 Rita Curtis
R151/95 Mrs J Jelley
R152/400 Rev VF Honey
R178/129 CD Ward
R179/130 M Harris
R288/1 Government Office for the South West

ALT21 Housing Allocation (Callington)
R2/210 Callington Town Council
R88/887 Churchill Property Group Ltd

ALT22 Employment Land (Callington)
R1/210 Callington Town Council
Caradon District Council Local Plan Inquiry 2006:
CORE DOCUMENTS

1. Caradon Local Plan Alteration: Summary of representations
2. Caradon Local Plan 1999: General Chapters
3. Caradon Local Plan 1999: Liskeard Area Statement
4. Caradon Local Plan 1999: Saltash Area Statement
5. Caradon Local Plan 1999: Looe Area Statement
6. Caradon Local Plan 1999: Torpoint Area Statement
7. Caradon Local Plan 1999: Callington & Gunnislake Statement
8. Caradon Local Plan First Alteration: June 2003
9. Caradon Local Plan First Alteration Re-Deposit May 2005
10. Background Paper One: Housing & Employment Land: May 2005
11. Background Paper Two: Housing Distribution: May 2005
13. GOSW: Regional Planning Guidance 10: September 2001
15. Sustainability Appraisal: January 2006
16. Sustainability Appraisal, Appendices: January 2006
17. Sustainability Appraisal: Post Consultation Addendum Appraisal of Omission
   Sites: June 2006
18. Cornwall Structure Plan: 2004
22. PPS1: Delivering sustainable development
22A Supplement to PPS1: Planning and Climate Change
23. PPG3: Housing
24. Consultation Paper on PPS3: Housing
25. PPG4: Industrial, commercial development and small firms
26. PPG5: Simplified planning zones
27. PPS6: Planning for town centres
28. PPS7: Sustainable development in rural areas
29. PPG8: Telecommunications
30. PPS9: Biodiversity and geological conservation
31. PPS10: Planning for sustainable waste management
32. PPS11: Regional spatial strategies
33. PPG12: Development Plans
34. PPS12: Local development frameworks
35. Creating Local development frameworks: A companion guide to PPS12
36. PPG13: Transport
37. PPG14: Development on unstable land
38. PPG15: Planning and the historic environment
39. PPG16: Archaeology and planning
40. PPG17: Planning for open space, sport and recreation
41. PPG20: Coastal planning
42. PPS22: Renewable energy
43. Planning for renewable energy: A companion guide to PPS22
44. PPS23: Planning and pollution control
45. PPS23: Planning and pollution control: Annex 1, Pollution control, air and water quality
46. PPS23: Planning and pollution control: Annex 2, development on land affected by contamination
47. PPG24: Planning and noise
48. PPG25: Development and flood risk
49. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 1: Housing supply
50. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 2: Housing Distribution
51. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 3: Housing site allocations
52. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 4: Affordable housing
53. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 5: Employment land
54. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 6: Town centres and retail
55. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 7: Infrastructure
56. Caradon District Council: Topic paper 8: Sustainability
57. Report on objections to the Caradon Local Plan (Deposit Version) Jan 1997
59. Sport and Landscape Development: Revised February 2005
60. Appeal decision: Ogwell Cross, Newton Abbot July 2006
62. Draft regional Spatial Strategy
63. Draft regional spatial strategy – Response of Caradon District Council
64. Caradon District Council: Omission Sites Document
65. Caradon Local Plan – Sustainability Appraisal 2003
66. ODPM Circular 01/2006: Planning for Gypsies and Traveller Caravan Sites
69. Public Transport in Cornwall: Guide to buses, trains, ferries & planes
   Winter 06/07: Cornwall County Council.
69A Education Transportation Support (Cornwall County Council).
69B Waitrose Free Bus Timetable
69C The Looe Valley Line (10/12/06 – 19/05/07)
70. Core Strategy for Plymouth 2006 - 2021
71. Opening Statement of Caradon District Council (Oct 2006)
72. Sustainability Appraisal Consultations (Nov 2006)
73. Demographic Change in Cornwall (Sept 2006)
75. Appeal decision: Land at East Taphouse, Liskeard, Cornwall. (August 2006)
77. Saltash Gateway Area Community Strategic Action Plan (Spring 2006)
80. PPS 3: Housing (Nov 2006)
80A Delivering Affordable Housing (Direction 2006)
80B Statement of publication, Yvette Cooper (29th Nov 2006)
80C Statement of publication Joan Bailey (29th Nov 2006)
81. Best Value Review of Leisure Services (Assessment of Land Requirements To Meet The District’s Current & Forecast Leisure Needs To 2011
82. The Town and Country Planning Regulations 1999
83. Local Plans and Unitary Development Plans – A Guide to Procedures
86. ODPM Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations
87. A38 Dobwalls Bypass – Non-technical Summary of the Environmental Statement (Jan 2005)
88. PPS25: Development and Flood Risk
89. Callington Town Plan (Draft 2005)
90. Lanteglos Parish Plan (Jan 2005)
92. Further Deposit London gazette advert June 2005
93. Inspector’s Notes on Round Table Session 1 – Housing Supply (November 2006)
94. Inspector’s Notes on Round Table Session 2 – Housing Distribution and Sustainability (November 2006)
95. Inspector’s Notes on Round Table Session 3 – Affordable Housing (November 2006)
96. Inspector’s Notes on Round Table Session 4 – ALT11 Housing at Addington and ALT15 Open Recreation

Last updated 23/2/07
INSPECTOR’S ACCOMPANIED SITE VISITS

Thursday 25 January 2007
ALT10: Lamellion

Those attending:
The Inspector – Mr Richard Hollox
Objectors - Mr W M Gregory, Mr R Blamey
For Caradon District Council - Mr D Alder of Foot Anstey Planning

Tuesday 6 February 2007
ALT11: Addington & ALT 15: St Cleer Road

Those attending:
The Inspector – Mr Richard Hollox
Objectors -
Mr A Cook
Mr K Wilton, Mrs J Ussher, Mr F Brown, Mr J Rowe, Mr G Wheeler (on behalf of Addington Environmental Action Group)
Mrs C Brockhurst, Ms R Bohane of Waterman CPM (on behalf of Persimmon Homes)
Mr T Larner of Barratt Homes
For Caradon District Council - Mr J Hills

Proposed Omission Site OS04: Tencreek Farm

Those attending:
The Inspector – Mr Richard Hollox
Objector - Mr T Larner of Barratt Homes
For Caradon District Council - Mr J Hills

Wednesday 7 February 2007
ALT16: Looe

Those attending:
The Inspector – Mr Richard Hollox
Objector - Mrs C Brockhurst of Waterman CPM (on behalf of Persimmon Homes)
For Caradon District Council - Mr C Cresswell, Mr J Hills
WITHDRAWN OBJECTIONS

**Introduction**
F690/525 Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

**EM4 Craft Homes**
F778/578 Cllr Mrs JM Sneyd

**Para 5.02**
F605/3 Cornwall County Council

**Para 5.04**
F668/524 Persimmon Homes

**HO1 Housing requirement**
F604/3 Cornwall County Council
F667/524 Persimmon Homes

**HO2 The sequential approach**
F666/524 Persimmon Homes
R116/894 Cornwall Wildlife Trust

**HO3 Housing allocations**
F665a/52 Persimmon Homes
F709a/54 Ken Horsley

**HO3 (Proposed Omission Site OS02)**
F514a/44 Mr R Olver

**Para 5.19**
F603/3 Cornwall County Council

**Para 5.20**
F721d/55 John Turner

**Para 5.23**
F709h/54 Ken Horsley

**HO4 Phasing strategy**
F663/524 Persimmon Homes

**HO5 Housing in towns**
F600a/3 Cornwall County Council

**HO6 Housing in villages**
F661/524 Persimmon Homes
R309/433 Sunnybanks Homes

**HO7 Housing in the countryside**
F599/3 Cornwall County Council
F800/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis
R10/594 Mr & Mrs C Jarvis

**HO8 Conversion of buildings**
F660/524 Persimmon Homes
R114/894 Cornwall Wildlife Trust

**HO10 Replacement dwellings**
F785/582 Caradon Conservative Group
R297/3 Cornwall County Council
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HO11 Affordable housing in towns & villages
F598/3 Cornwall County Council
F659/524 Persimmon Homes
F721c/55 John Turner
F786/582 Caradon Conservative Group
R298/3 Cornwall County Council

HO13 Rural exception housing
F787/582 Caradon Conservative Group

HO14 Wheelchair housing
F658/524 Persimmon Homes

ALT2 General design principles
F581/489 Chelverton Developments Limited
F657a/52 Persimmon Homes
F788/582 Caradon Conservative Group

ALT3 Sustainable design
F580/489 Chelverton Developments Limited
F657b/52 Persimmon Homes

CL4 Removal of occupancy conditions
F721a/55 John Turner

CL18 Areas of Great Historic Value
F692b/52 Cornwall County Council Historic Environment

EV1 Historic Settlements
F692c/52 Cornwall County Council Historic Environment

R2 Playing pitch provision
F656/524 Persimmon Homes

CO5 Telecommunications equipment
R289/3 Cornwall County Council

ALT4 Management of flood risk
F579/489 Chelverton Developments Limited
F655/524 Persimmon Homes

ALT5 Management of surface water
F578/489 Chelverton Developments Limited
F654/524 Persimmon Homes

ALT6 Large scale retail development
F144b/15 Somerfield Stores Ltd
F577/489 Chelverton Developments Limited

ALT9 Industrial land allocation
F148a/15 Linda Woolf
F149a/15 Chris Woolf
F592/3 Cornwall County Council
F843a/62 John W Lingard
F943a/71 Dorothy A Sherdon
F944a/71 Geoffrey H Sherdon
F946a/72 John Foster
F954a/72 T Taylor
F955a/73 EC Taylor
ALT10  Housing: Lamellion
F43/56  Mr John Grant
F95/107  M Bousfield
F140/149  Mr AD Wood
F148b/15  Linda Woolf
F149b/15  Chris Woolf
F169/177  Paula Charman
F170/178  Dr Dan Charman
F187/194  D Barrett
F198/204  Mr & Mrs NC Hollingsworth
F262a/23  Mrs W Libby
F313/268  Mr R Thomas
F358/306  Sue Robbins
F419/364  J & S Woolcott
F420/365  Mr RF Parsons
F424/369  Mrs D Parsons
F447a/38  Mr James Grieve
F458/395  HG Banks
F505a/44  Ms TM Thompson
F509/444  Margaret Peaty
F532/466  KL Banks
F533a/46  Mr & Mrs PD Whiting
F536/470  Clive Emmerson
F591a/3  Cornwall County Council
F606/490  Clive Evans
F615/499  WM Hasshill
F617/501  Philip F Henslowe
F695/530  Nigel Dixon
F697/532  Leah Hardiman
F698/533  Pauline Hardiman
F699/534  Merryn Hardiman
F700/535  Philip Hardiman
F708a/54  Mr & Mrs D Matthews
F709b/54  Ken Horsley
F720/554  Mr & Mrs DM Thorley
F721b/55  John Turner
F798h/59  Highways Agency
F808/596  Charles A Rawlings
F809/597  Mr SV Luscombe
F834/619  GVR Williams
F843b/62  John W Lingard
F843h/62  John W Lingard
F870/645  Liam & Elizabeth Carey

ALT11  Housing: Addington
F29/42  Simon Spence
F148c/15  Linda Woolf
F149c/15  Chris Woolf
F213a/26  Alan Lutkin
F262b/23  Mrs W Libby
F447b/38  Mr James Grieve
F505b/44  Ms TM Thompson
F533b/46  Mr & Mrs PD Whiting
F591b/3  Cornwall County Council
F709c/54  Ken Horsley
F720/554  Mr & Mrs DM Thorley
F843c/62  John W Lingard
F876a/65  Mr & Mrs AJ Woods
F879a/65  Mr & Mrs D Truscott
F885a/66  Mr & Mrs Auckland
F888a/66  Mr & Mrs JA Banyard
F889a/66  Mr & Mrs VR Hicks
F891a/66  Mr & Mrs Spooner
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F901a/67 W and R Newby
F910a/68 R & J Gilmore
F915a/69 Mr & Mrs Mortimore
F931a/70 Mrs N Marshall
F941a/71 Mrs L James
F943b/71 Dorothy A Sherdon
F944b/71 Geoffrey H Sherdon
F946b/72 John Foster
F954b/72 T Taylor
F955b/73 EC Taylor
F958a/73 S Hortop
F960a/73 Mrs Press
F961a/73 GE Turner
F963/738 Mrs S Mutton
F967a/74 B Lawson
F971a/74 RG Yacomen
F979a/75 Mrs E Stead
F981a/75 Ms Janet Willcocks
F995a/76 Mrs M Rundle
F1003a/7 DCR Pryor
F1040a/8 Mrs Self
F1043a/8 Mr T Devine
F1054a/8 Mrs O Job
F1055a/8 ABedford
F1059a/8 J Surtees
F1067a/8 WH Baileys
F1072/84 FW Woods

ALT12 Housing: Bramble Lane End
F39/52 Mr V Lamb
F40/53 Mrs HM Lewington
F60/72 Miss M Heaton
F65a/77 Mr AC Vellacott
F131/142 Mr & Mrs RK Andrew
F175a/18 Doris Pote
F262c/23 Mrs W Libby
F303a/25 Joan Booker
F323/280 Mrs A Laywood
F325/281 GJ Laywood
F326/282 Mr BJ Rossiter
F327/283 Mrs CE Rossiter
F368a/31 DP Sullivan
F462/399 Dr John Critchley
F533c/46 Mr & Mrs PD Whiting
F590/3 Cornwall County Council
F709d/54 Ken Horsley
F798j/592 Highways Agency
F843d/62 John W Lingard
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ALT13  Housing: Western Avenue
F35/48  Miss ME Balloch
F54/66  Mr & Mrs R Hesline
F65b/77  Mr AC Vellacott
F130/142  Mr & Mrs RK Andrew
F175b/18  Doris Pote
F262d/23  Mrs W Libby
F303b/25  Joan Booker
F368b/31  DP Sullivan
F448/385  Mr AG Hainsworth
F471/408  FE Fellows
F533d/46  Mr & Mrs PD Whiting
F709e/54  Ken Horsley
F798k/59  Highways Agency
F843e/62  John W Lingard

ALT14  Housing: Rosemellen Terrace
F30/43  Mrs H Nicholas
F330/286  Mr & Mrs Dixon
F533/467  Mr & Mrs PD Whiting
F589/3  Cornwall County Council
F708b/54  Mr & Mrs D Matthews
F709f/544  Ken Horsley
F798l/592  Highways Agency
F799/593  Mr PJ & Mrs ME Reed
F843f/628  John W Lingard

ALT15  Open recreation: St Cleer Road
F148d/15  Linda Woolf
F149d/15  Chris Woolf
F213b/26  Alan Lutkin
F505c/44  Ms TM Thompson
F798c/59  Highways Agency
F843g/62  John W Lingard
F876b/65  Mr & Mrs AJ Woods
F879b/65  Mr & Mrs D Truscott
F885b/66  Mr & Mrs Auckland
F888b/66  Mr & Mrs JA Banyard
F889b/66  Mr & Mrs VR Hicks
F891b/66  Mr & Mrs Spooner
F901b/67  W and R Newby
F910b/68  R & J Gilmore
F931b/70  Mrs N Marshall
F941b/71  Mrs L James
F943c/71  Dorothy A Sherdon
F944c/71  Geoffrey H Sherdon
F946c/72  John Foster
F954c/72  T Taylor
F955c/73  EC Taylor
F958b/73  S Hortop
F960b/73  Mrs Press
F961b/73  GE Turner
F963/738  Mrs S Mutton
F967b/74  B Lawson
F971b/74  RG Yacomien
F979b/75  Mrs E Stead
F981b/75  Ms Janet Willcocks
F988b/76  Mrs PE Coles
F994b/76  Mr K Rundle
F995b/76  Mrs M Rundle
F1003b/7  DCR Pryor
F1018b/7  BJ Crabb
F1021b/7  E Bolitho
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F1026b/8 Mr Roy Morrish
F1028b/8 Mr J Browne
F1036b/8 Ivor EA Saunders
F1040b/8 Mrs Self
F1043b/8 Mr T Devine
F1044b/8 Mrs CA Devine
F1053b/8 Mrs O Job
F1054b/8 Mr PB Job
F1055b/8 ABedford
F1058b/8 J Surtees
F1067b/8 WH Baileys
R175/592 Highways Agency

SA1 Broadmoor Farm
F19/32 ED Beer
F587/3 Cornwall County Council
F756/570 Midas Homes Ltd
F798d/59 Highways Agency
F818/604 Mrs C Holland

SA1 (Proposed Omission Site OS01)
F653/524 Persimmon Homes

SA4 Highway Reservation
F798e/59 Highways Agency

PEL1 Housing: Pelynt
R243/224 Mr J Walker

PEL1 (Proposed Omission Site OS06)
R238/903 Looe Marina Developments Ltd
R240/904 Lypar Developments Ltd

ALT16 Housing and Employment: Looe
F195/201 Looe and District Amenity Society
F665b/52 Persimmon Homes
F709g/54 Ken Horsley
R242/224 Mr J Walker
R310/201 Looe and District Amenity Society

ALT16 (Proposed Omission Site OS06)
R239/903 Looe Marina Developments Ltd
R241/904 Lypar Developments Ltd

ALT16 (Proposed Omission Site OS07)
F227/224 Mr J Walker

ALT17 Housing: Pelynt
F9/22 Richard Stevens
F33/46 Miss PS Cudlipp
F69/81 Lawrence Northcott
F153/162 Mr & Mrs PS Spreckley
F155/164 Mrs J Clayton
F156/165 Mr G Clayton
F159/168 WER Philp
F318/274 Pelynt Parish Council
F319/275 Derek Wakeham
F332/288 H Kinner
F348/296 Mrs OM Codgbrook
F361/309 Mrs Bettinson
F364/312 Mr A Jeffery
F442/379 Peter & Alison Catnach
F467/404 David Johns
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F524/458    SJ Richards
F525/459    Mrs Joyce Beuan
F542/473    Persimmon Homes
F585/3      Cornwall County Council
F665c/52    Persimmon Homes
F709i/544   Ken Horsley

M1 Southdown Brickworks
F692a/52    Cornwall County Council Historic Environment
R303/3      Cornwall County Council

M1 (Proposed Omission Site OS05)
E9/910      Alistair Godfrey

SN1 Housing: Seaton
R244/905    Mr & Mrs Stamp

ALT18 Housing: Millbrook
F10/23      Brian Jones
F26/39      RA Jones
F541/473    Persimmon Homes
F584/3      Cornwall County Council
F665d/52    Persimmon Homes
F709j/544   Ken Horsley

ALT19 Housing and Industry
F48/61      Jeremy Gist
F63/75      EG & FA Chatting
F71/83      Mr DE Bristow
F161/170    Mr PG Jakeman
F304/259    Mr & Mrs D Holbrook
F309/264    Mrs S Clinick
F311/266    JC Packer
F340/13     English Heritage
F341/13     English Heritage
F342/13     English Heritage
F414/375    Mr M Bond
F539/473    Persimmon Homes
F576/489    Chelverton Developments Limited
F583/3      Cornwall County Council
F607/491    Cllr Mr CNB Thomas
F614/498    Larry Horton
F665/524    Persimmon Homes
F709k/54    Ken Horsley
F797/591    Mr & Mrs SJ Clayton
F798/592    Highways Agency
F847/632    Mark Gillett
F1090/86    Mr & Mrs Lane

ALT19 (Proposed Omission Site OS02)
F514b/44    Mr R Olver

ALT22 (Proposed Omission Site OS02)
R79/883     Mr R Olver

OS10
O134/525    Barratt Homes (Exeter) Ltd

Proposed Omission Site OS22
F52/64      Andrew Thomas