

Fowey Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre- Submission Consultation

CC Officer Consultation Response (12/12/18)

CC Officer/Team	Action Taken by Steering Group
NDP Team Comments (12/12/18)	
1. The overall NDP is very well structured and presented. It is streamline and clear to understand which is really valuable for a working document such as this. The majority of the following comments are very minor in nature, largely addressing minor oversights and typos (which often are only picked up by a fresh set of eyes).	✓
2. Front cover – update date to 2019-2030.	✓
3. 1.2 – missing full stop (end of para).	✓
4. 1.7 – update date.	✓
5. 2.2 – 2.3 (formatting – missing gap between paragraphs).	✓
6. 2.6, 7.1 & 8.7 - Consistent use of abbreviations – CC instead of Cornwall Council (would be useful to run a ‘find and replace’ in word to check for other instances).	✓
7. 3.2 – Recommend footnote moved to directly after ‘...Checklist...’.	✓
8. 6 B, 6 F & Section 9 – Capital P’s on Parish.	✓
9. Section 6 – consistent application of colons and full stops at the end of bullet points.	✓
10. 7.1 Consistent use of abbreviations – CC instead of Cornwall Council.	✓
11. Policy 1 – this could be strengthened by including, in the supporting text, reference to	✓

<p>where document users will find information relating to the sensitivities around local character and distinctiveness (consider how the document user will know how to judge this and ensure this is satisfactorily covered off).</p>	<p>On further CC advice added reference to Appendix 1</p>
<p>12. 8.3 – reference is made to ‘NDP Environment Workshop’ but its not clear in what context/what respect?</p>	<p>Added to reference.</p>
<p>13. 8.4 Missing full stop after ‘...Design)..’</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>14. 8.4 Is Appendix 4 what needs to be also referred to in supporting text of Policy 1 (see previous comment).</p>	<p>(No Appendix 4) added Appendix 1 to Policy</p>
<p>15. 8.5 delete full stop between ‘areas’ and ‘8’.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>16. General – All references to the NPPF will need to be updated to reflect the 2018 NPPF, if the NDP is not submitted on or before the 24th January 2019.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>17. 9.4 – Lankelly Lane Housing is referred to as being illustrated on Figure 5 but on Figure 5 this isn’t clear.</p>	<p>Added to Figure 5</p>
<p>18. 9.6 – include reference to any heritage designations at Place House?</p>	<p>Place House setting referred to in Policy 10 Justification and to Policy 10 and added to Figure 11</p>
<p>19. 9.8 – refer to definitions of <i>all</i> infill, rounding off and previously developed land being in the glossary.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>20. Policy 6 – recommend you amend wording to read ‘Proposals for development will only be permitted where they have <i>appropriately</i> demonstrated...’ (as this requirement will not be relevant in all instances where planning permission is sought; the inclusion of the word ‘appropriately’ will give planning officers discretion in where this requirement is enforced).</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>21. Figure 12 – the key must <i>specifically</i> refer to the ‘town centre’, ‘the primary shopping area’ and the ‘primary retail frontages’ in order to directly support Policy 11 wording. As</p>	<p>Added to Figure 12</p>

<p>drafted, only the primary shopping area is clearly defined.</p> <p>22. Policy 11 (3) – delete ‘for’ and replace with ‘the’.</p> <p>23. Policy 11 (5) – delete space before ‘Support..’.</p> <p>24. Policy 12 (1(ii)) – add ‘; and/or,’ to end of sentence.</p> <p>25. Policy 15 1 (i) – add ‘(...distance) from this.’</p> <p>26. Section 12 – space between ‘...development of...’.</p> <p>27. 12.1 – missing full stop after (1.80).</p> <p>28. Policy 17 – consider restructuring document so that this policy is presented next to the Policy 10.</p> <p>29. Policy 17 – supporting map(s) needs to be referred to, which clearly sets out these locations.</p> <p>30. Policy 19 – recommend rewording: ‘...and energy reduction, where:...’</p> <p>31. Policy 21 (1) – recognising rather than recognise.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>This is important to the Health and well-being of the community and is has more relevance in this section. New map created –Figure 14</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
<p>CIL Response 12/12/18</p>	<p>Action Taken by Steering Group</p>
<p>Policy 16: Fowey Parish Infrastructure Having a clear focus for future CIL money received by the Parish Council is welcomed. However, I would advise consideration of some caution with regards being too single issue focused in the policy itself.</p> <p>Cornwall Council need to produce a Regulation 123 List, which is required to demonstrate to developers that we will not seek S106 developer contributions for something that we intend to spend CIL money on. Although Parish Councils have more</p>	<p>Changed Policy 16 to include ‘community health and well-being projects particularly for young people’</p>

<p>flexibility in how they spend their portion of CIL, they will still need to ensure that this is not in conflict with the final Regulation 123 List. The final list will be going to Cabinet for approval in December 2018.</p> <p>Depending on timescales for completion of the Fowey NDP, the group may wish to keep themselves up to date with progress on this matter. Alternatively, they may wish to consider making the wording of Policy 16 slightly less restrictive, just in case it is determined that ‘enhancing play facilities’ should be sought through S106 rather than CIL. They may also wish to consider producing a priority list of projects on which to spend their local portion of CIL on.</p>	
<p>Landscape Officer 12/12/18</p>	<p>Action Taken by Steering Group</p>
<p>General comments</p> <p>The Fowey NDP has given careful consideration to the potential impact of development beyond the settlement edge within the AONB and this is welcomed.</p> <p>Policy 2 (2) Page 13 – suggest including density of development which also needs to be sympathetic to the built and natural environment of Fowey.</p> <p>Policy 2 (4) Page 13 – suggest adding ‘and the wider protected landscape’ at the end of the paragraph</p> <p>Objective 2:Housing para 9.2 Page 16 clarification is requested as to why the character of the built form has been described in only one area of the town (purple shading) on Figure 4. Why has this area been singled out?</p> <p>Objective 2:Housing para 9.4 Page 16 it is not clear why only some of the designations and constraints have been identified on Figure 5. The Conservation Area meets the development boundary on Polvillion Road, and to the south of the houses along Tower Park, and covers Brewery Fields. There are tree preservation orders on Hanson Drive and Green Lane. The Monterey Pines are a key landscape feature on Brewery Fields. Green lane is also covered by a UK Biodiversity Action Plan habitat of woodland.</p>	<p>✓ Added to Policy</p> <p>✓ Added to Justification</p> <p>✓ Added to Figure 4 Lankelly Lane; asked by NDP officer to describe this as an area of larger gardens.</p> <p>New Point 6 to explain in more detail the designations and constraints.</p>

<p>Objective 2:Housing para 9.6 Suggest adding that this land is one of the key character elements of the scenic background to Fowey</p> <p>Housing Policy 3 para 9.10 The reason the LLCA Edge of Settlement Assessment indicates there are few sites suitable for a significant number of houses is for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development would be harmful to the landscape character and views with no possibility to mitigation the effects • Landscape designations (AONB, Heritage Coast, Conservation Area) are present • Locally valued landscapes and features such as BAP Priority woodland, ancient woodland, and the Daymarker on Gribbin Head <p>The LLCA does not take account of local opposition to development in the landscape surrounding the town.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>✓ Added</p>
<p>Housing Policy 4 para 9.18 Suggest amending text to remove ‘under strict national guidelines’ and replace with wording similar to: ‘in line with landscape character assessment best practice and assessment guidance adopted by Cornwall Council in the Development Management Toolkit’</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Reference 2014, Judging Landscape Capacity: A Development Management Toolkit, Cornwall Council</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Housing Policy 4 para 9.21 It is unclear why the text does not follow on, but has a large gap on page 23 till the text continues on page 25.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Under ‘Land parcel 7b – suggest also adding that development in this land parcel would introduce the built form of Fowey into the wider AONB landscape, the South West Coast path and rural undeveloped views in land from Gribbin Head</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Objective 3 Natural Environment Para 10.2 The AGLV does not extend down into the Fowey parish.</p>	<p>Removed</p>
<p>Policy 6 Suggest amending the text to remove ‘objectives’ and replace with Strategic and Local Section policies of the Cornwall AONB</p>	<p>✓</p>

<p>Also suggest adding that development should respect and enhance the local landscape character</p> <p>Policy 6 (1) Development is sited to minimise visual impact and impact on local landscape character</p> <p>Policy 7 (1) I do not have access to Appendix 2. It is hoped that key views are indicated on mapping showing their extent and direction, and are accompanied by clear criteria which explain the components/ elements which mean that the view is considered valuable.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
<p>Affordable Housing Team</p>	
<p>Looks much better now and policy is clearer on exception sites as well as clear explanation with the boundary settlements.</p>	