

Summary notes from parish meeting on the draft NDP consultation comments 11.1.2021

Present: Parish Council: Cllr Marsden (chair), Bradley, Nash & Toland, Whibley + clerk;
 NDP Steering group: T Damer (Chair), D McQuillan, R Martin, G Morris + J Evans (consultant)

This meeting was agreed to allow discussion by both groups on the recommendations presented below by the Steering Committee following on from the Public Consultation last Autumn. T Damer began with a summary – 850 letters were sent out to the wider parish community along with 46 statutory consultees (rising to 50+) in September 2020 to start the Public Consultation Phase of the NDP journey. Cornwall Council then resent to numerous internal department for consultation. An additional 150+ individual letters relating to listing on either the NDHA or Open Green Spaces list were also sent out. 54 different comments were received back, most of them positive. 19 were listed tonight with recommendations from the NDP SG, 2 for consideration.

NDP POLICY

File Ref	Comment	Consideration	Recommendation to PC	PC decision (11/1/21)
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable single bedroom units should have extra half room Space to allow for home working, carer, visitor, baby Amend NDP to incorporate? 	<p>Add wording (where?) to support affordable developments that accommodate or provide home working space. Do not relate to no. of bedrooms – set by need.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Consultant (Post-meeting – possible addition and wording in next column)</p>	<p>We could add in a separate para after 8.2.27 that says:</p> <p>The parish also support in principle, subject to accordance with other policies in this plan, the provision of a separate space within housing to enable working from home, and other appropriate incidental or ancillary uses.</p>	<p>PC agreed with amended wording</p>
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 1 (p39) . At asterisk change cumulatively to read cumulative to accord with use in paras above it. What is meant by cumulative site? Needs better explanation to prevent crocodile or piggy-back development. Policy 2. Seeks to determine the proportion of affordable homes within an RES. Use of word “contribute” in 2a)i suggests mixed housing whereas the agreement applies to the whole development – inferring all units affordable. 	<p>RES must meet local housing need. Cannot dictate mix – it’s up to developer. Affordable component to have perpetuity agreement.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Consultant (Post-meeting –clarification wording in next column)</p>	<p>Asterix on page 39: the term cumulatively in the context of this policy relates to proposals for all new housing developments that adjoin sites which are/have been either; a. subject to the determination of a current planning application; b. to an extant planning approval; or, c. developed within the NDP period.</p> <p>The purpose of the term in the policy is to prevent artificial or contrived subdivision of a site to circumvent the policy approach.</p>	<p>P1 - The clarification on this was accepted as necessary – it was mean to prevent “piggybacking”/ site splitting to allow an overall larger phased developments. Policy to be revised.</p> <p>P2 – Rural Exception Site vs affordable not National Policy. Not necessary to revise Policy.</p>

52	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argues that Mawnan is being urbanised. Notes scale of building increased 4-fold in last decade. The CNA requirement of 0 at section 8.2.1 used again to state that <u>no</u> new dwellings should be built. Only exception being to allow limited building that meets defined social housing needs of existing residents. Purports that NDP policy will lead to 20% building expansion by 2030. Suggests NDP SG was misdirected by Parish Council 	<p>Lowenna has had impact.</p> <p>Not sure that the 7 referred to (obtained from planning apps in last decade) were new builds or replacements.</p> <p>Summing the intentions of policy 1?</p> <p>The policy is restricting development and will be controlled by the PC and robust defence of the AONB.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Consultant to consider and provide response</p> <p>(Post-meeting –response wording in next column)</p> <p>NDP was directed by CC at a joint NDP/PC/CC meeting pre SEA version of the NDP accepted by PC before submission to CC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change needed, but suggest response below?: <p>The 0 target is a minimum figure (there is no maximum) and has been set by Cornwall Council via the Cornwall Local Plan. It does not prevent further housing development taking place, subject to accordance with policies in the NDP, the CLP and the NPPF, including those conserving and enhancing the nationally designated AONB. However, the 0 target also means there is not a necessity through the NDP to specifically plan for further growth, such as through land allocations on the edge of our settlements.</p>	<p>Ongoing object which has already been addressed on multiple occasions, by both Parish Council, Consultant & S Furley (County advisor) without effect. Cannot change the opinion of objector and time spent on further attempts would be fruitless.</p> <p>Letter to objector thanking for comments and that they will be included in evidence base but Policy will not be changed as they do not reflect LPA guidance.</p>
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of a settlement boundary 	<p><u>Action:</u> Consultant to advise</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change, but response: <p>The CLP enables NDP's to set settlement boundaries concerning the application of housing policies in the CLP – such as those relating to infill or rounding off development. Some NDP groups have provided settlement boundaries and others have not. If a boundary is to be set, this would involve settlement edge assessments, and detailed analysis of where the built area of the settlement stops, and the open countryside commences. We considered that the definitions of what infill and rounding off development are, as outlined in the CLP, are clear already, and a settlement boundary would not add any material benefit to the NDP and the application of policies within it, the CLP and the NPPF.</p>	<p>Extra work to decide what classes a 'settlement' and to reassess all areas based on this decision would be counterproductive and against the initial decision made by the SG/PC.</p> <p>PC agreed that there be no defined settlement boundaries included in the Policy – will reply on Cornwall Local Plan.</p>

NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS (NDHA)

File Ref	List No	Comment	Consideration	Recommendation to PC	PC decision (11/1/21)
		Many comments were clearly concerned by the use of the term “list”. All negative commentators received a follow-up email to clarify Cornwall Council advice on the rationale for their entry in the NDHA schedule. This is shown in the next column.	“The identification of the properties as non-designated heritage assets actually isn't the same thing as a local list, the properties are not listed and this doesn't bring about extra planning restrictions. All it does is highlight that this is one of the non-designated heritage assets that the community locally value. Non-designated heritage assets are already referred to in national and local strategic policy and already the requirement is not to cause harm to them. The NDP is highlighting that this is one of the structures that are valued - but without this specific reference a planning officer could still apply their judgement and say that this is a non-designated heritage asset. Only the Local Planning Authority (i.e. Cornwall Council) can designate a local list, although NDPs can and do propose assets for that.”		TD – there were some people who did not want their homes to be added to this list but the majority of responses were positive and accepted inclusion. Many of the requests for removal focussed on the possible future consequences on improvements. The question was raised as to whether inclusion or not on the NDHA schedule was for the owner to decide, or for the PC to include or remove from the NDP. JE said that the owners had the right to re-iterate their comments at the wider consultation which would go to the examiner for consideration.
7	3	<p>Cottages Adjacent to Square</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Strong objection to entry from No. 4 on grounds of lack of pre-consultation, loss of privacy, car in photo, and reference to rear extensions. •This row of cottages is a real heritage asset as it is first sight of early vernacular Cornish build for visitors approaching from Sampys Hill. Accompanied by view of listed Red Lion it adds to quaintness. •Cannot “detach” one cottage from row of 5 that are in total public view. 	<p>Retain the entry but take photo from North end of terrace, ideally with no cars in frame.</p> <p>Add photo from early 20c of thatched cottages to add context.</p> <p>Remove sentence re rear extensions.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Historic WG Leader</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry with amendments 	<p>The PC agreed to the change of perspective & use of historic photo, along with the amended wording</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>

22	36	<p>Meudon Barn Walls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 2 walls of significance; the wall that can be seen from the road is clearly a potential heritage asset. It is owned by the Meudon Barn resident. • The wall that is the boundary between the Barn and Meudon Cottage is jointly owned. 	<p>After written assurances to both parties that there were no planning implications for inclusion in the NDHA schedule of assets, neither was willing to accept the entry.</p> <p>Historical accuracy has been questioned.</p> <p>The roadside wall is included in PA20/05635. That wall is stable.</p> <p>The jointly owned wall was the subject of PA15/02140 that aimed to lower the wall to give light to the adjoining cottage and to help stabilise the wall. Recent photos show that this wall has been patched up with concrete block while in County ownership – it no longer merits inclusion in the NDHA schedule.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the roadside wall is subject to current planning approval and the heritage element is known to CC, it will be removed from the schedule. • The joint wall no longer merits inclusion. • Remove the entry. 	<p>PC agreed to the removal of this entry</p> <p>PC to write letters to consultees explaining decision.</p>
6A	62	<p>Budock Vean Cottage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial objection based on extensive modernisation and concern for implication of listing. • Received assurance as per CC advice. • Content to retain entry but feels there are more worthy examples . 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The core of the property retains characteristics of Cornish building of the late 19th /early 20th period. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry. 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry but to try to sourcing of historic photo for substitution.</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
15	29	<p>Porth Sawsen House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Original photo gave rise to objection on the grounds of privacy and security. • New photo from distance (Coast Path) reduced concern. No further correspondence. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace photo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry with the new photo</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
49	35	<p>Meudon Cottage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided with the CC assurance shown above. • Considers that harm & loss occurred while the property was in CC ownership. • Gave approval in principle for the entry but - worried that ongoing surveys will reveal further weaknesses in the property; therefore, sought further written assurance that acknowledges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NDP cannot provide additional assurance. • In the light of approval in principle, SG believe the entry should stand. • <u>Action</u>: NDHA WG to reword entry as follows: ‘Single-depth dwelling of killas rubble construction, cement-rendered on the West side only, with attractive symmetrical front elevation and large attached mid c19 open barn to the East. Evidence of an earlier (pre-c18) dwelling at the NE corner of the existing property has been found but the current dwelling is an early Victorian remodelling of two earlier semi-detached late 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the amended entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>

		<p>and allows for the challenges of restoring old buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided rewording of the entry. • Last correspondence (4/11/20) related to NDP wish to retain entry as Meudon area contained some of the oldest buildings in the Parish. No response as at 8/12/20 	<p>c18 dwellings. Further mid-Victorian and early Edwardian modifications added a two-storey gable to the SE corner and a sleigh roof down to first floor level on the East side respectively. Adjacent to Meudon Farm (List Entry No. 1142100)'. </p>		
51	37	<p>Meudon Hotel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Black Box representation challenged Local Green Spaces (LGS) entry but stated that owners were content for the hotel building to remain on the NDHA schedule. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain Meudon Hotel in NDHA Schedule • Note that the LGS issue is at pages 6/7 	<p>Retain hotel building but expand to general comment about gardens</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
13	82	<p>Bosanath Mill</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial reluctance as doubts raised regarding their own and future improvements. • Response by Parish Clerk was in line with CC guidance. • Further email on 4/11/20 to close the loop – no response. 	<p>Only impact would be knowledge of property's importance in the event of a new planning application.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
25	44	<p>The Watch House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted a "chat" about impact on the property and how the designation could be respected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No contact could be established, by phone, email or letter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
11	60	<p>The Tower House</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requested that property be removed from the list. No reason given. Has not received the CC assurance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very substantial and visible property near Helford Passage that exudes heritage value. Retain the entry? • Owners right to say no. JE suggests it is a planning, not personal decision. • (Admin – should we follow up?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
29/29A	80/81	<p>The House and Barns at Boskensoe</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubts as to the planning implications for future development of the barns. • Recent significant modernisation of the house 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC assurance sent to owner at file 29A. • No further correspondence, so assume owner is content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the entry 	<p>PC agreed to retain this entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>

LOCAL GREEN SPACES (LGS)

File Ref	List No	Comment	Consideration	Recommendation to PC	PC decision (11/1/21)
43,44, 48 etc	28/ 29	<p>Anna Maria Creek</p> <p>3 x residents commented that maps indicated that the respective LGS entries covered private land and thus contravened planning rights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed correspondence to reflect the scenic beauty of the area and access for recreation. Area 28 is the most relevant of all our LGS to raise awareness of the local impact of environmental damage and inability to regulate use of the creek. Complained that NDP SG had not used Audit methodology given by CC via Guidance on Local Green Spaces and Green Infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area 29 has sufficient protection as a Tree Preservation Area and a County Wildlife Site. A revised map and descriptive table had been provided that better clarifies and supports the LGS designation. NDP SG comfortable that we have used adequate methodology in determining LGS via NPPF and CLP guidance. <p><u>Action:</u> a. Amend LGS Annex</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Withdraw all reference to Area 29. Amend map and table for LGS 28. 	<p>Works with stakeholder group undertaken by PC members. The PC agreed that the area was demonstratively special to the local community due to its spectacular views but these were badly harmed by abandoned boats and other marine detritus. The site was alone in the Parish for such severe environmental impact. PC work with a stakeholder group is ongoing.</p> <p>Agreements made to retain amended list entry # 28 only as set out by residents</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
51	21	<p>Meudon Hotel Valley Garden</p> <p>The Black Box (BB) representation objects to the listing on behalf of the owners of the hotel and cites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to maintain the grounds is dependent on the viability of the hotel business now and in the future. The role of the hotel should be a primary consideration in any designation. We have not followed national policy guidance and established criteria. Local interest is insubstantial – most interest stems from tourism. The gardens are not demonstrably special to the local community. There is no free public access or visibility. Accepts that the former is not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst it would be possible to refute many of the arguments put forward by BB and correct their interpretation of our NDP, a long drawn out and contentious debate with them would follow. The issue could be left to the examiner to decide but that approach risks further argument and collapse of the entire NDP at an extremely late stage. A “strategic withdrawal” on the grounds of potentially restricting the business’s ability to maintain the gardens was discussed. Those in the SG with a law background supported this approach. The Leader of the Environment & Heritage Working Group wished it to be placed on public record that the inclusion of the gardens in LGS listing should stand due to its historical and botanical links. Some paring of the map could diminish the hotel’s concern about restrictive planning effects of LGS designation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined 	<p>There was significant discussion on this item following the Black Box response and the future implications it held for the PC. It was agreed that rather than leave this for the examiner to make a decision an expanded but less restrictive NDHA listing would be a better option.</p> <p>Remove from LGS list but expand general comment about gardens within NDHA list entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>

		<p>essential in determining the designation but cites recent contested cases where designations ignored the ability of access by the public and proved highly contentious.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The designation places an undue burden on the hotel business. It does not complement investment in local business and the promotion of jobs. • Our plan does not positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of our community in housing or in addressing social, economic and environmental priorities. • Additional protection of the gardens beyond the AONB designation is not necessary. Has the test of additional local benefit been applied? • The proposed designation indirectly conflicts with a positive strategy for the historic environment due to the burden placed on the hotel. 	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SG could not arrive at a clear decision. The Chair would write to the Parish Council seeking their guidance as to the local importance of the gardens and how the SG should proceed. 		
54	17	<p>Budock Vean Golf Course and Valley Garden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valley Garden has very limited public access. Accepts historical significances. • Designated Ancient Woodland. • Site of ancient priory not considered to be green space but part of gardens. • Access to golf course limited to hotel residents and fee-paying members of the golf club. Not considered to be an open recreational amenity. <p>Does not contribute to public landscape value as the course can only be seen by hotel residents and a few neighbouring properties.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet all LGS criteria due to limited access and thus no additional benefit to the local community. • Not demonstratively special to the local community. • Admin Note: PA 13/01397 approved the building of 7 holiday homes on the hotel grounds. Of these, 3 have been built, and foundations/services provided for a further 2 homes. Sites have been earmarked for 2 further homes. The hotel, even at this late stage, could further develop the estate. An LGS designation could prevent further development of the business and be counter productive in terms of the NDP business and employment policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove LGS designation • Expand the NDHA description of the valley garden 	<p>Similarly to the Meudon Hotel listing it was agreed that rather than leave this for the examiner to make a decision an expanded but less restrictive NDHA listing would be a better option whilst not adversely affecting the business use of the site</p> <p>Remove from LGS list but include a general comment about gardens within an NDHA list entry</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>

42	18	Carlidnack Woodland The joint owners of the small field at the Western extremity of LGS 18 have indicated that they have longer term plan proposals for houses on this site. They ask that the field be removed from the listing. The right of way path would be retained.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any development would require planning application and meet AONB constraints. • The designation would still support local benefit if the field were removed from LGS 18. • The SG were made aware of imminent change of use for the field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To await developments. • An LGS may include right of way footpaths. 	<p>Remove field from LGS listing whilst the woodland area to be retained</p> <p>PC to write letter to consultee explaining decision.</p>
		Grass area at Shute Hill adjacent to No. 47 and Primary School.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG agreed there was recreational benefit and to add area to LGS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to LGS listing. 	<p>Not appropriate to listing</p>

It was agreed that the clerk would produce the letters noted [in red text] using general comments and forward to the NDP SG for review – it could be that these are sent to the consultees via email, rather than post if this is how they made contact originally. These correspondences would then be sent out after agreement from the PC is ratified the January 21st meeting.

Any action for updating either policies or listings [in blue text] would be done by the NDP SG and a final draft of the document provided to the PC prior to submission to Cornwall Council.

TD then said that this summary would now be incorporated into the legal scrutiny document to provide evidence of public consultation being acted upon.

Thanks was given by Cllr Marsden for all of the works undertaken by the SG to this point.

Meeting ended at 8.50pm

It was agreed that these recommendations, made in joint discussion with the NDP Steering Group, would go forward to the Full Parish Council meeting for ratification as the position of the Parish Council in response to public comments made at the Public Consultation phase of the NDP's progress. Appropriate emails/letter would be sent by the clerk to those submitting members of the public explaining the decisions made by the PC on the removal or continued inclusion of the listings noted.