



Dear Local Plan Team,

**Cornwall Local Plan – Strategic Policies (pre-submission version)  
Gypsy and Travelling Communities Strategy and Delivery Plan  
Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

Please find included with this letter, the joint response from Gwinear-Gwithian and St Erth Parish Councils to Cornwall Council's consultation on the documents listed above.

We should be grateful for an acknowledgement that our response has been received and will be considered carefully. Thank you.

If you need any clarification on any matter, please contact the Parish Clerks who will be happy to assist:

Mrs Vida Perrin [vida.perrin@ggpc.org.uk](mailto:vida.perrin@ggpc.org.uk)

Mr Peter Rylett [sterthpc@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:sterthpc@hotmail.co.uk)

Thank you.  
Regards,

Chairman  
Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council

Chairman  
St Erth Parish Council

## **CORNWALL COUNCIL CONSULTATION**

### **Cornwall Local Plan – Strategic Policies (pre-submission version) Gypsy and Travelling Communities Strategy and Delivery Plan Community Infrastructure Levy Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule**

#### **COMMENTS FROM GWINEAR-GWITHIAN AND ST ERTH**

##### **PARISH COUNCILS**

#### **Overall comments**

1. Many of the proposals and policies in the Cornwall Local Plan and the Gypsy and Travelling Communities Strategy disappointingly appear to add little or nothing to their equivalents in the National Planning Policy Framework. It is important to expand these documents to take account of and reflect Cornish conditions and aims.
2. We appreciate that these are initial documents which may be amended at later stages on the way to their final adoption but the nature of this bureaucratic process raises concerns about its transparency and about the local awareness and will to take part in further rounds of consultation. It is important to take every possible step to ensure that policies and proposals are clearly explained and justified and that local communities continue to be involved.
3. On this subject of influencing emerging Plans and Strategies, Gwinear-Gwithian and St Erth Parish Councils have shown themselves to be interested and experienced in community planning matters and they have sought expert advice in compiling these comments. They therefore ask Cornwall Council to invite them to take part in future expert groups set up to prepare and refine planning documents like these.

#### **Gypsy and Travelling Communities Strategy and Delivery Plan**

1. The document is based on out-of-date research. It is not clear why it has been published ahead of a survey to up-date the 2006 GTAA.
2. The document is considered to be light-weight and of little practical benefit. It contains factual background information but it is not site-specific nor (importantly) does it achieve the aims at the bottom of page 4.

3. It does not include a clear delivery strategy. It appears to rely on previous District Local Plan policies (but the Kerrier District Local Plan was never adopted, its policies including H26 have not been saved and so it no longer deserves any weight). The inclusion of a "call for sites" suggests that the availability of land may on its own be a decisive factor in determining the distribution, size and nature of future sites rather than environmental criteria in land-use policies.
4. The emerging Cornwall Local Plan is not part of the development plan. The third bullet-point of paragraph (ii) on page 23 should accordingly be changed to make this clear.

### **Cornwall Local Plan**

1. Despite its title, this document is evidently very different from previous District Local Plans. It does not occupy a "halfway house" between the NPPF and Neighbourhood Plans, is generally lacking in detail and while there may be little to disagree with it overall, does not appear to add much clarity or certainty to the present planning process in Cornwall.
2. The wording of many policies is unclear and open to subjective interpretation (e.g. "appropriate" in policies 7, 11, 12, 14, 23 and 28; "inappropriate" in policy 23; and "suitable" in policy 7). There is concern about consistency in interpreting such vague requirements, encouraging uncertainty and argument, and this approach seems to rely heavily on Neighbourhood Plans (which may or may not be eventually forthcoming) to define important local characteristics which new developments should respect.
3. More detailed comments on individual policies and proposals are separately attached.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

1. We firmly believe that developments should pay for the infrastructure demands they place on local services and facilities. These demands have increased over time because of levels of affluence and new consumer products. We are also concerned that necessary developments might be discouraged from coming forward because of the scale of financial and other requirements imposed on them. The question of viability is central to this debate but it is not clear how this will be assessed in detail in individual cases or how transparent the process would be to Parish/Town Councils and the general public.
2. In the light of this, we oppose the exemption from CIL for affordable housing (see paragraph 11.1). All new housing must impact on settlements, bearing in mind the experience in our Parishes and

elsewhere that most affordable dwellings are occupied by people who were not resident there immediately beforehand.

3. We are also opposed to the proposed pattern and levels of residential price zones. To the observer, there is no obvious distinction to make between our two Parishes or other adjoining ones and so we cannot support the proposal that Gwinear-Gwithian and St Erth are each in a different price zone from the others.
4. Putting St Erth Parish in the zero-rated zone means that it will receive no contributions from either the CIL or from Section 106 Obligations, despite being expected to accommodate more development which inevitably strains its infrastructure. We strongly oppose this arrangement.
5. More detailed comments are separately attached.

## **CORNWALL COUNCIL CONSULTATION**

### **Cornwall Local Plan – Strategic Policies (pre-submission version)**

#### **Policy Messages for Places (Hayle and St Ives)**

### **DETAILED COMMENTS FROM GWINEAR-GWITHIAN AND ST ERTH**

#### **PARISH COUNCILS**

### **Cornwall Local Plan**

#### **Policy 8**

It refers to rented affordable houses being managed by bona fide affordable housing providers but there appears to be nothing under “Intermediate housing” to deal with management arrangements put forward by private developers (e.g. THF in Connor Downs).

#### **Policy 9**

As far as its last paragraph is concerned, we agree that there must be one answerable body (e.g. Cornwall Council) responsible for ensuring the first and future occupation of affordable homes in line with this policy. We are however concerned at the lack of evidence to show how this will be achieved. We ask for assurances that we will be fully consulted on the detail of this policy and the consultation process.

#### **Policy 11**

The exemption from CIL for affordable houses raises concerns that developers will propose them as an avoidance mechanism and later apply to vary their planning permissions in favour of more open-market properties. A similar trend is already apparent in seeking to vary the requirements of Section 106 Obligations. In this event, it is essential that CIL should be recouped if this variation is accepted.

### **Policy 13**

Without clarity over standards of open space, parking provision etc., this generally-worded policy is unlikely to achieve consistent, good quality developments.

### **Policy 15**

The policy does not refer to community benefit contributions, which have already proved useful sources of local income to the communities involved in renewable energy developments. This should be a requirement of the policy.

### **Policy 26**

We support this policy because of the growing incidents of flooding in our Parishes. This makes it more important that infrastructure contributions are specifically directed to flood improvement works.

### **Hayle and St Ives CNA**

#### **Page 61**

The map on this page specifically identifies the villages of St Erth and Connor Downs. There is nothing in the map key to explain what this identification means, i.e. does it represent villages that have already experienced high levels of growth (however that term is defined), or those where most of the future development under Policy PP2(2)(a) should go? In either event, we consider that particular villages should not be identified on the map.

Gwinear-Gwithian and St Erth Parish Councils are producing Neighbourhood Plans which will recognise where development should best go within the Parishes and their allocations should not be prejudiced in any way by the current general document.

#### **Page 64**

Policy PP2(2)(a) refers to around 350 houses being provided in our two Parishes (and Towednack) outside Hayle and St Ives by 2030 but the housing commitments mentioned on page 60 reduce this figure to 158. We do not believe that this considerable reduction in the scale of future residential development compared with recent schemes in our villages is realistic. We are prepared to consider further growth in all our villages, provided that there are compensating infrastructure improvements and ask that this figure is reconsidered to reflect our view of housing need for people with links to the area.

We consider that the last part of Policy PP2(2)(a) should include criteria relating to the visual impact of development and on the cumulative effects of previous growth in the settlement concerned.

## **Overall**

In general, without more detail this document appears to add little to the Strategic Policies document and so is unlikely to be very useful.

## **CORNWALL COUNCIL CONSULTATION**

### **Community Infrastructure Levy**

#### **DETAILED COMMENTS FROM GWINEAR-GWITHIAN AND ST EARTH PARISH COUNCILS**

##### **Page 4(2)**

We repeat our view that CIL should be charged on affordable houses. All residential development by its intrinsic nature places additional pressure on existing infrastructure. This is especially true in rural Parishes like ours where there is a relatively high proportion of affordable properties coming forward.

##### **Page 7 (2.1)**

For the avoidance of doubt, it should be made clear that creating one or more dwellings attracts CIL even if they are less than 100 sq. m floor space.

##### **Page 7 (2.2)**

We have no objections in principle to sub-dividing existing houses but consider that the additional units, however they are created, should not be exempt from CIL for the reason explained above.

##### **Page 7 (4.4)**

We maintain that a meaningful proportion of the CIL income from every new dwelling in each Parish should go directly to its Parish Council. In the case of Gwinear-Gwithian and St Erth, we see no reason why both should not receive the same proportion of CIL income which should be the amount proposed for Gwinear-Gwithian.

##### **Page 8 (5.2)**

We would like to express our concern that necessary infrastructure schemes won't come forward under CIL and we remain to be convinced that it's a better system than the current one of Section 106 Obligations. We ask that Cornwall Council keep the matter under close review and take immediate action to alter whatever approach they take as soon as any evidence emerges that it's not producing required infrastructure works.

**Page 8 (5.3)**

We are concerned that the Regulation 123 list of infrastructure projects is not being published now, because people need this information in order to respond properly to the current consultation.

**Page 9 (7.6)**

In the absence of the Regulation 123 list, it is not clear what funding is likely to come from CIL to projects deemed desirable in our Parishes or whether CIL will be enough to make up the identified financial shortfall.

**Page 11 (9.4)**

We are generally content with the affordable housing targets for our Parishes but are concerned about the distribution of CIL/ Section 106 Obligation payments to other infrastructure needs. It appears that Cornwall Council leans heavily towards affordable housing in negotiating them, to the detriment of other deserving infrastructure improvements. We consider that negotiations (whether before or during an application) should be conducted transparently and in accordance with a protocol giving clear priorities for particular infrastructure requirements within the area concerned.

**Page 13 (11.3)**

It is unclear whether Parishes will lose out financially in such cases.

**Page 13 (12.1)**

If CIL is paid by instalments, it is essential to include mechanisms ensuring that the meaningful proportion continues to be paid to the Parish Council. We have concerns that essential infrastructure improvements may not be implemented if CIL payments are not promptly made.