

Portreath NDP Appendix 14 Issues raised during consultation and steering group responses

(Click to follow link)

- Policy 1 [Locations and Scale for New Housing Development](#)
- Policy 2 [Housing Type, Size and Layout](#)
- Policy 3 [Principal Residency Requirement](#)
- Policy 4 [Design Standards](#)
- Policy 5 [Designated and Non-designated Heritage Assets](#)
- Policy 6 [The Portreath Harbour component of the Cornwall and West Devon World Heritage Site](#)
- Policy 7 [Conserving and Enhancing Village Character](#)
- Policy 8 [Provision of Energy efficient buildings and places](#)
- Policy 9 [Safeguarding and Enhancing our Valued and Designated Landscapes and Seascapes](#)
- Policy 10 [Conserving and Enhancing the Godrevy to Portreath Section of the Cornwall AONB](#)
- Policy 11 [Conserving, Enhancing and Restoring Biodiversity and the Natural Environment](#)
- Policy 12 [Informal Recreational Activities and Access](#)
- Policy 13 [Flood and Tidal Vulnerability and Coastal Erosion](#)
- Policy 14 [Local Green Space Designations](#)
- Policy 15 [Supporting and Safeguarding existing and supporting new Community Facilities](#)
- Policy 16 [Community Scale Renewable Energy](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
1	Is this closed? Anyone interested in the intricate details of planning processes might find this locally relevant case interesting. https://www.judiciary.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Corbett-v-Cornwall-Council-judgment-9-April-2020.pdf of course, there are whole libraries full of this stuff!	GoCollaborate	1	As above	As above	
1	Policy 1. Village Settlement Boundary. The principle of identifying a settlement boundary, using it as a policy boundary and having different policies inside/outside of it is unarguable and fully supportable. However, it is not clear how this boundary has been arrived at and for this reason I don't support it in its current form. A settlement boundary factually and objectively exists whether or not a line is drawn on a map. No boundary map for Portreath existed in the former KDP Housing Chapter. Where did the so called 'original' map dated 2018 in the supporting evidence come from? The 'methodology' included cannot result in the map produced nor does it obviously reflect any process recorded in the minutes. I would prefer to see a factually fully inclusive currently accurate map as a starting point (e.g. from the VCA) together with detailed explanations specifically addressing each modification/removal and explaining exactly how they support delivering sustainable development.	GoCollaborate	1	The boundaries worked from the original draft of settlement boundaries produced for the the Cornwall Plan	A review of settlement boundaries was undertaken which recommended that the boundaries are removed from policy 1 and replaced by defined settlement areas and specified scale of development. This recommendation is approved by the steering group	
1	I think that the valley beside the incline should not be developed as it will ruin perhaps the most important historical feature in Portreath, the incline itself. Any building or development alongside it will prevent it being viewed without obstruction. I personally think it is a retrograde step allowing a	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	As above	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	caravan on site and it should be removed. So I specifically support the settlement boundary as it is and would not like it changed in the final version.					
1	I think the plan is entirely in line with what the majority, perhaps the silent majority, asked for during the earlier meetings and engagement events.	GoCollaborate	1	As above	As above	
1	I think it is vital to protect the remaining unspoilt landscape in Portreath specifically, specifically the valley sides both in the village and as it opens to Portreath Bay	GoCollaborate	1	As above	As above	
1	The area adjacent to the incline and directly behind railway terrace still has the footprint and foundations of buildings that were an integral part of the village and as such should be included in the permitted area of development.	GoCollaborate	1 +7 supporting	As above	As above	
1	<p>I have noticed that my garden which is situated at Sunny Corner has been taken out of the proposed settlement boundary, this area to the east side of my property has been used, and continues to be used by my children and their friends from the village for a play area and also for camps and sleepovers in the two existing buildings which have been on this land since before the 2nd world war.</p> <p>This land is also bounded with a large bund/ stone wall and I would like this parcel of land to remain within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>There are sufficient planning laws and policies already in place to prevent inappropriate building.</p> <p>A fellow resident questioned around thirty residents about the proposed NDP and the overwhelming majority had no knowledge of the plan until they received the recent flyer, maybe this</p>	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting	Noted	As above	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	should be put out for a reconsultation ensuring that every resident of the parish definitely has the relevant information sent to them in a simple format. I do not support the NDP.					
1	Suitability should be driven by further factors other than geographical location. For example, flood risk, landslide risk, impact on biodiversity. Boundary areas could be a blunt tool for a more complex decision.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	Other factors will be taken into account as well as any settlement boundaries used	
1	I would like to see what the alternatives are to the existing settlement boundary.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	See comment 1	
1	It seems wrong to exclude from the settlement areas places that already have houses on. We need more homes in Portreath not fewer. There's also many places where homes used to be which have been excluded. We need to re-use these brown field sites for building. The rest of the UK is having to build more homes to address the housing crisis and Portreath is no exception.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted in relation to Settlement boundaries our housing needs assessment suggests we need to be clear what type of homes are needed	Do not agree with home numbers but other issues will be taken into account on settlement boundary review	
1	Assuming this means per development not per settlement -supported	GoCollaborate	1	It does	Thank you	
1	Further the houses behind Tregea Terrace on Tregea Hill have an equally natural and obvious boundary, that of the cliffs directly behind the properties, again it seems incongruous to separate the back gardens from the main properties. For the same reasons as I have relied upon in my most previous message.	GoCollaborate	1 +4 supporting	Noted	As per previous comments on settlement boundaries	
1	There is no need for a double imposition on the gardens in Tregea Terrace. For these gardens to be designated as outside of the settlement boundary and also to be regarded as open space is incongruous. There are perfectly adequate planning laws in place that are already stringent enough to ensure unnecessary and inappropriate developed is	GoCollaborate	1+3 supporting	Noted	As above	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	not allowed. I do NOT support the present proposal for the settlement boundary as per the map on page 26 of your consultations document. There is a natural and obvious boundary for these properties where there back gardens met the armco barrier on Tregea Hill.					
1	Having perused the documents I see on page 26 a map outlining the new proposed settlement boundary. This is an arbitrary demarcation line draw without any reasonable justification. Not only is it unjustified, it is undemocratic and unnecessary. There are sufficient planning laws and policies already in place to prevent inappropriate building. This further imposition on freeholders land is impinging on their rights as home and land owners. I DO NOT support this encroachment on my rights which would further impede any planning application I may or may not wish to make in the future. There are perfectly adequate and protective rules in place already.	GoCollaborate	1 +7 supporting + 1 against	Noted	As above	
1	I think the limitation of three homes in Portreath (or two in Bridge) could be limiting beyond necessary limits. For example it may be possible to put a small development of four flats on the footprint of an existing small single property. This would give more small homes (as desired by the plan) without covering any new area of land than is presently covered.	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting + 1 against	Noted	We have increased the numbers of dwellings to allow for flats	
1	While we support the proposals set out in the NDP, we feel that the plan currently does not take into sufficient consideration the area of Bridge Moor, More specifically we would like to see the currently vacant Bridge Moor site between the Pemberthy Road and the river be part of the allocated sites designated for housing and development.	GoCollaborate	1 +1 against			

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	The site has been the subject of a pre-application earlier in 2020; We would like the site allocated for 'Self Build' and 'Community Right to Build' schemes to enable local engagement with the site while also supporting low cost builds. The site offers opportunities directly in line with the general aims of the NDP now proposed, with improvement in terms of environment, nature (river and trees) , transport, and amenity space as well potentially in terms of workplace/meeting place for locals.					
1	I think the village could actually support more properties than that, they need to be appropriate an to fit in but if there is the opportunity to provide more housing for young families, people in need we should do so.	GoCollaborate	1 + 1 supporting +2 against	Noted	We have increased the numbers of dwellings to allow for flats	
1	Vote against the plan. This whole plan is predominately about Portreath village and a little bit of Bridge. It's been cobbled together with a small committee and is only now being discussed because the policies are available. It's been done under the guise of Portreath Parish which has ramifications for residents of Cambrose and part of Porthtowan including all farmlands, and the majority of these residents don't have any details of the policies.	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	The policies in the plan apply other areas in the parish too	Not agreed	
1	Appropriating private gardens/land in the guise that it will benefit future generations is a misguided statement.	GoCollaborate	1+2 supporting	Noted	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	
1	Affordable housing - As the number of building sites are restricted, the value of the available sites will increase on a linear scale. Therefore if a plot of land sells for £300k no one is going to build a couple of affordable homes that sell for £125K. It's pie in the sky.	GoCollaborate	1+ 5 supporting	The polices need to do everything they can to encourage affordable builds and the village character assessment outlines cleare		

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	Houses that blend in with the village - I understand at least three committee members have recently built houses for themselves. Do they blend in with the village? No support from me			characteristics for future build		
1	I can't open the Draft Plan Summary edition. I would like to see the reasoning behind 3 properties for development. If there was a proposal for supported living or smaller units for elderly people or singles, then I would have thought 2 ground floor flats and 2 flats above would have been a standard design. Obviously that would then be 4 properties.	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	Noted	We have increased the numbers of dwellings to allow for flats	
1	There is already enough / too much development near the Bridge area. Overdeveloped at Illogan with the old overflow church / graveyard being built on by Coastline housing. We already have far too much traffic and in the summer time it gets even worse.	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting	Noted	See issues on settlement boundaries	
1	The new settlement boundary is in entirely the wrong place. It should be on the top outer edge of the properties in Primrose Terrace, including their gardens. It cannot go through peoples residential properties as it is confusing and nonsensical. Regardless of this imaginary boundary, people still have their permitted development rights. People know their boundaries and the land registry supports them. You have managed to take my entire garden out of the village somehow and several other people are complaining of the same draconian action.	GoCollaborate	1 +7 supporting + 1 against	Noted	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	
1	I have put area 5 and I think i mean area 6 Shows you how difficukt your bloody plan is tonread and understand 😏	GoCollaborate	1 +2 Supporting			

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
1	Why have you changed areas that have always been part of Portreath ? Ordinance survey maps show your pink and black areas to be wrong I need an expert to look into this for me	GoCollaborate	1 +2 Supporting	We are not changing the boundaries but adding sub boundaries within	see comments on settlement boundaries	
1	There were always dwellings on this piece of land In fact the foundations of said dwellings are still there I'm talking about the land adjacent to the incline Southern valley side Character area 5 This entire document is not user friendly for the average person In fact it's open to many diferent interpretations I've spoken to 4 people who have all read the documents and have come to diferent conclusions This is not conducive or consistent to achieving an accurate view of how people feel	GoCollaborate	1 +5 supporting	Noted we tried to make the docuent as user friendly as possible but it is a planning document	No change	
1	There is no legal definition of "affordable housing". What is affordable to one person may not be affordable to others. So, if only "affordable houses" can be built in certain areas, what criteria will be used to determine if they are, indeed, affordable??	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	We agree that this is important and will seek to find a definition	Review and add definition	
1	1. There is no clear definition of "affordable housing". What is affordable to one person may not be affordable to another. 2. Like all other seaside resort areas, property prices in or near Portreath Parish have risen dramatically in the last several years and no doubt, will keep rising, especially with the influx of home buyers from other areas of the UK. 3. The increase in road traffic near Bridge and in the village is already dangerous. Building more	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	Noted	See above	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	"developments" will increase traffic and increase danger of road accidents.					
1	The settlement plan cuts through some gardens and does not include foundations of previous building adjacent to the incline Therefore land owners cannot rebuild these cottages as it has now been redesignated	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting + 1 against	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	
1	The settlement boundaries need to be amended. The top half of the gardens of Primrose terrace (south side) are presently shown outside the settlement boundaries. The boundary presently cuts through the centre of the housing estate at Feadon Farm i.e. Tregea Close and Ashton Close are outside the boundary. The whole of the Gwelan Mor estate (both old original and relatively new buildings) is outside the boundary	GoCollaborate	1 +3 supporting	As above	As above	As above
1	I believe that a small set of 4 apartments could be built on the footprint of one property. As small 2 bedroom homes are wanted in the parish. The policy as it stands is too restrictive	GoCollaborate	1 +1 against	Noted	We have increased the numbers of dwellings to allow for flats	
1	Per development?	GoCollaborate	1	Yes	Document to be changed to clarify	
1	The settlement boundaries are inconsistent as drawn. The Gardens behind Primrose Terrace have been bisected and those behind Tregea Terr have been totally excluded (highlighted in red in my attachment) whereas large plots below Green Lane have been included (highlighted in green). Surely all the curtilages of people's properties have to be respected and included within the settlement boundary? More than half of the already built on the Feadon Farm Estate and adjoining Gwelan Mor development of both holiday lodges and private residences have been also been excluded. This makes no sense as they already in existence and	GoCollaborate	1	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	<p>therefore should be included within settlement boundary.</p> <p>The Policy states no more than 3 properties per site in Portreath. There is no indication of how big a site is and therefore how any development may or may not be considered appropriate is difficult. Therefore a blanket statement of no more than three is too non specific and possibly going against the aim of NDP.</p>					
1	<p>I object to the separating of the properties on Tregea Terrace from their back gardens. I am worried that this may affect what we can do with our back garden. The boundary of our land is Tregea Hill!</p>	GoCollaborate	1	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	See previous comments on settlement boundaries	
1	<p>Great number of errors in generating the Settlement boundary published in the draft NDP. The previous settlement boundary document that this is based on was never adopted, so the SG effectively started from scratch and could easily have drawn the line along the edge of propereties rather than through back gardens, used natural boundaries and applied the national infill and rounding off principles in Piortreath, Bridge and Cambrose. Where properties are affected by settlement boundary restrictions, Heritage designation or green space designation there is a mandated obligation (National Planning Framework) to engage with property owners to hightlight future implications of thiose designations.</p>	GoCollaborate	1	As above	as above	
1	<p>VCA Appendix C page 74 para 2: Incorrect statement.</p> <p>There IS opportunity for rounding off in area P6 and adjusting the settlement boundary that has been imported from the previously unadopted plan.</p> <p>The land to the west of the Incline is an ideal</p>	GoCollaborate	1+2 supporting	Noted	as above	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	candidate for inclusion as a rounded off area bounded by areas 1, 5 and 7 to the north, west and south and the natural barrier of the incline railway structure.					
1	<p>I cannot find any supporting justification in the plan for dictating that the private land to the west of the incline ("incline valley character area P6)" be designated a Green Site or excluded outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The land warrants one solitary sentence in the 8 pages of Appendix C, (page 71) which in no way supports any of the conclusions arrived at in P6 Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>In Appendix D (apparently still only in draft, even though presented as supporting documentation), the land warrants two sentences, one on page 55 and another on page 56, which again in no way support any conclusions wrt placing the Settlement boundary or green space designation.</p>	GoCollaborate	1+2 supporting	This particular local green space will be included in the settlement review	This green space has now been removed	
1	<p>Re: VCA Appendix C page 74 para 1. "Undeveloped and wooded" is not 'Landscape Character'. It is 'Land Use'. These are distinctly different things and this conflation and misconception should not be used support the policy as advised.</p> <p>Re: para 2: The advice that "they should be viewed as isolated development in the open countryside" goes against High Court judgements and consequent Local Planning Authority practice.</p> <p>Leaving aside the technical planning/law considerations, no one would ordinarily apply the word 'isolated' to these properties. Again, this advice should not be used to support the proposed policy because it does nothing except to create ground for time and money wasting legal challenges. (Which the NDP/LPA would almost</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Can we discuss at steering group please		

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	certainly lose). Also, even if effective, the policy opens the way for types of development which need be neither infill or rounding off, neither of which apply to open countryside!					
1	Is the NDP aware that in placing properties and parts of them outside of the settlement boundary, any development upon them is no longer subject to the restriction of being infill or rounding off?	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	Yes	No further action	
1	There is no 'What's wrong with this page button' . The 'View Document' link in the 'Minimum NDP Housing Target for Cornwall (Portreath)' box throws up only a 'How many second homes are there in Cornwall?' from 2018. Surely not the correct document?	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	The view should also have offered sight of the housing needs assessment	No further action	
1	To follow on from my previous comment (1000 characters is very restrictive I think) I very much disapprove of several houses in my street laying empty for a lot of the year and giving the impression of being abandoned.because of holiday letting use. It seems quite wrong families do not live in them. But what policy can the NDP to address this? Obviously, it cannot do anything and the principal home restriction is irrelevant.	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting	We note your frustration but this is not within the remit of the NDP	No further action	
1	Re: Principal Home condition. It is quite obvious that the vast majority of holiday use properties are existing or replacement dwellings. Given that the NDP, despite surrounding jargon, appears to gravitate towards preventing new properties altogether it is difficult to see what effect this policy would actually have. One effect is to make existing properties more attractive (i.e. £valuable) for holiday letting. Also, where is the bureaucracy to support this? Who pays for it? It surely cannot be said in an area that relies heavily on tourism that such activity is a 100% negative? As well as that,	GoCollaborate	1 +2 supporting	The policies are also attempting to use new build for affordable and smaller housing	Concern noted	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	<p>many of the properties used for holiday lets are owned by people who live locally! It is difficult to support policy that seems pretty much totally ineffective and gives the impression only of being an expression of poorly disguised xenophobia and envy.</p>					
<p>1</p>	<p>Re: The gardens on Primrose Terrace (these comments might also apply to other areas). These gardens which date from the mid 18th Century are already in the AGLV and World Heritage Site. The proposal to place them outside the settlement boundary simply seems incoherent and pointless since as well as being constrained by not only these designations, the topography and access renders them almost totally unuseable for new housing. In any case, the gardens already have development rights. The owners can cut down all the trees and planting if they want and put extensive permitted development on them. It's up to the owners. There are many existing examples including large structures at the top adjoining the field against the skyline. Everyone else can do that as well. The NDP cannot 'protect' the particular condition or view of these gardens as some people seem (maybe are incorrectly being led) to believe. Especially not by the non factual 'settlement' boundary proposed.</p>	<p>GoCollaborate</p>	<p>1 + 2 supporting +1 Against</p>	<p>See previous comments on settlement boundaries</p>	<p>See previous comments on settlement boundaries</p>	
<p>1</p>	<p>It would be better if the NDP was clear on the difference between 'Settlement Boundary', 'Development Boundary' and 'Policy map/area boundary'. These are all different things and using one in place of the other can create confusing and incoherent results. (As can not understanding the difference in the first place) Chopping off parts of the village (even parts of individual properties) on the false pretence that they are not part of the</p>	<p>GoCollaborate</p>	<p>1 + 2 supporting +1 Against</p>	<p>We agree that it is important to be clear on definitions. The purpose of a settlement boundary is to assist planning not to separate the village</p>	<p>See new recommendations on settlement boundary above</p>	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	settlement of Portreath in order to impose policy is clumsy and incoherent and can also have unintended adverse consequences. It should not be taken for granted that development approved pursuant to policies applicable to open countryside are what would be welcome in what is factually the settlement irrespective of the misconceived boundary. If detailed policy is considered appropriate for gardens, it would be better that one is written that applies to all of the village on the basis of a settlement boundary that includes what is factually the settlement					
1	I am happy and support that the settlement boundary is where it, with perhaps a few minor modifications, as it will protect the remaining unique landscape of the valley sides in Portreath. Specifically I have no issue that the settlement boundary goes through my garden in Primrose Terrace in order to preserve my part of the valley sides to be without further development.	GoCollaborate	1	Any modifications made in boundaries need to continue to offer protection	see above	
1	I'm personally supportive of having the upper part of my garden in Primrose Terrace outside of the settlement boundary to ensure it remains undeveloped in the future.	GoCollaborate	1 + 1 supporting + 1 against	See above	See above	
1	I think the wording in this ;policy should say three per plot or development - it reads as three in total for all of Portreath	GoCollaborate	1 +3 supporting	Agreed	This change will be made	
1	Cambrose is a large settlement, should be included within the plan.	GoCollaborate	1 +1supporting	Cambrose is taken into account in the plan and will be included in the review of settlement boundaries		
1	The proposed housing numbers are essentially saying that the village cannot grow any further. If that is the intention then may be the housing policy	GoCollaborate	1 +1 supporting	This is not the intention of the policy rather it is to specify the types of	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
	should explicitly state that. While this might not be the intention the current policy is inflexible to future housing needs. For example over the longer term should the plan think about how the village settlement boundary should change in response to inevitable sea level rises driven by climate change. Climate change will mean replacement housing on higher ground will be required for the most vulnerable parts of the village. Where we would like to see the housing be sighted?			houses needed in the village		
1	As long as new for old using the existing footprint	GoCollaborate	1	NDP covers new development sites	No change	
1	Per development ?	GoCollaborate	1	Agreed	Will be changed to development	
1	Relative level of support for policy	GoCollaborate platform	84	Agree - 51 Disagree - 21, Undecided - 12	Overall support for this policy	
1	Objection to the exclusion of land south of Railway Terrace from the development envelope	Petition	? Final number	The objection has been noted and included in the review of the settlement boundary	See recommendations from review	
1	I would like to see the currently vacant Bridge Moor site between the Pemberthy Road (in the bend of the road B3300) and the river be part of the allocated sites designated for housing and development. The site offers the possibility of developments that meet the vision described in the NDP, and the requirements of Policy 1 and 2 and 3 for new Housing.	Email	1			
1	In regard to Figure 6 it is accepted that the Gwel-an-Mor Site lies outside the Portreath Settlement Boundary.	Email	2	Noted. Other comments received in this correspondence will be considered elsewhere.	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 1 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	
1	River Row/Tregea Terrace including land to side of incline. Line should run along Tregea Hill and East.	Zoom	3	The objection has been noted and included in the review of the settlement boundary	see previous comments	
1	Need to include whole of Portreath Village	Zoom	2	Point noted	as above	
1	Lack of owner involvement. Need to be consulted	Zoom	2	This is part of the Pre-Submission consultation	All comments are being reviewed. A robust consultation has been undertaken	
1	Settlement boundary should include curtilage of peoples property and also the properties at the Feadon Farm development and Gwel an Mor	Post office form	1	The objection has been noted and included in the review of the settlement boundary	see previous comments	
1	Blanket statement of no more than 3 properties does not take account of the size of the plot and excudes types of building (such as small blocks of 4 flats) which would meet other objectives.	Post office form	1	noted	we have increased the numbers of dwellings in the policy to address this	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 2 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
2	Up to 3 properties per site - depends upon the plot size	PO Form and note	1	Current planning regulations ensure no over development	No change	
2	Supports policy as wishes to develop in Bridge Moor	Email	1	Welcomes support	No change	
2	What is deemed to be an 'affordable' home	Zoom meeting and Gogollaborate	2	Impossible to define this at a parish level and so will use CC local plan definitions. Other local NDPs do not refer to specific local affordable definitions of affordability	No change	
2	Plan appears to be restricting the number of houses that can be built	Zoom meeting and GoCollaborate	4	Engagement feedback and the housing needs assessment report which shows an over delivery of 179 houses to date against it's allocation from Cornwall Council counter the views expressed. In addition 3 comments favourable to the HNA data and 1 unfavourable	No change	
2	Support lifetime homes	GoCollaborate	1	Agree	No change	
2	Any new property will impact the carbon footprint and so should start as near to zero as possible	GoCollaborate	1	Agree and dealt with in policy 8	No change	
2	4 bedroom affordable houses also needed	GoCollaborate	1	This is possible in 'exceptional circumstances'	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 3 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
3	Principle homes policy would be detrimental to the village. St Ives quoted as example where established properties in town centre bought as second homes as St Ives NDP had a similar policy. Also led to higher property prices in centre. It is suggested Gwel an Mor are excluded from this policy	Email & Zoom	3 = 3 supports	The strong feeling about 2nd home ownership (4th most concerning with 39% of parishioners stating this) indicates this matter is of great concern. Neighbouring St Agnes NDP has a similar principle homes policy. For 2nd home ownership figures to carry on unchecked would only escalate the current issue	No change	Add in that the policy only applies to the settlement areas
3	Principle homes policy would be detrimental to Gwel an Mor's future business development. Its plans for further development would be hampered and the local economy and employment would be harmed. It is suggested that this matter is removed from the policy or Gwel an Mor are excluded from it	Email, Zoom and GoCollaborate	7 + 1 support	Gwel an Mor was involved in all aspects of engagement of the business community including hosting one of their meetings. The future aims of the Gwel an Mor business were not shared with the group. There were equally favourable/unfavourable comments in GoCollaborate data relating to the balance between restricting trade and restricting second home ownership. In the phase 1 report, the 58 responders to the business survey requested a planning policy for second home ownership - this is such draft policy	No change in this policy but other business related policies will address	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 3 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
3	The period of time holiday lets would be available for occupation would be less than year round according to the VCA.It is suggested Gwel an Mor are excluded from this policy	Email & Zoom	3	The VCA mentions this but it is not a policy	Modify VCA page 83 P7.1 to remove this comment	Amend in draft plan
3	Add redundant properties to the list of open countryside circumstances where development would be allowable	GoCollaborate	1	Niether the CLP or NPPF allow for this	No change	
3	Clarification of what is intended in terms of numbers of properties that could be built within the settlement boundaries	Email	2	The wording within the draft plan is clear but a frequently asked question was circulated to help understanding which stated that the number of new dwellings that could be built (3 Portreath and 2 elsewhere within the parish) was per site	The current wording in policy 1 states that the numbers of properties that could be built is per site.Therefore no change is necessary. Page 27	
3	Holiday lets and second homes are not as big an issue as other coastal parishes (less than 10%) It is suggested the policy only relates to new developments within the settlement boundaries and that an enforceable condition be added	GoCollaborate	6 = 3 supports	The main concern was related to Portreath village and the settlement areas cover that area	The policy remains but is restricted to the settlement areas.This could satisfy the request of Gwel an Mor to be excluded and others who feel this would be too restrictive. Page 34 Enforceability is covered by the legal status of the NDP.	Add in that the policy only applies to the settlement areas

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 4 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation
4	<p>Re: Policy 7. The words .."proportionate to the scale and nature of each development,..". Presumably, despite the use of 'All development..', the word 'proportionate' can only be intended to operate within the scope of the statutory requirement to submit a Design and Access statement? Or does the NDP seek to impose on applicants a wider requirement than Parliament has enacted?</p>	Go Collaborate	1	<p>Question relates to Policy 7 and a similar comment has also been raised in respect of Policy 9. The SG has considered this and agree with the point raised by the consultees.</p>	<p>The words 'the design and access statement' should be replaced with the words 'a supporting statement' in the following policies. Policy 7(a) and Policy 9(b) and also in Policy 5(c), Policy 5(d) and Policy 10(c).</p>
4	<p>The original character if the village would have been fishing, mining cottages for workers. No need to go back to no electricity, no toilets. These things could be incorporated into cottages with today's modern conveniences. Looking classically old but with modern twist. It would help the village to look and feel authentic. However, I've no idea where these could be built,</p>	Go Collaborate	1	Noted	No change
4	<p>NDP Draft Page 35 Policy 4 Design Standards (e) - wording makes no sense. Typo perhaps? "through its layout,</p>	Go Collaborate	1	<p>Considered. This is not a typo but the wording could be made clearer. The policy intention is to encourage the prevention of crime to be considered at the design stage,</p>	Add a comma after the word 'detailing'.

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 4 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation
	orientation and detailing designs out crime;"				
4	<p>a) The village has already been ruined by the houses built since the sixties onwards and completely disregarded heritage. There are more new houses than the character houses. If you intend to limit new build to handful of houses/flats it isn't going to make any difference what style they are.</p> <p>b) You are saying you will not allow external security lighting for homes/ businesses or for matters of safety. Good luck with enforcing that.</p>	Go Collaborate	1	<p>a) Noted</p> <p>b) The policy states 'if external lighting is required, it protects the night sky as far as possible'. It is not the intention to prevent security lighting.</p>	No change
4	<p>Really valuable and interesting pieces of work. There are many different characters, as the document explains, which does make it more difficult to ask for a development to be in keeping with the other houses.</p> <p>I particularly like the small things that make areas distinct, ie the stone front walls along Penberthy Road. It would be great to have car</p>	Go Collaborate	1	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy 8 states 'Any new development to incorporate car charging point infrastructure;</p>	No change

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 4 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation
	charging points in new developments incorporated into the off road parking.				
4	The area is already being overdeveloped. It used to be a reasonably quiet area but now it is getting turned into something it does not belong to be. Particularly in the summer time. The place gets loaded up with people and traffic. They have monstrosities built so close to the edge of the land I wouldn't be surprised to see a few of them end up in the sea. Not only are they horrid to the eye but I doubt the average wage earner in Cornwall could even consider purchasing one.	Go Collaborate	1	Noted. The NDP covers future development. It cannot be applied retrospectively.	No change
4	I agree with the above comment regarding people have already built huge monstrous houses overlooking the beach But is it moral of some of those same people who have done that to now tell others they can't ?	Go Collaborate	1 + supported by 2	The NDP covers future development. It cannot be applied retrospectively. Policies have been developed via a pre determined process of consultation with the community.	No change
4	In many areas, off road parking is difficult or impossible. I agree with other comments that the character of properties to be	Go Collaborate	1	Comments noted. Policy 13 covers Flood and Tidal Vulnerability and Coastal Erosion	No change

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 4 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation
	in keeping with the heritage of the area has already been destroyed by new builds. Adding more homes to flood risk areas is risky at best, especially "affordable" housing, as the cost of insurance for homes in flood risk areas is extremely high.				
4	why has cambrose been left out and why have you jumped over cambrose to porthtowan hill doesn't seem right if you ask me and you need to look at land for new affordable housing outside the village in a sustainable location closer to schools work and shops,	Go Collaborate	1 + supported by 1	The SG has been advised that Cambrose has specifically not been recognised as a settlement in all recent planning decisions. The subject of what can be built (including affordable housing) outside the settlement boundary is covered in FAQ 4. Edition 1. https://www.portreathndp.org/FAQs_and_Zoom_Session_Summaries_34538.aspx	No change.
4	On the face of it this sounds good. However with such a variety of property in the parish and even in the same street, this would be very difficult to achieve. Who would decide?	Go Collaborate Zoom Feedback form Email	6 + supported by 5 1 1	The SG recognises this point and the character of different areas is documented in detail in the Village Character Assessment and the Local Landscape Character Assessment which form part of the NDP. Once adopted, the NDP must be taken into account when planning decisions are made,	No change
4	The character of the area matters.	Go Collaborate	1	Noted	No change
4	please don't allow any more Cornish hedges to be replaced with wooden.	Go Collaborate	1	This is covered by Policy 11. 3c which states 'ensure retention, restoration and/or re-creation of habitat linkages	No change

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 4 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation
				such as Cornish hedges as part of developments'	
4	The provision for off-road parking should ensure that drainage through the parking surface is porous to allow for run-off or it will simply add to flood risk.	Go Collaborate	1	Comments noted. Policy 13 covers Flood and Tidal Vulnerability and Coastal Erosion	No change
4	Likes design out crime	Police email	1	Agreed	No change

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
5	Can it made clear what the actual evidence is for each asset? Government guidelines state: " Irrespective of how they are identified, it is important that the decisions to identify them as non-designated heritage assets are based on sound evidence.	email	1	Dwelling age was derived from study of old maps, the age groups matches those of the CISI survey of Portreath except where it was unable to pursue the oldest categories because of COVID and the closure of Kresen Kernow. Dwelling age was derived from study of old maps, the age groups matches those of the CISI survey of Portreath except where it was unable to pursue the oldest categories because of COVID and the closure of Kresen Kernow. This methodology was approved by the NDP planning consultant	Due process not followed to compile the non-designated asset list Appendix B. Amend pages 1 & 2 of the Appendix. Remove all pages from 6 upwards, except for pages 28-45 which are the amended short version of the CISI report. From the pre-submission copy of the plan take out 2.4.22 and amend Heritage policies from 7.6-7.6.8 + the table. The existing appendix B should be passed to the parish council to use as a starting point for a future non-designated asset list.
5	NON _DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS Primarily our residence, but applies in general. What is the evidence for our property to be in the now-designated, non-designated heritage assets list? I cant find it. Please show me something that will stand up in a court of law. As mentioned to Chris Matijasevic when he delivered NDP hard copy to us. A photographer only identified by first name wanted to photograph a feature for the community. Lots of other photo's were taken of our property whilst on it, and my wife instructed her to delete them. At no time was it mentioned that the photo's would be published and in the public	email	1	I wrote to you on the 9/12 regarding this matter. Maybe you did not see my response. I note that you wish any images of our property and land removed from appendix B, heritage inventory, and this will be done asap	Images removed. Recommendation at F5 above applies

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
	<p>domain. Permission was not asked for publishing and none was or is given. Someone also renamed our property. Please remove any images that show any part of our property/garden area from all media, and confirm.</p>				
5	<p>It has come to my attention that a photograph of our home and my car with the registration number clearly visible has been published as part of the PNDP booklet. Please remove this immediately.</p>	email	1	<p>Many thanks this is really useful. By means of an update I have emailed James Evans and have asked him to remove the photo from the inventory. While we wait for him to do so I have emailed the coordinators of the NDP website, GoCollaborate and the Parish Council to ask them to delete the current Appendix.</p> <p>My apologies for this once again The amendment has now been made to the document and I have sent the revised version out for uploading. Ref HM</p>	<p>Images removed. Recommendation at F5 above applies</p>
5	<p>Policy 5. I make nothing of it, but just for accuracy I note that number 100 on the CISI list which was designated a 'significant building' was demolished along with its Cornish Hedge Walls. But having noted that, I suppose it does raise the question of exactly what significance or status is assumed by anything being on a list. And that the list now records something that does not exist but detailed notes appear against other entries. A technical detail that no one noticed maybe. But the devil is in the detail, as they say</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	<p>Amended in short form CISI attachment</p>

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
5	The non designated items in this policy have been compiled and written by a person or persons with no expertise or qualifications in the subject. Indeed, the photo's taken on our property were done so under false pretenses and the photographer who had no ID and didn't stipulate the precise reason for the vist was told to delete some photo's of the layout of our property	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	Images removed. Recommendation at F5 above applies
5	A very detailed and interesting piece of work. Often we don't notice the value of places we see every day.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	Noted
5	Although I have read through as much of the proposed report that my eyes could withstand I am still confused what it would mean in simple terms for the likes of myself in Tregea terrace, if it was to become a world heritage site what stipulations would be upheld in terms of my property, until I am satisfied that I understand fully the proposal I will have to remain undecided, I believe it is important to have some sort of meeting with residents and go through the proposal so we are fully aware of what it means for us	GoCollaborate	1	Historic England Advice note 7, para 23. The management of any locally listed asset will also be easier if it is included on the list with the knowledge of the owner. As a minimum, owners should be advised of the intention to locally list an asset, including an explanation of the planning implications, but it may be worth putting in place a process for handling appeals. Local listing is a good opportunity to develop a dialogue with ownersand to provide them with information on the local importance of their property.	Recommendation at F5 above applies
5	As our property is referenced in the documents as a "non designated heritage site", what exactly does this mean? Does your statement tell us that we are under rules regarding "appropriate repair and	GoCollaborate	1	Historic England Advice note 7, para 23. The management of any locally listed asset will also be easier if it is included on the list with the knowledge of the	Recommendation at F5 above applies

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
	conservation works"? And exactly what are those rules? Does this policy impact only new builds or existing properties. It is not clearly set out in this policy			owner. As a minimum, owners should be advised of the intention to locally list an asset, including an explanation of the planning implications, but it may be worth putting in place a process for handling appeals. Local listing is a good opportunity to develop a dialogue with owners and to provide them with information on the local importance of their property.	
5	I object to the way that the area at the top of Tregae Hill around Feadon Lane+Feadon Farm+The Incline is consistently wrongly referred to in the wording of the report as 'Gwel an Mor'. (This is the new name adopted for the Holiday Park when it was re-developed recently). This area of Portreath has been known as FEADON for hundreds of years. Could you please change the wording in the report to reflect the important historic value of FEADON, where the Engine House for the Incline still stands. I would also like to see a plaque of some sort on the converted Engine House	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	No action required
5	From Appendix F CISI 2000. "Walls are an important feature of Portreath..For example, the harbour sea wall, the Harbour Terrace enclosing walls, the walls to the roads from the harbour to Lighthouse Hill, the Harbour House Wall, the walls along Penberthy Road and the walls to Glenfeadon all make a positive	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
	<p>contribution to character. Where the walls that once existed have been lost definition evaporates,.. loss of front walls on the north side of Penberthy shows the extent to which this loss can adversely affect the historic character of the settlement." Even though this was known in 2000, The Parish Council have not only continued to support applications where these walls have been destroyed, it has failed to supported World Heritage Site office when they urge PPC and LPA to negotiate better design. The LPA in one case after saying that the design need be no better that what was around it, said that PPC supported it anyway! It is difficult to see how this NDP changes anything</p>				
5	<p>Beautifully vegetated Cornish Hedge walls are routinely destroyed taken away and replaced with cheap modern fencing and other poor substitutes. Baines Hill is a recent example where now one side is just an unattractive blank stretch of basic quaility fencing. This is also an example of the dripping tap effect where bit by bit the historical character of the village disappears without trace. Unfortunately, under Part 11 'Heritage and demolition' of the General Permitted Development Order 2015, Class C, this appears permissible without any planning consent. Frankly, this is shocking. Can our Plan do anything to control this</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	No action required
5	<p>Of course, small scale permitted development, which is often out of</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Considered	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 5 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
	necessity cheap, poorly designed and visually unattractive cannot be affected by this policy. And the planning regulations restricting permitted development in a WHS as regards location and size seem to be routinely ignored anyway				

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 6 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Changes to be made
6	Of course, small scale permitted development, which is often out of necessity cheap, poorly designed and visually unattractive cannot be affected by this policy. And the planning regulations restricting permitted development in a WHS as regards location and size seem to be routinely ignored anyway. Typo (?) in the policy statement.	GoCollaborate	1	The wording referred to is All development proposals within, or in the setting of the Portreath Harbour ... The permitted development referred to here is actually restricted in a World Heritage Site	This should be changed to All development proposals within the setting of the Portreath Harbour...	This should be changed to All development proposals within the setting of the Portreath Harbour...
6	Harbour needs cleaning of seaweed smell.	GoCollaborate	1	This is the County Council responsibility as owners of the Harbour	Outside the scope of the NDP but should be taken up by the Portreath PC with Cornwall CC	
6	If we don't look after our heritage then not only Portreath but World Heritage Site status for all the sites in Cornwall could be lost through our carelessness. It is one of our top assets.	GoCollaborate	1	Agreed	No Change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 7 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Changes to be made
7	All development proposals, proportionate to the scale and nature of each development, should set out comprehensively, within a Design and Access Statement, how the proposals strengthen andenhance character, as described for the appropriate Village Character Area(s) (both within and within the setting of the development site) - Both within and within???	GoCollaborate	1	The wording referred to is Village Character Area(s) (both within and within the setting of the development site)	This should be changed to within both the Village Character Area(s) and also the setting of the development site.	This should be changed to within both the Village Character Area(s) and also the setting of the development site.
7	Policy 7 " .. distinctive and unique character of the built environment of the Parish" I'd have said that the overriding character of the built environment is that it has built up successively over the centuries and decades with whatever was the fashion and preference at the time. So much so that the current ubiquitous large boxes covered in pastel colour faux timber artificial composite cladding with pvc windows and a chinese slate roof are as much the 'character' as the radon emitting energy guzzling damp stacks of stone piled up by mine workers in the 1800's. To make objective judgements and firm rules about this kind of thing is well nigh impossible. Personally, I'd like it to be compulsory that all new buildings were designed by Stan Bolt. https://stanboltarchitect.com/completed-work.html Other than designating a conservation area where specific design codes can be enforced, it is all a matter of opinion and personal preference. That said, the NDP cannot NOT have this policy!	GoCollaborate	1	This contribution suggests that unless it is a conservation area it is just a matter of personal preference. However the contributor states that we have to have the policy included.	No change	
7	The requirement for design and access statements is set out in The Town and	GoCollaborate	1	The SG has considered this for this policy and others	The words 'the design and access	The words 'the design and access

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 7 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Changes to be made
	Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2013. Not all proposals require a D&A statement. Apart from statutory requirements, it is generally up to an applicant how they demonstrate compliance with policy. (Which of course may take the form of a document called a D&A statement if they so choose, even if not legally required!) Neither the NPPF or CLP require a D&A statement as a matter of policy. The requirement is set out in the Statutory Instrument. The LPA could not reject an application for lack of a D&A statement if the law does not require one. I'd say that the words requiring a design and access statement should be removed as they have a technical meaning that does not belong here as policy. I think the same thing has been said in other policies and the same applies. This makes no difference to the actual policy but improves legal accuracy.			and agree with the point raised by the consultees.	statement' should be replaced with the words 'a supporting statement' in the following policies. Policy 7(a) and Policy 9(b) and also in Policy 5(c), Policy 5(d) and Policy 10(c).	statement' should be replaced with the words 'a supporting statement' in the following policies. Policy 7(a) and Policy 9(b) and also in Policy 5(c), Policy 5(d) and Policy 10(c).
7	There are many different styles and it is important to provide homes for people who need them but this policy has to be in the NDP as this is surely what everyone wants for the village.	GoCollaborate	1	Agreed	No Change	
7	Houses are individual there is no set design within the village, anything that has similarities to any of the multitude of designs would be in keeping. Houses are an independent choice of course you wouldn't build a 5 storey modern house in the middle of bassets terrace but what is built is down to an individual why should it be dictated.	GoCollaborate	1	All plannings laws lay out what is allowed and not allowed. The NDP iallows greater local participation in what the local community wants and needs.	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 7 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Changes to be made
7	The area adjacent to the incline which is in the piece of land you refer to as southern valley site is private land and has never been public land or even open to the public .We are desperately short of bungalows suitable for the elderly to live in.This would be an ideal area to build such dwellings . It would provide the needed oppurtunity for existing elderly who are living in big family house's in the village somewhere to downsize to. It would free up big family homes for local children to be able to afford to buy , ad raise families in as well as providing the elderly of the village more suitable dwellings without having to leave the village they may have lived their whole lives in . This area would be very suitable.	GoCollaborate	3	Any developments in this area would be more dependent on the settlement area in Policy 1.Currently it would be subject to standard planning poicies.	No change	
7	What about the "new builds" already done that did not follow this policy? Many areas in the Parish already have newer houses that are not in keeping with the others they are close to. And who will decide what is done to "strengthen, enhance, etc." the area.	GoCollaborate	2	The object of the NDP is to help clarify what will strengthen, enhance etc in future developments.	No change	
7	Character protected without requirement. Badly worded - ambiguous.	GoCollaborate	1	Cannot find "Character Protected" within the policy. However there are extensive details within the VCA of the character of different areas of the village.	No Change	
7	Badly worded	GoCollaborate	1	Not defined	No change	
7	It is difficult to see how the heading 'Environmental' is directly connected to conservation and character (whatever they mean anyway) or how it is discernable as	GoCollaborate	1	The word environment has many uses and some may look at the meaning only applying to Policy 8.	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 7 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Changes to be made
	being conceptually distinct from other policy concepts aimed at doing the same thing. I'm not sure what I'm being asked to comment on. It does not seem to have anything to do with environmental matters in the sense that the word is commonly used. Of course, the planning system itself is not really a vehicle for supporting environmentalism except in the very broad sense of promoting development that will sustain humans for some undefined period into the future. It is not even obvious that 'sustainability' automatically requires conservation and enhancement of existing perceived 'character', (good or bad) anyway.			However the meanings - "the surroundings or conditions in which a person, animal or plant lives and operates" or "the natural world, as a whole or in a particular geographical area , especially as affected by human activity" definitely apply to Policy 7 as well as Policy 8.		
7	Does Portreath have a distinctive housing character?	Zoom 11/11	1	Very varied but certain areas do have distinctive character	No change	
7	This is listed as Policy 6, but is Policy 7. You advocate higher standards of buildings than those meeting today's regulation, will this not impact on the provision of affordable housing, also supported within the document?	Email 15/11	1	If done correctly - higher standards should not be excluded from affordable homes.	No change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 8 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
8	A good policy in itself, but most of it is in the realm of Building Control. BC minimum standards have to be met in any case and don't necessarily have to be detailed at the planning application stage. It's possible that all you will get is cut and paste text on the planning drawings saying it complies with policy, but since BC is not public domain there is no way to know what result, if any, the policy has. That said, the policy intention is to 'encourage consideration' of various factors, so it recognises it is probably limited to only being able to do that.	GoCollaborate	1	Agreed. The NDP is restricted as it can not stipulate building standards that go beyond existing requirements. It can encourage and support higher standards.	No change	
8	For houses that are older by vintage, the cost of alteration to enhance carbon neutral, energy efficient may be next to impossible without large investment. And, what is defined as "carbon neutral" in regard to homes?	GoCollaborate	1	Accepted. The policy is intended to demonstrate support for energy saving measures and discourage alterations that adversely impact energy efficiency of the building.	No change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 9 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
9	The quality of Cornwall’s landscapes, seascapes, towns and cultural heritage, enables tourism to play a major part in our economic, social and environmental wellbeing, it generates significant revenues, provides thousands of jobs and supports communities.	Written representation by S Bott and W Haslam - as attachment to email to SG Business Group 30 Dec 2020	Gwel an Mor	NDP SG shares the view that the landscape and seascape are enablers to economic, social and environmental well being through tourism	No change	
9	“There is a very steep gravel section to the woodland walk which is unsafe”. This is not accepted. It is not unsafe and is maintained by Cornwall Council and well used	Written representation by S Bott and W Haslam - as attachment to email to SG Business Group 30 Dec 2020 and within body of email dated 6 Nov 2020		The comment is referenced to text in the Village Character Assessment (Area P7 Cot Road and Gwel-an-Mor Page 81) which states “There is a very steep gravel section to the woodland walk which is unsafe”. The Local Landscape Character Assessment, covering the same area states on p54 of Appendix D: that “There is also a multi use trail through Glenfeadon linking Gwel-an-Mor holiday chalets and Portreath Village. The trail is well used and is part of the Mining Trail network.”. Further supporting text is provided in Appendix G. The subjective view stated in the Village Character Assessment is not supported or referred to in Policy 9.	Edit text in Village Character Assessment for consistency with Local Landscape Character Assessment	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 9 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
9	... other very onerously worded landscape character policies that can easily be interpreted to refuse any form of development.	Email 14 Dec 2020	1 on behalf of 'Y' Family	The wording of the policy seeks to safeguard and enhance valued and designated landscapes and seascapes such that development proposals are required to conserve and enhance lanscapes and how through design a supporting statement any development can poisitvely address adverse effects on landscape types. The policy does not seek to refuse any form of development.	No change	
9	Your plans or orders may present opportunities to protect and enhance locally valued landscapes. You may want to consider identifying distinctive local landscape features or characteristics such as ponds, woodland or dry stone walls and think about how any new development proposals can respect and enhance local landscape character and distinctiveness.	Letter - email attachment 5 Nov 2020	Natural England	Noted that Natural England does not have any specific comments on the draft Portreath Neighbourhood Development Plan.Views and sources of information suggested by Natural England to identify issues and oportunities for sustainable development, have been used in the formation of NDP Policies. NDP SG share Natural England’s aspiration to conserve, enhance and manage the natural environment within the parish for the benefit of present and future generations.	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 9 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
9	Enhance and conserve may be contradictory. A dwelling may look great with suitable character, but positioned incorrectly and the impact on biodiversity and hazard risk (flood and landslide etc.) will increase. I would support a strong emphasis on use of brownfield sites, as this would enhance visually displeasing buildings, as well as maintaining the biodiversity if greenfield sites that would then be left alone.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted. The policy is designed to both safeguard (conserve) and enhance the valued landscape and seascape. Additional policies deal with biodiversity, flooding and erosion.	No change	
9	Not clearly defined as to what "enhances" means in regard to this policy.	GoCollaborate	1	Enhance in this context of landscape is taken to be 'further improve the quality, value or extent of'.	Explained. No change	
9	Too broad a statement : the plan has carved the village up into many different landscape and character assessment areas. Need to be more specific what constitutes "enhance" , surely "in keeping" would suffice	GoCollaborate	1	Enhance in this context of landscape is taken to be 'further improve the quality, value or extent of'.	Explained. No change	
9	The reality of the words 'conserve and enhance', which are found in various places throughout planning system, is that so long as a proposal does not make things obviously worse, that's as far as it goes. The usual stock phrase in officer reports is 'does no harm' to this or that. In the AGLV for example, the CLP says development "should maintain the character and distinctive landscape qualities of such areas" and that	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 9 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	"Within AGLVs the primary objective is conservation and enhancement of their landscape quality and individual character." I challenge anyone to find evidence of the operation of these principles in planning applications further that listing 'AGLV' in the constraints section. Or in fact in some applications, not even that! That said, I doubt whether the NDP can do anything about that and the policy is itself good.					
9	I agree but how is it going to be "policed"?	GoCollaborate	1	Firstly through consideration, by PPC, of Planning related applications including a requirement to demonstrate in a supporting statement how development will address adverse landscape condition factors and development pressures and a requirement to describe how the development responds positively to landscape management	No change	
9	Relative level of support for policy	GoCollaborate platform	73	Agree - 57,Disagree - 10,Undecided - 5	Overall support for this policy	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 10 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
10	... other very onerously worded landscape character policies that can easily be interpreted to refuse any form of development.	Email 14 Dec 2020	1 on behalf of 'Y' Family	The wording of the policy seeks to conserve and enhance the section of the AONB within the NDP. Development proposals are required to conserve and enhance landscapes character and scenic beauty of the AONB and not contribute to further loss of green open space within the AONB boundary. Design and access statements are required to show how development has taken account of AONB Management Plan requirements. The policy does not seek to refuse any form of development.	No change	
10	If you are proposing development within or close to a protected landscape (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) or other sensitive location, we recommend that you carry out a landscape assessment of the proposal. Landscape assessments can help you to choose the most appropriate sites for development and help to avoid or minimise impacts of development on the landscape through careful siting, design and landscaping.	Letter - email attachment 5 Nov 2020	Natural England	A Local Landscape Character Assessment has been prepared as part of the evidence base for the NDP and will serve as a guide for assessing landscape impact arising from future development.	No change	
10	What are the areas of "outstanding natural beauty"? Again, poorly defined policy.	GoCollaborate	1	AONB Boundary with Portreath NDP area shown shaded green on Figure 2, page 9 and wider Godrevy to Portreath AONB is shown in Figure 12, page 48 and further detailed in Appendix D and E.	No change	
10	I would like to see stricter environmental restrictions for building in AONBs	GoCollaborate	1	Noted. The policy as drafted seeks to provide for development control in the context of landscape character and scenic natural beauty in AONB. SG believes that Policy 10 adds strength to the detailed policies set out in Cornwall AONB	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 10 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
				Management Plan Policy 11 refers to biodiversity and natural environment		
10	Need to correctly identify green spaces in the first place: the land to the west of the incline in the Southern Valley Site area is not an open public space and should not be included on the list.	GoCollaborate	1	Comment incorrectly assigned to Policy 10. Reference to be assigned to Policy 14.	Refer to Policy 14	
10	An alternative view of the 'southern valley side' might be that the 1949 AONB boundary is now an incongruous quirk of history that does not match 21st century reality of the extent of the settlement and acts as an outdated constraint to the NPPF objective of promoting sustainable development. A better and more coherent line might be along Green Lane. Surely no one thinks that build up of development on slopes around the seafront and harbour are in themselves objectionable? This is what we see in almost every similar location not only in Cornwall, but all over the country. The idea of maintaining 'green spaces' within the village, while understandable is maybe overplayed. This is not an inner city borough where such space is a rare commodity. In a couple of minutes walk in any direction, vistas over miles of open countryside, coast and woodland can be enjoyed. Conserving the wider area means that development should be directed to within the settlement where it inevitably can be seen.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted. However, it is not within the remit of the NDP to recommend an alteration to the boundary of AONB	No change	
10	There has already been too much building in the AONB along Green Lane -Battery Hill area.	GoCollaborate	1	The NDP positively plans for the future cannot act retrospectively	No change	
10	Need to clarify the green spaces and work with those who wish to build rather than a simple yes or no there needs to be more open communication on what this policy actually means regarding open green spaces as people's	GoCollaborate	1	The NDP sets out the intention and justification of Policy 10. This policy should be read in connection with the current Cornwall AONB Management Plan and any proposal should take these into account	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021- Policy 10 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	gardens are open and green but they have a right to develop them as they see fit as long as it meets planning requirements set by county planning teams.			before submission of a planning application		
10	Initially missing from the site, Appendix G to the plan should be a detailed description of the unilaterally declared green spaces designated as such without engaging with any of the actual land owners. In fact Appendix G is only a crude copy of Table 6 from the main plan document and does not provide any supporting evidence.	GoCollaborate	1	Comment incorrectly assigned to Policy 10. Reference to be assigned to Policy 14.	Refer to Policy 14	
10	What development doesn't create a loss of open green space. How can't enhance an area of scenic beauty - snow an example.	GoCollaborate	1	Redevelopment upon existing/former foundations or on a brownfield site may prevent a loss of green space.	No change	
10	within? All developments create a loss of open green space	GoCollaborate	1	Redevelopment upon existing/former foundations or on a brownfield site may prevent a loss of green space	No change	
10	This policy wording should be expanded to refer not only to development with the AONB itself but also to its setting	GoCollaborate	1	Policy 10b and 10c includes consideration of development within the setting of the AONB	No change	
10	Relative level of support for policy	GoCollaborate platform	72	Agree - 55,Disagree - 11,Undecided - 6	Overall support for this policy	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
11	<p>I never looked into this before but it appears Cornish Hedge Walls have effectively no protection and can be destroyed and removed as Permitted Development. (This is also relevant to policy 5 I would think). Almost nothing is said about them in the CLP or this NDP even though they are a major aesthetic, heritage and ecological feature here. Legal opinion says they are not hedgerows, therefore Regulations applying to those don't apply. But of course, a Cornish Hedge Wall could have a hedgerow growing on it to which Regulation could apply! But not to the wall! Guidance published by Cornwall Council indicates that even they don't know what the position is. Also, in the cases where permitted development rights are removed, they never as far as I can find go as far as removing the sections relating to walls. Even if included on drawings, they can be removed on a whim. Unless specific planning conditions are applied where appropriate at the application stage, this situation will remain.</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Comment	No action required	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
11	It is easy to overlook the fact that many areas locally are still suffering from the environmental disaster that mining inflicted on it. Heavily polluted barren scars and remains are scattered over the landscape. A completely unnatural environment.	GoCollaborate	1	Comment	Noted	No action required
11	Policy 11. I fully support it, but I have no idea how you'd measure it or enforce it. This is of course written into the CLP and is derived not only from National Planning Policy but obligations under international conventions. Our legislation only requires environmental surveys on particular applications. Even then, in practice, so long as a proposal does not make a site worse than it is at the time of application, then all is good. If all evidence of organic life gets eradicated before the application, the assessment concludes development can't do any harm! It is not the fault of this NDP, but our planning system is frankly rubbish in this respect. All it usually amounts to is telling applicants to put up a bat box or leave a gap in a wall for hedgehogs or something similar. Transport the newts to somewhere else and cover the place in concrete. There is virtually no animal or plant that stands in the way of 'sustainable development' for	GoCollaborate	3	Supporting comment concerning biodiversity planning criteria.	Noted	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	humans. But better to have the policy than not.					
11	Some of the development will be on spoil tips, land made barren from harbour and mining activities. It will have had man made elements already and non-local species taking hold as a result of those changes. We will have lost species, which need to be restored. Increasing biodiversity by 10% is a great aim, however do we need to bring in non-local species to achieve this, i.e. different fish as the oceans warm, different plants as the planet	GoCollaborate	3	Comment concerning biodiversity criteria: should be looking at local species only.	Change policy wording to reflect that local species on the site should be retained or increased.	Policy wording amended to remove 10% figure (National policy applicable to major developments) and replace with "net gain in biodiversity within the settlement area".

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	warms. We should be minimising the total global change and restrict it to recovering lost local species only.					
11	Any gains need to be native rather than bringing in more non local plants/fauna and species.	GoCollaborate	1	Comment concerning biodiversity criteria: should be looking at local species only.	Change policy wording to reflect that local species on the site should be retained or increased.	Policy wording amended to "net gain in biodiversity within the settlement area".
11	Define "biodiversity" and give it a number. Impossible to achieve a 10% gain as there is only a finite number of species living in the county in the first place.	GoCollaborate	2	Comment concerning biodiversity criteria and inability to quantify.	Change policy wording to reflect that local species on the site should be retained or increased.	Policy wording amended to remove 10% figure (National policy applicable to major developments) and replace with "net gain in biodiversity within the settlement area".
11	Don't forget hedgehog runs	GoCollaborate	1	Consider including "Hedgehog Highway" requirements in new site boundary planning conditions.	Amend policy wording to include Hedgehog access requirement.	Amend policy to include "New development boundaries must include holes of 13cm ² area in the base of fences to create 'highways' that enable small wildlife to roam freely."

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
11	Please can we write in a policy to provide hedgehog highways in new fencing. The Wild Life Trust commented on how many other NDP's had put this into their document.	GoCollaborate	1	Consider including "Hedgehog Highway" requirements in new site boundary planning conditions.	Amend policy wording to include Hedgehog access requirement.	Amend policy to include "New development boundaries must include holes of 13cm ² area in the base of fences to create 'highways' that enable small wildlife to roam freely."
11	Typical wishy-washy unquantifiable statement. How can you increase number of species on a site by 10% without importing non-native flora and/or fauna?	GoCollaborate	2	Comment concerning biodiversity criteria, inability to quantify and inability to increase diversity without importation of non-native species.	Change policy wording to reflect that local species on the site should be retained or increased.	Policy wording amended to "net gain in biodiversity within the settlement area".
11	Great policy. Any development coming forward should make a net contribution to biodiversity either on the site or by contributing to off site biodiversity investments. This is exactly the direction Cornwall Council is undertaking through the adoption of its biodiversity net gain approach to planning so its great to see Portreath's Neighbourhood Plan being an early adopter of this approach to making new development support nature recovery rather than leading to wildlife loss which has sometimes been the case in the past.	GoCollaborate	2	Supporting comment concerning biodiversity criteria and a net contribution to biodiversity	Noted	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 11 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
11	Policy 11 OBJECTION - This is a strategic level policy repeating the requirements of Cornwall Council policy – what is it adding by being within the NDP. There is no local emphasis being added beyond what is required by Policy 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan, the NPPF or the Cornwall Council Biodiversity SPD. This is a duplicate policy that is unnecessary and adds little to the local policy context through the NDP process.	NDP Objection - Kessell.pdf	1 (3)	Areas wished to be covered by NDP policy 11 are already adequately covered by extant Policy 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan, the NPPF and the Cornwall Council Biodiversity SPD. Policy 11 is therefore redundant and should either be re-drafted to specifically address Portreath parish issues or be removed.	The NDP is an addition to extant national planning frameworks and provides an additional layer to ensure development in keeping with local requirements and aspirations. The NDP does not countermand extant regulation, but will guide future development down an agreed route as shaped by local wishes.	Policy wording amended to remove 10% figure (National policy applicable to major developments) and replace with "net gain in biodiversity within the settlement area".

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations- Policy 12 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
12	Suggest area for motorhomes to park or stay over	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No change	
12	Suggest clearer signage for walking and cycling trails as not thought so apparent	GoCollaborate	2	Noted	No change	
12	Access to green space is hugely important to people's wellbeing and sense of place for the local community and should be encouraged wherever possible. The policy wording could be tightened to reflect this.	GoCollaborate	1	Policy 12 considered tight enough	No change	
12	Coastal path had been being used by off road motorcycles which cause damage to the path and adjacent areas. Concern for path itself, walkers and cyclists themselves.	Email	1	Noted	No change	
12	Natural England did not have any specific comments on the draft Portreath Neighbourhood Development Plan. They referred SG to information which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.	In response to submittance of draft plan	1	Recommendations in line with Natural England's recommendations	No change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 13 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
13	Flood risk assessments should be carried out for all proposed development. This should include the risk of flooding in valleys where development is proposed on higher land.	GoCollaborate	1	Additional cost and time involved in including all new developments to have an FRA and deemed to be unreasonable	No change	
13	How much consultation occurs with parishes further "up" the drainage basin? It will be the development of the valley sides and the larger urban areas upstream that will increase flood risk the most. I believe collaborative working with other parishes would be the most effective here.	GoCollaborate	3 + 2 supports	The majority of the water coming down the valley emirates from Redruth parish and therefore it makes sense to ensure developments up the valley are also included in this policy	Amend policy to include this matter	Add in F) Portreath Parish Council to be consulted on planning applications in Redruth Parish which have potential to cause flooding down the valley
13	If an acceptable FRA is submitted with all the mitigating measures, then there should be no reason to object to a development within the flood plain	GoCollaborate	3 + 1 support	The policy wording is worded sufficiently to address this matter - 'New development should avoid areas of flood risk as far as possible	No change	
13	Portreath is not another Boscastle waiting to happen Ask the environmental agency why they have stopped maintaining and employing someone to monitor the sluice gate If Portreath ever floods , it will be because they have decided to stop doing this People have families that lived here for generations , and Portreath has never flooded Get the sluice gates/system repaired, or replaced and employ people to operate it and maintain it	GoCollaborate	2	This is a matter for the EA and not the NDP	No change	
13	Should the plan say something about planning for coastal change and the potential impacts of increased flooding and sea level rise. A significant part of the village sits in the flood plan and working with Redruth and other communities higher up the catchment will be crucial to manage	GoCollaborate	2 + 4 supports	The policy covers these matters in section c, d, and e	No change	

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 13 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	further flood flows. A new approach to coastal protection of the village will also be required as with some long term thinking about what climate change adaptation means for the village.					
13	Sea level rise is very slow and therefore we can take time to prepare sea defenses. Building projects with runoff and soil erosion from farmland are rapid and we could halt and gradually reverse these. The amount of brown water presumably coming down from the Gwel-an-Mor site and from the fields at the top of Tregea Hill is extremely worrying.	GoCollaborate	1	Large developments at the top and along the sides of the valley have the potential to cause flooding if adequate SuDS are not in place. However there is adequate wording within the policy to address this matter	No change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
14	<p>I note that a large part of my garden is designated as 'Local Green Space'. Since no one can actually see it and it is not open to the public, this seems somewhat inaccurate to say the least. I don't really care about this except for the fact that last year we were pestered at great length by a time wasting crackpot who involved Cornwall Council in spurious demands and threats of prosecution to have access on the grounds my garden is Common Land. He came to this erroneous conclusion on the basis of various maps he had obtained. It is not the first time we have been confronted with the "I know my rights" fanatics who go poking around everywhere with maps mainly in the summer. My garden is quite open to the woodland and I don't like the idea of the NDP assisting such people by giving them even more ideas they have the right to come onto my property.</p>	GoCollaborate	4	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries ie do not cut through back gardens.
14	<p>Agree with the majority of designations which have public access. I think an additional level of care and scrutiny is needed to justify the inclusion of private land to which the public has no right of access. The justification would need to be supported by strong evidence of environmental and bio diversity significance which would not otherwise be protected.</p>	GoCollaborate	1	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space without sufficient justification.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries ie do not cut through back gardens.

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
14	We need to preserve the remaining green spaces for future generations that I am part of. The landscape is part of what Portreath so special.	GoCollaborate	2	Comment re extant green spaces.	Noted	No change
14	It's important to look at the green spaces we want to keep rather than just allowing ad hoc development and then at the end of the day we've suddenly lost all our green spaces. Highlighting the green spaces is a good way for the community to decide which ones are valuable to them. Most people agree the village has had a lot of development and we want to be careful where we allow future development.	GoCollaborate	2	Comment re extant green spaces.	Noted	No change
14	This needs to be clarified individual gardens are not green spaces they are owned by property owners. Green spaces should be accessible for all.	GoCollaborate	1	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens.
14	Although Appendix G has now appeared, instead of being a detailed description of the unilaterally declared green spaces (designated as such without any form of engagement with the actual land owners), it is merely a copy of Table 6 from the main document. What are you hiding? Will the Steering Group be liable for the financial losses to land owners as a result of now being unable to develop their land?	GoCollaborate	2	Status of Appendix G confirmed with CCC and response given through FAQ. Engage with affected property owners on a more personal level to outline implications of classifying their land as Green Space	Consider re-drafting Appendix G to actually become a detailed description of proposed Green Spaces including full supporting justification.	Table 6 deleted from the main NDP document, Appendix G renamed to "Summary Table of Green Spaces"

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
14	<p>Totally disagree with making the area adjacent to the incline (that you call southern valley side) into a green area This is private land and always has been</p>	GoCollaborate	4	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land: delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens. Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.
14	<p>The existing school field was a gift to the school from a local A large part of the field was sold to the water board or whatever they are called now and there is now a large sewage treatment plant at the bottom of the children's playing field Without doing this the school was in danger of closing as it was too small and the village would've lost its school which as many know is often the heart of a small village This demonstrates how decisions about a place are never cut and dried The survival of small communities often depends on development and difficult decisions being made Nostalgia is wonderful but so is keeping a village alive And that is often by building houses that folk can afford, changing the face of something that may have been thought irreplaceable many years ago in order to make way for new , especially if that goes a long way to ensuring the village survives, grows</p>	GoCollaborate	5	Comment re importance of getting NDP "right".	Noted (for policy 1?)	No change required

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	and continues to benefit the many , not just the few					
14	Could you be more open when you use the term "We" Transparency is very crucial to all groups such as these The people making decisions/suggestions to the cc that may impact on individuals lives should be made known We know who is on the parish council	GoCollaborate	5	Comment concerning members of the NDP Steering Group. Addressed at Zoom Meeting and FAQ	No further action required.	No change required
14	Agree that some of the "green spaces" are on private land. This policy is not clear as to what "very special circumstances" are and who makes that decision as to what could or not be done to private land.	GoCollaborate	4	Dissatisfaction that no clear indication of what can be done on private property that has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens.
14	Designated green space number 6 , no this should be redefined . There was once dwellings here and the pictures of the dwellings are available form the land owner. Opportunity to build in character dwellings as per the historic character of this land should be given here. The land owner should have been consulted directly when this boundary for settlement was decided and I believe they did not get directly told I til the final draft was realised .	GoCollaborate	1	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space without sufficient justification or engagement with the owner.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land: delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens. Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.
14	Some of the green spaces identified are within the boundaries of existing properties. i.e. the top half of all the gardens along Primrose Terrace	GoCollaborate	4	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens.

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
14	There should be no circumstances.	GoCollaborate	1	Not clear what this refers to: entered in error?	No action required	No change required
14	Gardens behind Primrose Terrace are in green space list. These are private not public, so should just be a subject to existing planning regulations.	GoCollaborate	1	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries and not cut through back gardens.
14	Appendix G Detailed Description of Green Spaces..... who checked it before publishing? Two grid references are wrong: Area 3 on Portreath airfield and Area 6 is a house on Green Lane. Interestingly, the appendix is so poorly written that the 4 stock phrases that make up the "detailed description" equally apply to the Green Lane property, so maybe its the title of Green space 6 that is wrong.	GoCollaborate	1	Status of Appendix G confirmed with CCC and response given through Zoom meeting. Check Grid references and correct.	Consider re-drafting Appendix G to actually become a detailed description of proposed Green Spaces including full supporting justification. Area 3: SW6720 4495, Area 6: SW6569 4512	Table 6 deleted from the main NDP document, Appendix G renamed to "Summary Table of Green Spaces" and remaining grid reference for Atrea 3 updated.
14 (from policy 10)	Initially missing from the site, Appendix G to the plan should be a detailed description of the unilaterally declared green spaces designated as such without engaging with any of the actual land owners. In fact Appendix G is only a crude copy of Table 6 from the main plan document and does not provide any supporting evidence.	GoCollaborate	1	See above	See above	Table 6 deleted from the main NDP document, Appendix G renamed to "Summary Table of Green Spaces"
14	Appendix G (<i>Detailed description of Green Spaces</i>) is populated by Table 6 information (<i>summary phrases</i>) and should not be	Zoom Meeting 3	1	James Evans, Planning Consultant, explained that the information was exactly the same as Table 6 and that there is no other information to be added.	No direct supporting information to warrant Area 6 being classified as a Green Space: delete Area 6 from the NDP.	Table 6 deleted from the main NDP document, Appendix G renamed to

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
						"Summary Table of Green Spaces"
14	<p>I cannot find any supporting justification in the plan for dictating that the private land to the west of the incline ("incline valley character area P6)" be designated a Green Site or excluded outside the settlement boundary.</p> <p>The land warrants one solitary sentence in the 8 pages of Appendix C, (page 71) which in no way supports any of the conclusions arrived at in P6 Planning Guidelines.</p> <p>In Appendix D (apparently still only in draft, even though presented as supporting documentation), the land warrants two sentences, one on page 55 and another on page 56, which again in no way support any conclusions wrt placing the Settlement boundary or green space designation.</p>	GoCollaborate	3	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space: lack of supporting evidence.	Draft watermark remains until NDP and Appendix D approved by the PC. Delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP as no supporting justification has been produced.	Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.
14	<p>Completely disagree that the area adjacent to the incline in the Southern Valley Side area should be designated a Green space. This is private land that was originally for GWR dwellings. It is not an open public space and is an ideal area for houses that would not impact on the overall thrust of the Delevopment Plan.</p>	GoCollaborate	4	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space.	Delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP	Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.
14	<p>How is area 6 a 'Local Green Space?' It is private land, has no public access rights or footpaths (that I know of anyway). The trees have no protection</p>	GoCollaborate	3	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space without sufficient justification.	Delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP	Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	<p>order on them and are there by choice of the owner. It is not in the WHS. There are vague claims about wildlife and such like , but there is no evidence or assessment of it being any more important than anywhere else. It is well established in English Law that generally, no one has the right to a view. It is in the AGLV, but since no one, including this NDP, takes any notice of that at all, it is for all intents and purposes irrelevant although actually that would be the better policy justification.</p>					
14	<p>Coming out of the woods from Illogan up into Portreath past the tank trap, there is a beautiful open view to the right across gardens onto the woodland SSSI and to the impressive rock faces beyond.. But this is not included. By contrast you can hardly see up into the gardens to the left. Why are private gardens 'green space' anyway? There is no obligation on owners to keep them 'green' nor do the public have right of access. That said, the view to the right is now permanently degraded by a massive house approved by the Parish Council which does not seem to be either infill or rounding off. Perversely, PPC having approved it, the NDP now says it is outside the settlement boundary! Apparently, the owners have also destroyed the very attractive pond</p>	GoCollaborate	2	<p>Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space without justification being given. Remainder noted.</p>	<p>Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.</p>	<p>Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries ie do not cut through back gardens.</p>

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	shown on the map which for years was a valuable wildlife habitat.					
14	Home and land owners who find their properties are worth less because this policy declares their land/back gardens as green spaces would be looking to the steering group for financial liability No one should loose money on their property because of their intervention	GoCollaborate	3	Comment	Noted	No action required
14	"We are signing this letter to register our disapproval and rejection of the draft Portreath Neighbourhood Development Plan (Pre-Submission Regulation 14 version), specifically policies 1 (7.2.11) and 14 (7.15.1-3).Privately owned areas and properties (eg private back gardens, the incline valley and all the Cambrose area) are left outside the proposed settlement boundary and would be subject to far more rigorous and restrictive planning criteria if the draft plan is adopted. It has also been identified that a number of proposed green spaces are on private land, including back gardens (eg Tregea Terrace, Glenfeaden Terrace & the incline valley). Both impositions will negatively impact on the value of properties affected.We therefore sign this letter to register our disapproval of the draft Portreath NDP."	prepared letter	24	Dissatisfaction that private property has been classified as Green Space without sufficient justification.	Amend Green space boundaries to align with property boundaries and exclude private land.	Green Space boundaries have been aligned with property boundaries ie do not cut through back gardens.
14	Without any prior consultation with the landowner, the Portreath NDP is seeking to designate a parcel of private	Signed petition	66	Dissatisfaction that private land has been classified as Green Space.	Delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP (realign settlement boundary to	

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	<p>land in the heart of the village as being :- 1.Outside the village settlement boundary And 2.A designated Local Green Space (Tregea hill to Incline)-this is overly onerous and will blight an area of land that is in a sustainable location in easy walking distance of all the facilities in the village We object to the NDP for this basis and urge the ND team to withdraw the development boundary to enable the northern part of the site (Area 6 - closest to the village) to be included as part of the village settlement area.</p>				<p>include northern part of land in question (Policy 1)).</p>	
<p>14</p>	<p>Policy 14 - Local Green Space Designations – OBJECTION The supporting text states that ‘local communities can identify green areas for special protection that are of particular importance to them’. Local Green Space 6 – ‘Valley – Tregea Hill to Incline’ is in the ownership of the Kessell Family. No discussions in relation to the designation of this land has taken place between the landowner and the authors of the draft NDP. This objection is made against the identification of this private land as a ‘local green space’. There is no assessment of the land other than the statement that it ‘a wild area with no public access available for wildlife to flourish’. The key point is that it is private land with no public access, the landowner can manage the land as</p>	<p>NDP Objection - Kessell.pdf</p>	<p>1 (3)</p>	<p>Comprehensive response by Planning Consultancy questioning many aspects of the draft NDP. The Policy 14 Objection specifically concerns lack of engagement, justification and supporting evidence for classifying Area 6 a Green Space and is contrary to National Planning Guidelines. It also questions the NDP approach to all listed Green Spaces.</p>	<p>Review all Green Space criteria/justification. Delete Green Space Area 6 from the NDP.</p>	<p>Area 6 has been removed from the NDP.</p>

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	<p>they please, it is not for the NDP to try and effectively take over their land with no prior consultation. The swathe of land included 28 December 2020 Influence Planning within LGS Area 6 is large and does not take account of the differences in character across the land area.</p> <p>The NPPF at Para 100 states 'The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:</p> <p>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance....and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>The NDP fails to demonstrate how this land is 'special to a local community and holds particular significance'.</p> <p>Keeping land available for wildlife to flourish is not a demonstrable reason that meets the tests of the NPPF. The whole approach to the Local Green Space designations should be reviewed and in particular the inclusion of Area 6 must be scrapped and removed from the plan. There is no need to include a policy with tests akin to Green Belt policy requiring 'special justification' to be developed. This test is excessive and far more onerous than anything else in Cornwall that does not have a green belt.</p>					
14	On Page 57 of the Pre-Submission Document at 18 a Feadon Farm Wildlife Area, as an informal green	email	2	Define area in question in more detail and discuss	Discuss limits and implications with Landowner to agree a way forward.	Limits of the 3 areas consisting Green Space 18 were

NDP Policy 14 feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 14 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
	space, is referred to. This is difficult to identify on the small scale map provided and is not agreed without further discussion and assessment			limits and implications with the Landowner.		discussed with land owner who is content with the designation: no further action required.

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations - Policy 15 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG consideration	SG Recommendation	Amend
15	There seems to be no policy directly regarding Business and Tourism. Although the objectives chart on page 23 of the draft NDP has boxes ticked for policies 5, 8 and 15 these don't appear to have anything directly to do with supporting development for Business and Tourism.	GoCollaborate	1	Business and tourism included in policy 15 and implicit in the draft plan .However, this should be strengthened	Strengthen business and tourism explicitly in the plan, especially policies 3 and 15.In addition, create separate policies covering this matter	Introduce new policies which explicitly cover, business, employment and tourism
15	Let's develop a community hub.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No change	
15	Lack of support for the business and tourism	Emails	3	Business and tourism included in policy 15 and implicit in the draft plan .However, this should be strengthened	Strengthen business and tourism explicitly in the plan, especially policies 3 and 15.In addition, create separate policies covering this matter	Introduce new policies which explicitly cover, business, employment and tourism
15	More support needed for sustainable economy and employment,	Emails	2	Economy and employment included in policy 15 and implicit in the draft plan .However, this should be strengthened	Strengthen business and tourism explicitly in the plan, especially policies 3 and 15.In addition, create separate policies covering this matter	Introduce new policies which explicitly cover, business, employment and tourism
15	Visit Cornwall supports Gwel an Mor in it's business endeavours	Latter	1	Noted	No change	

[Back to Index Page](#)

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 16 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
16	I hit 'undecided' on everything because this is an interim stage and as currently written I think the NDP still needs a lot of work. So hitting a general 'Agree' or 'Disagree' would be a misleading response. Personally, although on balance I think it is better to have an NDP than not have one, I think they are generally oversold to the point of even maybe misleading people as to what they achieve and in the end, what gets past an examiner is often just a restatement and rubber stamp of existing local authority policy. That's a general view, not a criticism of Portreath NDP specifically or the people and work done on it which I commend. Community engagement and raising awareness of the planning system is a good in itself, regardless of any other aim or outcome. The usual shtick is that sooner or later, A Local Authority rigs up a piece of publicity showing what a particular NDP is claimed to have 'delivered'. Politically all very predictable and understandable. Cynical? Me?	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No action required
16	Policy 16. Probably something that if it were proposed will be driven overwhelmingly by National and Local policy. 'Local people' invariably object. That's just the way it is.	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No action required
16	I think renewable energy schemes that benefit residents should be supported. Some people are more concerned	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No action required

NDP Policy feedback and recommendations January 2021 - Policy 16 FINAL

Policy Number	Issue/Recommendation	Source	Numbers Raising	SG Consideration	SC Recommendation
	about the visual effects than the benefits they bring. I'm sure engine houses were not seen as pretty landscape features when they were built.				
16	New renewable energy sources may still be worth considering even if power is not primarily used by local residents if the wider network can use more renewable power I.e. national grid	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No action required
16	Support! Love Portreath can in enabling individuals to understand the possibilities of renewables	GoCollaborate	1	Noted	No action required

[Back to Index Page](#)