Appendix 78

Penzance Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation – Cornwall Council Policy Team Comments.

Penzance NDP – Additional policy comments.

Thank you for taking our previous comments into account; I have only made comment against the policies where I have identified a concern.

General – the Climate Emergency DPD has now been found sound at examination and has been supported at Full Ciuncil – it will now move forward to imminent adoption. As the DPD policies are strategic, the Penzance NDP will need to be in general conformity with them. I have identified policies where there is duplication with the CEDPD policies and ask that you remove any policy text that duplicates the CEDPD requirements.

Policy	Text	Comments
DDH1		Part 2, final paragraph; note that you can't require additional validation requirements for minor development so a planning statement setting out the response can be encouraged but not required. I think this is covered by 'should demonstrate' but just want to manage expectations.
		We think that design coding will be increasingly important and referencing a future Penzance design code will future proof the plan but making sure that it will have future weight – you could do that here or in policy H11.
DDH4		The CEDPD is has been approved for use and is now moving rapidly forward to adoption; policy SEC1 covers much of the content of this policy and we would ask you to review that policy and remove duplication here (for example, biodiversity NG, tree cover solar gain etc.). We cant require development to meet Passivhaus standards.
DDH5	ii) provide new safe pedestrian and cycling links within development sites where possible, while minimising the impact of light pollution;	Not sure that the light pollution is appropriate here?
H7	Policy H7: Meeting Affordable Housing Needs in Communities (Local Lettings) 1. The initial, and subsequent, occupation of	The comments in red are from the affordable housing team – unfortunately, they do not support your
	new affordable housing units provided in	local lettings approach.

the Plan area will be prioritised to ensure affordable housing is available to those in need in the community where the housing is provided. 2. Eligible households, identified by the **Cornwall Housing Register or approved local** surveys, will be prioritised as follows: local surveys do not assess and verify housing need. In addition they are position at a single point in time without a mechanism to review change of circumstances. i) firstly to those with a local connection to the relevant settlement (within the Penzance Parish) where the affordable housing is located; and Defining, justifying and enforcing boundaries will be problematic. We experience this at a Parish level and can provide several example of where this will cause queries and challenges to allocations of homes. ii) secondly to those with a local connection to Penzance Parish; iii) before cascading to adjacent parishes or Cornwall as a whole. 3. For the purposes of this policy and to enable local lettings to be made accordingly: i) "community area" is defined as the settlement (village or town) where the housing is located; and, ii) "local connection" is defined as: this is in direct conflict with Council's allocations scheme and cannot be supported. a) currently living (and have done for 5 or more years) in the community area; or, b) previously living (and have done for 5 or more years) in the community area; or, c) working for 16 hours or more per week within the community area; or, d) having immediate family (child(ren), sibling(s), parent(s) or grandparent(s)) who currently live in the community area (and have done for 5 or more years); or, e) providing or receiving care for immediate family (as defined in iv) in the community area. Н9 1. Major Development proposals which, as a whole or as the sum of phased parts of a site, provide 10 or more dwellings (major Move yellow text to supporting text. development) are essentially changing or

	creating a new community. Developers will	It would make more sense to explain
	be required to create should provide a	what a community integration plan
	•	,
	Community Integration Plan establishing	should include in Policy DDH7. This
	how new homes will that community will	policy H9 could then be very short (or
	function , how it will interact with adjacent	removed).
	existing communities, and how it respects	
	their distinct identities as set out in policy	See also suggested alternative policy
	DDH7. It is important that the Community	text suggested in previous comments
	Integration Plan is developed with the	which could be used in policy DDH7:
	engagement of those communities to secure	Proposals for major development must
	intelligently designed, balanced communities	demonstrate in their application how
	which work to maintain the quality of the	they have consulted with the local
	built and natural environment and social	community over their development
	fabric, creating integrated, functional	plans. Proposals must
	extended communities rather than	• show how the development will
	the state of the s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	piecemeal suburbs or dysfunctional urban	enhance and connect to adjacent and
	sprawl.	neighbouring development; new
	Move yellow text to supporting text of policy	developments should increase
	DDH7.	permeability and where possible,
		improve walkable access to local
		facilities.
		Show how the new development will
		contribute to and enhance the sense of
		place.
		Show how the development will
		deliver
		the right mix of homes for the local
		community
		• Explain how the feedback from the
		local community has been reflected in
		the design
H11	ii) take fully into account this Plan's Design	Suggest inclusion of a reference to a
1111	. ,	
	Principles set out in Appendix 5 of this Plan,	future PZ design code
	and any future Penzance Area Design Code	Para ix) is largely covered by policy SEC1
		of the CEDPD and could be removed.
GI1		Ensure that there is justification for the
		inclusion of each of these proposed
		green spaces and that landowners have
		been identified and made aware of the
		proposed designation.
GI4		I think this is now covered in Policy G2
		of the CEDPD and could be removed?
GI7		I think this Is now covered by Policy G3
and		of the CEDPD?
GI8		
NEW16		This is quite permissive – do you want to
INCANTO		qualify support for a boat house?
		'where it is sensitively designed /
		maintains access to the coast etc?'

Information Classification: PUBLIC