

Minutes

Meeting Title: Liskeard Neighbourhood Plan Hearing

Date: 26th March 2018

Time: 10:30

Location: The Long Room, Liskeard Town Council Offices, 3-5 West Street, Liskeard PL14 6BW

Chaired by: Deborah McCann

Attendees: Deborah McCann, Sarah Furley, Imogen Day, Ryan Searle, (CC) Steve Besford-Foster, James Shrubsole, Lorna Shrubsole, Steve Vinson, Jane Pascoe, Christina Whitty, Rachel Brooks, John Hesketh,(LTC) Jamie Grant (Wainhomes), Simon Wagemakers, Gemma Furse (Persimmon), Des Dunlop (Pearce Fine Homes), Simon Collier (Acquiro Ltd)

Apologies:

Minutes

1 Introduction

DM - Read her opening statement and emphasised that consideration is refined to the Basic Conditions. Issues for clarification include; the development boundary, employment, housing, retail and landscape.

SF - gave an overview of the relevant strategic policies within the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP). Policy 2a and 3 give the key targets for development across Cornwall. Policy 2a states that the target for Liskeard is 1400 homes to be built within the plan period. She stressed that this number is not a limit to development, but more of a distribution pattern. She also stated that the settlement boundary conforms to the CLP and identifies a suitable amount of land for development within the plan period. The development at Trencreek is within the Parish of Menheniot, but the development is considered to serve Liskeard Town.

Minutes

2 Policy NP1 – Development Boundary

SBF- There was a local appreciation of a village boundary which is supported by national policy directing development to settlements to achieve sustainable development, and separate settlements from the open countryside. The 2007 Caradon Local Plan settlement boundary was used as a starting point (but this extended into Menheniot parish). GIS and the online planning register were used to map the sites with planning permission outside of the boundary and mapped rural buildings that could be included. The Cornwall Council online toolkit guidance was also used.

SBF- The CLP gives Liskeard a target of 1400 homes. Policy H5 is a mechanism to allow further housing to be released, following under achievement of development. Development on brownfield (BF) sites and windfall is expected to help meet the 1400 home target.

SC- Trevellis Park meets the criteria to be included in the settlement boundary, as two thirds of the site edge is enclosed with development. The site was included within the boundary at the Regulation 14 consultation stage, and then excluded from the settlement boundary when the plan was formally submitted. A planning application (PA) was refused, then the appeal dismissed for highways reasons only, not because the site is unsuitable.

SBF - Responded that the site was excluded for clarity because it was unlikely to come forward after the appeal was dismissed. A second planning application has been refused, which is currently at appeal. The application has been reduced from 14 to 9 dwellings, with highways issues negotiated and resolved.

SF - Refers to the officer's report and that the Landscape Officer has stated that the application would harm the local environment, the site would not be considered rounding off, there is no Affordable Housing provision and the development would extend into the open countryside. Policy 3.1 and 7 of the CLP were referenced as refusal reasons. Liskeard NDP was formally submitted to Cornwall Council (12 December 2017) once the Planning Application had been made 4 December 2017).

JG- Commented on lack of flexibility of the settlement boundary, as multiple applications have been refused.

Minutes

JS - The NDP will release sites using a scoring system (Policy H5).

3 Policy H5

JS - The purpose of this policy is to achieve flexibility. Calculations used were using the Cornwall Council Strategy using a lead in time and build out rate and based on post-recession calculations, so are conservative. Flexibility needed for develop ability and sustainability. Sites were assessed against sustainability criteria.

SF - This has been checked against the Cornwall Council monitoring team. They have confirmed that the figures are consistent with their methodology for the housing trajectory.

JS - Delivery between 2010 and 2015 was slow, but the NDP trajectory represents over delivery by 2030. 102 dwellings being built in the past year, the trajectory forecasts 70. This demonstrates that Liskeard will meet its target.

DD - Questioned how this will work. Will the developers, Cornwall Council or NDP Steering Group lead this?

JS - Confirmed that the same monitoring process will be used as Cornwall Council. Cornwall Council publish their implementation strategy (including monitoring figures) annually.

SBF - If there is a housing shortfall, Policy H5 will be used.

DM - Land owners and developers can also monitor this.

SBF - Commented that this is a step forward from a non-existent system and it will be monitored annually.

JS - Commented that a three year moving average was used for the trajectories.

LS - Commented that extensive criteria were used for this policy.

SF - Commented that there is scope for the review of the NDP to potentially include sites within the plan.

SW - Persimmon supports the plan, but references to the H2 sites are a concern for suitability reasons. There is no evidence to show that the H2 sites are suitable. Part F and G of H5, is the 5% trigger and the CLT reference well assessed and implementable?

SBF - Stated that it is difficult to do viability studies in advance of a

Minutes

trigger mechanism policy. The 5% trigger came from national guidance. CLT is an aspiration.

DM - Asked if Cornwall Council have a self-build policy.

SF- Cornwall Council encourages self builds and is developing a policy for this. During the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP) examination, there was not enough evidence to have a trigger policy. This may come through during the CLP review.

DM - Stated that modifications will be made as some policies are too aspirational and cannot require as much.

SF - Confirmed that Policy 9 of the CLP applies to non-named towns

4 Policy EM1

JS – Strong community desire for employment. Looked at mixed use schemes (CLP Policy 5). It is not appropriate to have employment on some smaller housing sites (e.g. less than 10). Offsite contribution concept like affordable housing. 30 plus dwellings seemed an appropriate trigger size.

DM – Has the trigger of 30 dwellings been tested?

JS – 30 represents their opinion of a small-medium sized development.

DM – How does this fit in strategically?

JS – Engaging with developers to encourage mixed use.

SF – If policy is adopted then CC development management officers will consider this when a planning application comes in. CLP doesn't have a policy to require this or standard contribution. Not sure that the causal link is strong enough.

SW – Concerns regarding clarity and need. There is no contribution calculation. Policy EM2B has enough sites already, why are more needed.

DM – More about deliverability than availability.

GF – Should this be a requirement?

SW – Planning application for employment refused. Would mixed use be supported over housing?

JS – H5 sites not amended for employment. This would be done at the planning application stage.

SBF – CLP page 35/36, paragraph 2.12 is the route of this policy.

DM – By virtue of mixed use, employment subsidy made.

5 Policy EM2

JS – Policy included when H4 site uncertain to come forward for housing. It now has planning permission so the policy has been fulfilled.

6 Policy EM2B

SBF – Long term problems; need public sector intervention for employment sites (grant funding was used to provide access to Charter Way). Retail contribution from South to improve A38 access. 2007 Caradon Plan identified site to extend business park. Eastern side of Liskeard has always required employment development.

SV – 2017 Stratton Creber Commercial/Amion Lister commissioned for assessment of employment and office space. November 2017 bid to DCLG on Cattle Market site, decision due April 2018. March 2018 - (EN3 site) Stratton Creber demand study. "Agri-hub" – agricultural business recommendation report due May 2018. NP process has identified land owners who confirmed support to release sites for employment. Caradon survey work is available. CC own neighbouring site and highway access and are partners in the study. Cornwall Livestock support need for "Agri-hub". There has been little or no service improvements.

DM – Policy includes wording "may include".

SBF – Wanted flexibility for sites to come forward. Level of mixed use would come to viability discussions.

7 Policy EM3

Jane Pascoe: Outside of NP area but not in policy. More of a suggestion rather than a policy.

DM – Should be modified to make clear that is isn't a policy.

8 Policy H1

SC – Exclusion inconsistent with NPPF, presumption in favour of sustainable development.

9 Policy H2

JS – Public engagement indicated strong view that derelict sites should be used for housing and agricultural land preserved. Assessed BF sites – couldn't meet all housing demand. NPPF 111 and CLP 2.130 prioritise PD land so this meets basic conditions of NPPF.

DM – Why 90?

JS – Identified potential for 120 and discounted 30%. In conjunction with H5.

SF – CC supports ambition to regenerate town centre. But question whether the NDP require one to be dependent on the other? CLP encourages brown field sites but do not believe that the release of greenfield can be contingent on unrelated sites.

JS – Give developers a chance to develop before triggering H5.

JG – Agree priority but can't restrict other development. It is against national policy. 90 threshold may be breached, but may not address potential housing backlog.

SW – No information if sites identified on BF are suitable or will come forward.

SBF – Option to identify urban capacity sites as allocations, but resource implications go beyond NDP capacity. Strong community feel for BF priority.

JS – Monitoring process would apply here.

DM – Deliverability?

LS - BF sites are coming forward.

JG – Need for 90 houses?

LS – Confirmed that over 50% of BF sites have planning permission.

DD – Have these been commenced?

DM – They are coming forward without the policy. This policy might restrict other developments coming forward.

SBF – Working group evidence of site assessments in the 'A Place to Live' background paper.

10 Policy TC2

Rachel Brooks – Threshold established in Caradon Local Plan. No local threshold in DPD, so previous figure applied. Liskeard Town Centre is small, local support to increase vitality of TC. Vacancy rates approx. 10%. A1 uses not risen, 7 converted for residential use.

SF – CLP doesn't set thresholds but they can be set locally with evidence.

DM – Has Caradon evidence been reviewed?

RB – Recent vacancy rates and conversions to residential use. Town centre is dying; we're trying to fight this.

11 Policy OSL10

SBF – evidence base includes: Caradon Hill Historic LCA, Local Landscape Character Assessment (CEC consultants), Dark Sky Bodmin Moor, CC Mapping. Area Heritage Project identified medieval farmland, shrine and deer park with later industrial heritage at bottom of valley. Reg 14 – CEC did LCA. Concluded consistent with nearby AGLV for continuity of landscape setting. Future development to East, not West. Community consultation event confirmed support + new part is within Dark Sky designation.

12 Policy OSL11

SBF – Accessible viewpoints that represent the character of Liskeard. Local landscape that don't have designation – assessment of impact of a design that addresses impacts. Map could be improved to include vistas.

DM - "Any development proposals" not proportionate. Modify to

reflect proportionality. Requested local greenspace evidence.

SBF – Accept comments.

DM – Closed hearing