

Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan

Examination Version

Report to Cornwall Council of the Examination into the
Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan

Independent Examiner, Clare B. Wright MA PG Dip (BRS) MRTPI MILM

Member of NPIERS

15 May 2015

Summary of Recommendation:

Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan: as modified should proceed
to referendum

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status
3. Background documents
4. The Community's Vision
5. Consultation Statement
6. Projects identified through the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan
7. Modifications and recommendations to Roseland NDP
8. The Plan – Other Matters
9. Summary and Referendum

1. Introduction

Neighbourhood Planning provides communities with the power to shape future development in and around where they work.

This Report provides the findings of the Examination into the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan (referred to as the RNDP).

The Parish Council of St. Just in Roseland is recognised as the qualifying body for leading a neighbourhood development plan¹ in partnership with the parishes of Veryan, Gerrans, Ruan Lanihorne and Philleigh. They established a Steering Group to lead on production of the Plan.

This Report provides a recommendation as to whether or not the Neighbourhood Development Plan should go forward to a Referendum.

I am pleased to report that the Plan may proceed to Referendum subject to a series of minor Modifications. None of these fundamentally change the Plan's content or direction, but are intended to ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions. Within this report are also clearly marked recommendations that are optional and will enable the information to be presented more clearly in a user-friendly document.

Were the Plan to go to Referendum and achieve more than 50% of votes in favour, then the Neighbourhood Plan would be made by Cornwall Council. The Neighbourhood Plan would then be used to determine planning applications and guide planning decisions in the Roseland Neighbourhood Area.

Role of the Independent Examiner

I have been appointed by Cornwall Council with the consent of St. Just in Roseland Council to conduct the Examination and provide this Report as Independent examiner. I confirm I am independent of the qualifying body and local authority. I do not have any land or other interests that may be affected by the Plan. I am a Chartered Town Planner with over 20 years experience in local authority, private, partnership, third sector and community organisations specialising in planning, design and community-led development. NPIERS are satisfied that I hold the appropriate qualifications and experience to be a member of their Panel of Examiners.

¹ In line with the aims and purposes of neighbourhood planning, as set out in the Localism Act (2011), the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and Planning Practice Guidance (2014)

As Independent Examiner, I must make one of the following recommendations:

- a) that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it meets all legal requirements;
- b) that the Neighbourhood Plan as modified should proceed to Referendum;
- c) that the Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to Referendum, on the basis that it does not meet the relevant legal requirements.

If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to Referendum, I am also then required to consider whether or not the Referendum Area should extend beyond the Roseland Neighbourhood Area to which the Neighbourhood Plan relates. I make my recommendation on the Referendum Area at the end of this Report.

In examining the Neighbourhood Plan, I am also required, under Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- a) the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (PCPA) 2004;
- b) the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 PCPA (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area),
- c) the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

Subject to the contents of this Report, I am satisfied that each of the above points have been met.

Neighbourhood Plan Period

A neighbourhood plan must specify the period for which it is to have effect.

The Neighbourhood Plan clearly states, on its title page and in the Introduction that it covers the period 2015 to 2030. It therefore satisfies this legal requirement.

Public Hearing

As a general rule, neighbourhood plan examinations should be held without a public hearing – by written representations only. I have considered written representations as part of the examination process. A public hearing must be held when *the Examiner considers it necessary* to ensure adequate examination of an issue, or to ensure that a person has a fair chance to put a case.

The Consultation Statement evidences the opportunities for individuals and organisations to consider the Neighbourhood Plan and to put forward representations, whether in support, objection or as general comments. I consider the Neighbourhood Plan consultation process in detail below. I note that the receipt of representations in support and, whilst fewer in number, representations in objection to the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan, provides evidence that people have had a fair chance to put a case.

I am satisfied from the depth of the consultation responses and the spread of consultation invitations that most respondents have been satisfied with the process.

Taking the above into account, I consider it is **not** necessary for there to be a Roseland Neighbourhood Plan Hearing.

2. Basic Conditions and Development Plan Status

An Independent Examiner must consider whether a neighbourhood plan meets the “Basic Conditions” which were set out following the Localism Act 2011. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, a neighbourhood plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan (see Development Plan Status below) for the area; and,
- be compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements.

I confirm that I have examined the Neighbourhood Plan against these Basic Conditions.

I consider whether the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan have regard to national policies, contribute to sustainable development and are in general conformity with strategic development plan policies, the status of the relevant development plan and whether the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and human rights requirements.

The Modifications proposed for the submitted NDP will enable compliance with the Sustainability criteria of the Basic Conditions and the NPPF, particularly para 173 development viability.

Development Plan Status

The current Development Plan for the Roseland neighbourhood plan area comprises the saved policies from the Carrick District Wide Local Area Plan 1998. The first Cornwall Local Plan 2010-2030 was submitted to the Secretary of State in February 2015. Public hearing session one commenced on the 18th of May 2015 and Session 2 is programmed to commence in July 2015. Therefore I have considered the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) against the saved policies of the 1998 Carrick Plan whilst being mindful of the intent of the emerging Cornwall Local Plan. The principle of bringing forward an NDP before a Local Plan is adopted was established in the ‘Tattenhall decision’ which confirmed standard practice exercised until that date.

European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and European Union (EU) Obligations

I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR. The consultation process for the NDP has been wide ranging and responses listened to which have resulted in obvious changes to the Plan.

It is important to record an email received 8 April 2015 in my capacity as Examiner for this Plan. It was from a longstanding non-resident landowner and therefore not eligible to vote on the Plan. In this area and apparent from the consultation responses this situation is not untypical. The same can be said where businesses/ employers operate in the area. NDP legislation clearly states the Referendum is for those registered to vote in an area. There is therefore no different treatment for these groups than otherwise laid down in the legislation. The Consultation Statement records that commercial businesses/ employers and business property owners were sought out, contacted and provided opportunity for engagement. They have made representations in the Plan and which have resulted in changes as detailed in the Consultation Statement and the policies of the NDP. Where changes have not been made contrary to the wishes of respondees sufficient reason for not doing so has been provided in the Consultation Statement.

Some concern had been raised about the quality and manner of the engagement for young people. I note that various groups were contacted representing different age groups and interests, including young people and through various means. Few public engagements can be said to be absolutely perfect. In this case over the five parishes and with relatively sparse and partially seasonal population I am satisfied that best endeavours have been made to engage. I am therefore satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and the Basic Conditions.

The screening opinion from Cornwall Council, in consultation with the statutory bodies, is that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is unnecessary. The relevant documents from Cornwall Council are to be found in Appendix 2 of the Basic Conditions Statement. The Directive does not prescribe who is to carry out an SEA, but normally it is the task of the Responsible Authority, i.e. the body which prepares and/or adopts

the plan or programme². In this case Cornwall Council has responded as the Responsible Authority. I am therefore satisfied that the overall approach to assessing the environmental effects of the RNDP meets the legal requirements of the EU's SEA Directive and the Basic Conditions.

A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) undertaken as part of the emerging Cornwall Local Plan at publication stage concluded that its policy framework is sufficient to deliver necessary measures to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects. Additionally Cornwall Council undertook a specific HRA screening for the Roseland NDP and concluded that the Roseland NDP will not give rise to Likely Significant Effects and is therefore unlikely to have an adverse effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (d), alone or in combination with other plans and projects. It is important to record that Natural England's initial concerns are recorded in the Consultation Statement as having been clarified and resolved in a meeting with Cornwall Council. This resulted in changes to specific policies, LA4 and CV5 and deletion of policy HO5 (see page 15 of the Consultation Statement). I am therefore satisfied that the overall approach to assessing the Habitats effects of the RNDP meets the legal requirements of the Basic Conditions.

The Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group also produced an Equality Impact Assessment to test the policies in The Roseland Plan for having a positive, negative or neutral impact on people with each of the protected characteristics (defined in the Equality Act 2010 as age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, ethnicity, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation). The Assessment found the NDP will result in more positive benefits for parts of the local community with protected characteristics studied of older people and young people, and disabled people and those with limited mobility. The NDP makes 'equal provision for Affordable Housing and seeks to retain service and leisure facilities that will benefit these groups equally'. They have analysed that the Plan has no negative impact, mainly neutral and some good. The group should be commended for conducting an EqIA.

2

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7657/practicalguidesea.pdf

Sustainable development

The Steering Group has undertaken a Sustainability Assessment of the RNDP as a means of demonstrating that the principles of Sustainable Development required in the NPPF were taken into account. It is based on the Sustainability Criteria adopted by Cornwall Council assessing the economic, social and environmental impacts of the NDP's policy aims. Some of the criteria, such as maritime issues, are excluded from the Roseland SA analysis as it was felt that they fell outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan. I have examined the report in which each policy aspect is considered from a sustainability perspective and am satisfied that the RNDP addresses the sustainability issues.

Cornwall Council

The Basic Conditions Statement states that Cornwall Council has been engaged throughout the development of the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan which has ensured that the process of developing the policies for the Plan has been scrutinised in terms of conformity with strategic policies of the district plan – this includes the saved policies of the Carrick District Wide Local Area Plan 1998. I am satisfied the RNDP is in general conformity with the policies in the 1998 Plan that affect the overall deliverability of the Plan and meets the Basic Conditions in this respect. I have also noted the RNDP is mindful of the direction of travel in the emerging policies of the 2010-2030 Plan.

Neighbourhood Plan Area

The chosen Neighbourhood Plan Area will be the Area within which the Policies contained in this Neighbourhood Plan will be exercisable. Roseland Neighbourhood Plan Area is within the Local Planning Authority Area of Cornwall Council. The Neighbourhood Plan Area follows the Parish Boundary of the partner parishes. Each parish had made individual designation applications, as reproduced in the Basic Conditions Statement. The boundary therefore comprises a known area and is logical for the intent of the Neighbourhood Plan Policies, following the area traditionally known as Roseland.

The Plan Area does not overlap with any other and no other neighbourhood development plan has been made in this area.

The Roseland Neighbourhood Area has been designated by Cornwall Council 2nd July 2013. This satisfies requirements for the purposes of

preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan under section 61G (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

3. Background documents

In undertaking this examination, I have considered the following documents in addition to the Examination Version of the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) (2014)

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

The Localism Act (2011)

The Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012 as amended)

Carrick District Wide Local Area Plan 1998 (saved policies)

Cornwall Local Plan Publication Draft for 2010-2030

Basic Conditions and Consultation Statements

HRA and EIA Screening Statement from Cornwall Council

Equality Impact Assessment for Roseland NDP

Sustainability Assessment

Proposals (map)

Submission Letters

Neighbourhood Area (map)

Those documents listed in 'K. Appendices' from the Neighbourhood Development Plan

Representations received during the publicity period

Email received 8 April 2015 from a longstanding non-resident landowner

I spent an unaccompanied day visiting Roseland including its key settlements, countryside, coastline and surrounding area.

4. The Community's Vision

The Community's Vision for how they wish the future of their Parish to be taken forward is clearly set out in their NDP. Their vision was derived from testing with the public through various engagements and resulted in the clear direction of 'Conserving and enhancing the Roseland's character and distinctiveness for a sustainable future'.

The Basic Conditions, Consultation Statement and other supporting documents provided in K. Appendices to the Plan such as the community-led Roseland Local Landscape Character Assessment provides evidence of

the aspects that are valued and shows this vision has been tested and supported throughout local consultation.

The vision is supported by a series of objectives for each policy area which are clear and unambiguous and that will ultimately assist in the understanding of the Plan and delivery of its aims.

Roseland NDP's Vision fits well with the aims of the saved policies in Carrick Plan and of the emerging Cornwall Local Plan. They all emphasise retaining character and controlling development.

Roseland NDP, through its collective experience as a group of Parishes and specific Neighbourhood Planning consultations, recognises a need for development in order to maintain a living area into the future whilst protecting the quality of the local landscape that contributes to the area's economic wealth.

5. Consultation Statement

Public consultation is an important part of a Neighbourhood Development Plan. It is a legislative requirement. It forms part of the evidence base.

Building effective community engagement into the plan-making process encourages public participation and raises awareness and understanding of the plan's scope and limitations. Successful consultation can also create a sense of public ownership, achieve consensus and provide the foundations for a successful 'Yes' vote at Referendum.

As required by regulation 4, St Just in Roseland Council submitted a Consultation Statement to Cornwall Council on behalf of the cluster of parishes, setting out who was consulted and how, along with comments on the outcome of the consultation.

Over the three year process of developing the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan evidence demonstrates the community has been engaged and consulted widely and using various methods of contact.

The Consultation statement evidences that 98 local businesses have been consulted, as well as local residents and local organisations covering a wide range of ages. Non-resident landowners/ second home owners are an important part of the area and were highlighted in the publicity for the initial stages of consultation. Appendix A2 of the Consultation Statement Summary provides the detail of local groups consulted and Appendix A7 the Statutory Consultees. These show that, in addition to residents, a wide range of organisations have been consulted and that these are representative of the local area and the transient population changing seasonally for The Roseland. Publicity for the later stages of engagement and consultation is not otherwise differentiated, other than businesses targeted which may or may not include non-resident landowners, second homeowners and holiday lets. However the Consultation Statement demonstrates responses from second home owners and holiday lets throughout the consultation stages as shown in the categories of respondees. Whilst the second homeowners and holiday lets could have been targeted more overtly, I consider there to have been sufficient opportunity through the initial awareness raising stages, the subsequent mailouts to homes, electronic media and public events for this group to have been made aware of the process and opportunity provided to contribute to the Plan.

The community-led Roseland Local Landscape Character Assessment is to be particularly commended for its engagement of local people in understanding their local environment to create a robust evidence base for their Plan and in testing a methodology that may be replicated elsewhere.

The consultation and engagement produced a range of important evidence that has clearly informed the NDP. The Reg. 14 consultation responses have been either taken on board to alter aspects of the Plan or reason provided as to why responses have not been taken forward. In particular more flexibility has been incorporated into the Plan whilst not relaxing the emphasis on landscape conservation.

A comparison of findings with the 2011 Census indicates the spread of respondents to be representative of the local population. I am satisfied that the widespread engagement will have included a useful cross-section of the local population.

Some useful Regulation 14 responses have highlighted particular issues that require clarification in the NDP, therefore I make Modifications to accommodate these.

Given its fundamental importance to neighbourhood planning, I have scrutinised the public consultation process. Some dissatisfaction has been raised with the consultation process throughout the three year plan-making period, as described above. However I am satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan meets its statutory obligations in that the responses show a wide range of outreach and input, as described above, and that the majority of responses are positive about the quality of the process and the outcomes. Consequently I am satisfied the Neighbourhood Plan is a community-driven document.

6. Projects identified through the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan

An important result, and welcome by product of an NDP, arising from local people and stakeholder's engagement is local projects. They can lead to much wanted benefits in their area, as standalone projects and those which would support delivery of their Plan. Roseland NDP is to be commended for recording these projects and taking them through an initial test to ensure they promote Plan objectives, are sustainable and feasible.

I note within the projects that particular efforts are to be made to encourage second homeowners in implementation. Whilst outside the scope of this plan, as this is an intent of the community rather than planning policy, I offer advice that the community may wish to broaden the audience to highlight other sectors of the community more overtly in their delivery.

Returning to the projects themselves, projects are often outside the remit of the statutory planning process and would not be recorded as policies within the Neighbourhood Development Policy Document. However they must be recorded so they may be taken forward by other means.

The suite of neighbourhood plan documents may capture projects in a number of ways, making absolutely clear the non-development plan status of the projects. This may be through adding them either as an Appendix to the Policies document, to the Consultation or Basic Conditions Statements. They may also be included within the NDP itself as management or implementation projects, clearly differentiated from planning policy.

Adding non-development plan projects in an Appendix to the Plan carries risks. There may be a perception of them being policies to be voted upon in the Referendum which can confuse or add extra complexity. Additionally the resulting document could be an unwieldy size.

Ultimately this is the balanced decision and I see no concerns over retaining the projects within the NDP document where clearly appended and prefaced.

7. Modifications and recommendations to the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan

Modifications to the following Policies do not fundamentally change the Plan's content or direction and will ensure overall legal compliance.

Recommendations are optional for consideration by the Parish Council and its advisers. The recommendations below largely relate to clarifying the message and intent of the Plan through re-ordering information and placing it in other documents. The Plan itself is too long for easy consumption particularly for people new to the Plan and area in understanding and delivering its aims. This is much as the criticisms for the Cornwall AONB Management Plan and which resulted in it being split into several sections.

Therefore, for example, where this information relates to justification, such information would be better placed in the Basic Conditions Statement. Others would be best summarised and/or placed in an Appendix outside of the main planning policy document. Advice is provided below.

There is a separate document holding key maps. These can be usefully included within the relevant documents as advised below and will illustrate the flow and intent of the proposals.

Recommendations

Pages 10 – 15. This content could be condensed into a summary, perhaps added to paragraph A2. 'The Approach we Adopted' rather than the detail provided which is best placed in the Consultation Statement and indeed replicates this data.

Pages 23-25. E10.2 relating to justification is better placed in the Basic Conditions Statement leaving a brief summary in the Policy document

Pages 26 – 28. Glossary of Terms: Place at the rear of the document. F.1 1b 'Important notes' remain.

These changes will necessitate changing the references in the earlier pages.

Modification

Throughout the policies of the document replace 'development will be permitted' with 'development will be supported'.

Page 7. Insert the Neighbourhood Boundary Plan and date adopted by Cornwall Council in Section B4, page 7 at the beginning. Titled 'The Plan Area'. Add the standard adoption text.

The descriptive text may be renamed 'About the Plan Area', beginning 'The Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan area covers a remote peninsula...'

Page 16. 'The Localism Act 2011'

Page 32. Policy LA4 – Sea Defences and Shoreline Structures.

Insert at '(ii) it is demonstrated that the structure would not cause, or lead to'

Insert at '(iii) it is demonstrated that the development would not detract from....'

Page 34. Policy CV1 – Village Character. (i) Remove reference to 'Roseland Design Guide' as this does not yet exist and has not been through a consultation process. Reword (i) to read 'The proposal is well integrated with and contributes to and enhances the character of the village or hamlet, having due regard to the local Parish and Landscape Character Assessments and the adopted sections of the Carrick Design Guide'. Remove (iv) as integrated with (i). Remove (v). See Policy HO8 below for full explanation.

Page 35. Insert at the word 'existing' at para. G13.3 'old buildings, **existing** maritime installations such as slipways...'

Policy CV2 – Listed Buildings. Replace text with 'Development will be supported where it is designed to respect the setting ...etc'

Policy CV3 – Conservation areas – replace should with 'must' which makes the condition a clear requirement and is therefore considered good practice in policy writing.

Page 36. Insert at Policy CV5 – Marine Heritage reword (i) 'there will no adverse effect upon harbour operations etc'. Reword (ii) to read 'the structure would not cause, or lead to the causation of, harm to the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation through disturbances such as to flora and fauna, tidal flows and increased recreational access to water both during construction and in use;'

Page 40. Add reference to Carrick Design Guide having been consulted upon in the NDP process. Add wording such as 'The intention to adopt the specific named sections of the Carrick Design Guide as part of the determination of applications through the NDP policies was made clear throughout the consultation process, culminating in the 6 weeks pre-submission consultation. The document was available in hard copy at the exhibitions and on the Roseland Plan website'.

Throughout the Policies reference to Roseland Design Guide shall be removed as it is not yet begun.

Page 43. Policy GP3 – Settlement Boundaries. Include Plans of the Boundaries.

Page 47. Action HO5 to be changed to Policy HO5 and the highlighting to be yellow as the rest of the policies. Reword the Policy to read:

Action HO5 - Local Connection. Affordable houses delivered on the Roseland shall only be sold or let to and occupied by people (and their Household) whose housing need is not met by the market and who meet one or more of the following criteria:

- (i) lived continuously in one of the five Roseland Parishes for the last 5 or more years; or
- (ii) worked in permanent employment in one of the five Roseland Parishes for the last 5 or more years; or
- (iii) grew up in one of the five Roseland Parishes (defined as having spent 10 of their first 16 years in one of the Parishes); or
- (iv) who have a close family member living for a minimum of five years permanently and continuously in the five Roseland parishes.

2. Where such a person cannot be found, an affordable house may then be sold or let to and occupied by persons (and their Household) whose housing need is not met by the market and:

- (iii) lived continuously in one of the adjoining Parishes for the last 5 or more years; or
- (iv) worked in permanent employment in one of the adjoining Parishes for the last 5 or more years; or
- (iii) grew up in one of the adjoining Parishes (defined as having spent 10 of their first 16 years in one of the Parishes); or
- (iv) who have a close family member living for a minimum of five years permanently and continuously in the adjoining parishes.

3. Where such a person cannot be found, affordable homes may then be sold or let to and occupied by persons (and their Household) whose housing needs are not met by the market and has an area local connection within the five Roseland Parishes, adjacent parishes or a County Local Connection.

Note: Adjacent parishes are defined as St Michael Penkivell, St Michael Caerhays, Cuby or Tregony parishes.

Page 47. Remove reference to full-time principal residence requirement and Policy HO7. Change this to a general aim. This is because no evidence has been provided in the NDP, or quoted from other sources, nor any policy 'tail' in the local planning policies – extant and emerging – to support this policy. Simply referring to other plans having such a policy is insufficient evidence and justification for this NDP. There is no reasoned assessment of the possible consequences of implementation on both the housing market for new homes and existing homes that do not have a restriction in the Roseland nor wider area Without supporting evidence the policy is not **demonstrated** to have a sustainable impact, whether on the local economy, socially and upon the environment. It therefore fails the Basic Conditions.

The intent of this aim can be carried out more positively using alternative methods that will make the area more attractive to longer term occupiers such as local people and newcomers working from home. Therefore part of the equation is to manage occupation of affordable housing through Policy HO5. Another part is, for example, encouraging employment and

homeworking through the recently improved broadband. It is a different and defensible side of the same coin to achieve the goal of encouraging more permanent residential occupation in the area and accommodating the changing nature of employment.

Page 51. Policy CD1. Incorporate '....premises for business and other development such as infrastructure or necessary utilities development (where they require planning permission)'...will be supported...etc.

Page 53. Policy CD3. Remove (ii). Add 'Local Landscape Character Assessment'.

Page 54. H20.4 Amend to read 'Promotion of low-impact, landscape friendly... etc'.

Page 56. Policy CR2 – Proposal for ...etc shall be supported (remove 'allowed') etc. Wind turbines.

F. Appendices – Move all other documents to be appended to the Basic Conditions Statement. Exceptions are K.25 Roseland Development Checklist, K.26 Development Management Toolkit and K.27 Potential Project List. This latter will additionally require a preface explaining the relationship to delivery of the development plan policies.

8. The Roseland Neighbourhood Plan – Other Matters

The Neighbourhood Plan includes a section on Delivery and Implementation. Whilst this does not contain any policies, it provides a helpful explanation of how the Neighbourhood Plan will function and a list of forward actions which have been requested through public consultation yet are outside the NDP either in terms of timing or remit. This is a useful section and should remain. It can be read in conjunction with the Plan's policies and the projects for local delivery that are highlighted in the Appendix.

9. Summary and Referendum

In summary, it is my view that the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan reflects the views of the community and sets out a clear and deliverable vision for the neighbourhood area.

There are minor Modifications and recommendations to the Plan. None fundamentally change its content or direction, but are intended to ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and is a user-friendly document.

Subject to the above, the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area; does not breach, and is compatible with European Union obligations and the European Convention of Human Rights.

The Roseland Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

Referendum

I am delighted to recommend to Cornwall Council that, subject to the minor modifications proposed, the Roseland Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to a Referendum.

Referendum Area

Neighbourhood Plan Area - I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Roseland Neighbourhood Area. The Neighbourhood Area mirrors the external Parish boundaries of the five parishes.

I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate. I note that no evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that this is not the case.

I recommend that the Plan should proceed to a referendum based on the Roseland Neighbourhood Area as defined by Cornwall Council 2 July 2013.