

Meeting with Planning Aid, 9 May 2014

Jo Widdecombe, Tim Horwood, Lucy Davis

The meeting was to discuss the 63 draft proposed policy options for the St Ives Area NDP, in terms of viability and appropriateness as planning policy. The following key issues influenced the discussions about each proposed policy:

1. Overlap with the emerging Cornwall Local Plan (CLP) and NPPF;
2. What it is possible to achieve through planning policy;
3. Are they policies, objectives or projects?

Overall, they were impressed with the amount of work done and encouraged that some strong planning policy could be made for St Ives Area NDP. Some key areas stood out for them as potential policies:

- Housing and building design and landscaping, provision of play areas etc etc
- Character – urban (historic) and landscape (coast and countryside) – could be combined with design;
- Community facilities and public spaces;
- Exceptions Policies for affordable, resident occupier housing, NB. with a lot of thought and ingenuity!;
- Sustainable transport;
- Economy, including business and commercial use of property, live-work units, creative industries;
- Town centre, including shop fronts etc.;
- Protection of open spaces between settlements, NB. again with ingenuity!;

In general, the potential policies that they could envisage would cut across our topic areas. For example, a design policy would amalgamate policies put forward from built environment, housing, open spaces and transport; a community facilities and public spaces policy would amalgamate policies put forward by culture and heritage, built environment, amenities and facilities and economic development.

It is an interesting way of looking at our overall objectives, i.e. what is it we really want to achieve for St Ives area? I think the above key areas cover a lot of those aspirations and it was interesting the way they came together through a detailed and sustained study of all the proposed policies together.

They were concerned about an attempt to make housing site allocations, because of the amount of work and potential clash with the emerging allocations for the Cornwall Local Plan. There is also a lot of work to be done to refine the policy areas, and more evidence and information they felt was needed to back them up. What follows is a detailed write-up of our discussions on each topic area, with recommendations on work to be done. NB these are suggestions from people with experience of planning policy, but are just suggestions. As I've always maintained, if there is something we strongly want to pursue here in St Ives, we should try!

I've also given suggestions about the groups each topic group needs to link with to discuss the potential policy areas identified by Planning Aid.

A good suggestion for thinking about all policies is – trace it back to WHY?

- **Why is it needed in St Ives? What is special in our area to warrant it?**
- **And also – if it's not in the CLP, why not?**

Housing

H1	Already in the Cornwall Local Plan, so not worth repeating unless felt absolutely essential.
H2	Is this in conflict with the CLP and NPPF? IF so, not possible.
H3	This is an obvious key area for St Ives parish, but very difficult to achieve. Would require very different wording as a minimum. Recommendation: look at the Lynton and Lynmouth Plan to see how they achieved it. Need to: give strong evidence on need for housing; give figures for second homes and holiday lets and evidence of their impact on the resident population, e.g. house prices, tipping points. Would need to be written into an implementation and monitoring plan for the NDP.
H4	Recommendation: look at 'made' NDPs to see what they say about CIL money. Find out - how much CIL money are we likely to get here? Need to be more specific – what exactly are the projects we want to use it for?
H5	Combine with H16
H6	Not possible
H7	In the CLP, so not worth repeating
H8	Not a policy, but part of the general report write-up
H9	In the CLP, part of the general report write-up
H10	In the CLP, part of the general report write-up
H11	Part of a potential design/site landscaping policy
H12	Combine with H16
H13	Check with CLP and NPPF
H14	Part of a potential design/site landscaping policy
H15	If it's to be included, must be accompanied by site allocations Recommendation: look at Thame NDP allocations
H16	Definite potential policy, in two parts – see below

To sum up, there were three potential stand-alone policies here (as well as parts of policies):

1. Site allocations (with H15)
2. Exceptions Policy – for general affordable housing issues
3. Exceptions Policy – for sites outside those allocated for housing (i.e. pure exceptions) – give guidance as to where these might be, look at Lyn Plan.

Tim Horwood happy to give more advice, particularly on the split between exceptions policies.

Need to link with **built environment, open spaces and transport groups.**

Built Environment

BE1	Potential design policy. The policy would state 'character', the accompanying text would give examples in support. Recommendation: look at Norland NDP Design Guide
BE2	Combine with BE1 design policy. Promotion of architectural excellence – preamble Use of traditional materials – definitely include in policy Self-catering accommodation – separate issue; could be combined with exceptions policy for housing? Look at Lyn Plan.
BE3	Potential community facilities and public spaces policy. In objectives, set out importance of public spaces, then link in policy for development to respect existing spaces. Could identify projects for CLP?? – the specific projects identified (e.g. sloop, Royal square) can't go directly into policy, but could be identified as projects.
BE4	Objective, not policy. BUT could be re-written into a potential town centre policy, e.g. shop fronts, prevent amalgamation of units by larger chains (NB. worth BE and LED groups taking about this). Need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define the town centre • Check what the CLP says, e.g. retail policy, out of town centre retail policy.
BE5	Potential policy – i.e. retain commercial uses in specific circumstances. Need to identify specific areas; need more evidence for need, e.g. is commercial property being replaced by residential etc?
BE6	Preamble, vision – not policy.

To sum up, 3 potential policies (in combination with other groups):

1. Character and Design
2. Town centre
3. Commercial and business use

In general, the wording was too objective-like, policies need to be far more specific. Need to link with **economic development, culture and heritage, housing, open spaces and amenities and facilities groups.**

Open Spaces

OS1	Potential character policy – add on to end “provided that – trees on site protected....etc”
OS2	Combine with OS1
OS3	In CLP?
OS4	In CLP?
OS5	In CLP?
OS6	Could be a project in support of policies, recommendation – change “major” to “local” as a stronger NDP issues, as opposed to a national issue.
OS7	Combine with OS1

OS8	Part of potential design/landscaping policy. Need to show particular importance to St Ives Area.
OS9	Combine with OS1 – i.e. coast and countryside
OS10	Link to H4 – CIL money.
OS11	Link to amenities and facilities allocations, but in a positive light
OS12	Too general, needs to be accompanied by specific sites. Link to housing allocation sites, i.e. specify that each site is for X houses, with play area etc.
OS13	Potential community facilities and public spaces policy (see BE3) Need to establish need, i.e. is there a shortfall of open spaces for community use?
OS14	Part 1 – combine with OS1 Part 2 – potential design/landscaping policy Part 3 – potential sustainable transport policy
OS15	In CLP and/or NPPF?
OS16	Objective and vision, not policy, i.e. quality of the area attracts tourists
OS17	We were unsure what the aim was behind this, e.g. is it to minimise traffic to sites providing facilities for people not staying on site? If so, could be part of a sustainable transport policy.
OS18	Potential design policy. EXCEPT sentence in brackets at the end – this is a potential separate policy. Could consider doing a Landscape Character Assessment, i.e. why is it important? Photos of fields etc. NB. Could conflict with CLP housing allocations, because these sites are largely in the open areas of countryside between settlements.
OS19	Need to check the legalities of this, e.g. What does it say in the NPPF about allocation of private land as public open space? Also – why are they important? Could consider doing a Character Assessment of each to back them up. In short, not impossible, but would need strong evidence base.
OS20	Combine with OS1
OS21	Potential rights of way policy or part of a potential sustainable transport policy. Check CLP and NPPF. Be specific, are there footpaths that need improving/protecting? Recommendation: Exeter St James NDP has a lot on rights of way.
OS22	If the aim is to protect land between settlements, better to go down OS18 potential policy route.

To sum up, potential policies and parts of policies:

1. Coast and countryside character
2. Design and landscaping
3. Community facilities and public spaces: retain provision of open spaces for community use and develop new recreational facilities.
4. Sustainable transport, including rights of way
5. Protection of open countryside between settlements

1 and 5 are potential stand-alone policies, the others would need coordination with other groups, namely **built environment, transport, amenities and facilities and housing.**

Local Economic Development

LED1	<p>Objectives. BUT</p> <p>Potential commercial and business use policy, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial uses – retaining, rather than conversion to residential • Retail, e.g. preventing amalgamation of units • Allocations • Delivering live/work units <p>Needs a lot of work (and could be better placed in an Economic Strategy), but worth considering.</p> <p>Can link to a strong objective – e.g. retaining a vibrant economy, including tourism.</p>
------	---

To sum up, one potential policy:

1. Economy – commercial and business use, retail etc, with accompanying site allocations.

We had a long discussion about how economic development can ‘fit’ planning policy. They were not totally dismissive, hence the idea of amalgamation of units emerged. With more discussion and thought, more issues could emerge.

Need to link with **built environment and culture and heritage groups.**

Transport

T1	Objective, not policy.
T2	Projects, not policies
T3	Potential sustainable transport policy
T4	Project, BUT ALSO part of potential sustainable transport policy
T5	<p>Link to potential design and landscaping policy</p> <p>Need to look at CLP and NPPF – what are the parking standards policies? Does the Cornwall Design Guide say anything?</p> <p>Look at ‘made’ NDPs and what they have said about parking standards.</p>

To sum up, one potential stand-alone policy and one part policy:

1. Sustainable transport – e.g. “Development should support sustainable transport in St Ives by: providing cycle paths and provision, avoiding rights of way.....etc”
2. Design and landscaping

Need to link with **open spaces, housing and built environment.**

Amenities and Facilities

AF1	Potential allocation
AF2	Project, not allocation UNLESS site issues can be resolved
AF3	Part of a community facilities and public spaces policy

To sum up, one potential allocation and one potential policy:

1. “Development should not lead to the loss of local recreational facilities, unless suitable alternative provision can be given. This includes St Ives Sailing Club.....etc.”

Need to link to **built environment and open spaces**.

Culture and Heritage

CH1	Could be difficult to achieve as a policy. Need to be more specific – i.e. what are ‘creative industries’? Why are they needed? Recommendation: look at Chichester Local Plan, London borough??
CH2	As above. What is the use class of a live/work unit? Could be linked in to economy policy, i.e. retaining commercial use
CH3	Project, not policy
CH4	Use Community Land Trust, not policy
CH5	Use Community Land Trust, not policy
CH6	Use Community Land Trust and Community Charter, not policy
CH7	Not possible

To sum up, the most likely avenue they could see was through the economy/business policy, i.e.

1. “Use class cannot be changed from commercial or live-work to residential in the following circumstances.....”

The overriding feeling was that these aspirations could be best achieved through action rather than policy, given the restrictive nature of planning policy, i.e. land use. The Community Land Trust and Community Charter were both considered effective ways of complementing and using planning policy to achieve non-land-use goals.

Need to link with **economic development and built environment groups**.

Renewable Energy

RE1	Objective, not policy. Needs to be more specific. What does the CLP say?
-----	---

General

General policies G1 and G2 would be part of the preamble and general report write-up. G2 would also form part of the Implementation and Monitoring Plan that will accompany the NDP.