

## **Polperro and Lansallos Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan Examination**

### **Request for further information and questions from the Examiner to Cornwall Council and Polperro Community Council**

#### *1. NDP Housing Requirement.*

Reference is made in Paragraph 7.4 to the use of an “alternative approach” to calculating the housing requirement for the NP area over the plan period. I think this means as an alternative to setting the base housing target at zero as 50% of the parish is the AONB, as stated in Para 7.1. Please can you confirm that this interpretation is correct?

**SG Response:** Yes, that interpretation is correct.

**CC response:** the approach described as ‘alternative’ is the approach supplied and advised by Cornwall Council.

#### *2. Principal Residency Condition*

Policy 5.1(2) refers to open market homes restricted by a principal residency condition being occupied by the owner or their tenants. Is there a particular reason why tenants are included as well? In my experience, most of the principal residency conditions included in Neighbourhood Plans in the south west have only used this type of condition to limit occupation to the owners of the property. Do the Councils have any comments to make? Has a legal view been sought on how such a condition relating to tenants could be imposed?

**SG Response:** We propose to revise paragraph (2) of our NDP Policy 5.1 as follows, based on Cornwall Council’s advice note which can be found here:

<https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/31070036/principal-residence-policies.pdf>:

*2) The condition or obligation on new open market homes will require that they are occupied only as the primary (principal) residence of those persons entitled to occupy them. Occupiers of homes with a Principal Residence condition will be required to keep proof that they are meeting the obligation or condition, and be obliged to provide this proof if/when Cornwall Council requests this information. Proof of Principal Residence is via verifiable evidence which could include, for example (but not limited to) residents being registered on the local electoral register and being registered for and attending local services such as healthcare and schools.*

**CC response:** the standard wording of the condition in our guide note requires the future occupants of the property to occupy it as their primary (principal) residence. The purpose of the condition is to maintain the sustainability of the local community by ensuring that housing stock is available for permanent residents, who will contribute to the local economy and use local services and

facilities. The policy does not control the tenure of the property. The example tests in the model policy wording could be met by tenants as well as owners.

### 3. Proposals for Site at Polean

A representation has been submitted by Looe Town Council regarding the proposed employment site at Polean which straddles the border between Looe and Lansallos Parishes. In paragraph 11 of their representation, they suggest two options in terms of a possible way forward. Does the Steering Group have any views on the suggested options? In addition, has there been any discussion or agreement with Looe Town Council about possible policy wording which could be included in the respective Neighbourhood Plans regarding this site?

SG Response: We engaged with the Looe NDP team a number of times during 2017 to co-ordinate our respective approaches to the Polean area, making a joint site visit with Cornwall Council and the Looe NDP team, providing a summary of responses to the Polean question in our household questionnaire (which we were advised were broadly in line with the responses received to a similar question in Looe's questionnaire) and then emailing our proposed draft policy on commercial development to the Looe NDP team for comment. We believe we made it clear that because such a small corner of the Polean site falls within the boundary of Lansallos Parish we have taken the view that the site is primarily the responsibility of Looe and we would support a development proposal for the whole site provided that it meets the requirements of our NDP Policy 8. We have not heard further from the Looe NDP team or discussed any precise wording with them. We understand that Looe Town Council have recently decided to commission a Master Plan Study for Polean and look forward to reading the conclusions of this study in due course. Meanwhile we were advised that naming Polean in our NDP could trigger the need for an SEA, which we did not feel would be appropriate or proportionate in view of Lansallos Parish's rather marginal interest in the area.

Following the second option suggested by Looe Town Council we would be happy to name Polean either in the justification of Policy 8 or in the policy itself if it is felt that this would clarify our intentions, provided the change would not require our NDP to be subject to an SEA.

As an unrelated point, while re-checking our NDP Policy 8 we have noticed a typing error in Paragraph 8.29 which refers to Policy 9 instead of Policy 8.

CC response: no additional comments to those made by the steering group

### 4. Policy 3 and Talland Area

I have received a suggested rewording of paragraph 8.16 from the Steering Group. This suggests some rewording of the text of the NP to provide clearer guidance about the limited number of sites which may be suitable for infill in

Talland. Does the Steering Group have any views about whether an associated change is also required to Policy 3?

SG Response: After some discussion we felt that the amendment to Paragraph 8.16 by itself should make our intentions sufficiently clear and should allow for very limited development in the Talland area without comprising its distinctive character. However we would not be opposed to adding Talland to the policy itself if it is felt that would provide greater clarity.

CC response: In the proposed extra wording, is the statement 'It is felt that the Talland area is different in character from other parts of the parish' meant to imply that this area is more built up, or more rural? As I read the statement overall, I think that it is on balance discouraging infill development (whilst acknowledging that Policy 3 will apply) and that would be a reason not to include it in the policy.

If the Examiner feels that there is a need for Talland to be referenced in the policy, is there a need for a distinction between the level of infill appropriate at Talland and the level which is appropriate in Lansallos and Trenewan?

A distinction is already implied between Polperro and the areas of Lansallos and Trenewan, because the former is within a settlement boundary. By mentioning potential for limited infill at Talland, but not referring to it in the policy, this implies a distinction between Talland and Lansallos and Trenewan, with less opportunity for infill at Talland. If this is the intention this could be made explicit in any policy wording if reference to Talland is included.