

Theme: Housing	Policy Area: Affordable Housing	Policy Number: SBNDP1
-----------------------	--	------------------------------

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy / proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Affordable housing for young people, to buy and rent.	Yes The CLP includes policies 8 & 9. Policy 8 seeks affordable housing provision on schemes of 2 or more houses (<u>National guidance has changed and this is now >10 dwellings</u>). The provision is to seek up to 40% affordable in this area. Policy 9 relates to affordable housing led schemes on sites outside of the town. This seeks as a minimum 50% affordable. <u>Consider drawing a settlement boundary – anything outside the boundary will then become an exception site to maximise delivery of AH.</u>	Potentially Sites put forward under SHLAA. NP Group suggested north of A390 Some potential synergy.	1) CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission) and Network Profile 2) SHLAA in terms of sites being put forward by landowners 3) Figures from Homechoice	Both the Town Plan and the Par Bay Big Local report indicate that their consultations gave support to local needs affordable housing. The Town Plan identified that this should be primarily affordable to buy, with a proportion of properties to rent. The Town Plan responses also in favour of Par Docks IF at least 40% affordable and for local people. Town Plan states preference for brownfield sites. NP Group Proposition is for north of A390 (but no results yet to see if this is a consensus) <u>You will need to justify the approach, in particular considering why other sites are not suitable.</u>	Yes There appears to be general recognition of the need for affordable housing.	No Some further activity required – particularly if site allocations to be included.	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence Report: Update evidence report/this document with further shop results from current consultation statement work. Unsure if there has been additional shop consultation. Check. Planning advice – size of development triggering affordable housing allocation. Homechoice – check latest figures of need. Shared ownership may not be included on Home Choice register – check if stats available or make note of this omission. Gather Evidence re a Policy that Supports Development North of A390. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EA has offered to provide (re: flood zone/sequential testing, plot size implications etc) – NP group to follow up Transport Modelling/info from CC/Cormac if available re: congestion. Pollution on A390 (St Austell Study and CC info if available) Establish land type i.e. if brownfield etc./CC map South of A390 why The Mount and Par Moor not suitable (using info above) Other evidence (e.g. Housing Needs etc) A390 offers and exit out of the town Is there a need to think about overall development size and property size? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to consider shared ownership and future need. Ocean Housing suggesting that need more than 16 per to fulfil need. Information to Public Stakeholders Ensure that residents/stakeholders understand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> level of housing obligated to provide under CLP 2010-2030 (may change as currently 'in examination'.) 800 (now 900) homes across CNA; 568 completed/committed; remaining figure 232 (not 359 – which was March 2014 figure) <u>Update: 900 allocated – 412 built; 303 committed; 207 expected windfall.</u> Town Council/Working Group would like to see more. No min. within CLP and setting figures unlikely to be acceptable. Dev size shaped by policy wording? CLP numbers should be considered a minimum, to be informed by local housing need. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CLP seeks to provide affordable housing alongside market housing – higher % of affordable housing are likely to be unviable – which could raise issues about deliverability requirements of the NPPF in terms of conformity. Market housing required in order to deliver affordable housing. Viability issue if 'affordable housing ratio too high e.g. could have a policy using policy 9 exception sites for higher % to maximise affordable housing element i.e. 50% but viability of development then jeopardised – particularly as developer unable to access HCA grant for this ratio. Even 40% affordable housing under policy 8 would need to be tested for viability. Par Docks development More widely consult (via different methods) on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of an affordable housing policy in the NP – is

								<p>there a need to expand on existing policy 8 & 9 of CLP.</p> <p>b) Whether to set ratio for buy/rent allocation (or again, stick with CLP) <u>Suggestion, consider a policy which gives flexibility to allocate / determine AH type and tenure in accordance with a local housing needs survey or according to the latest Homechoice data.</u></p> <p>c) Shaping development to north of A390 (giving reasons why)</p> <p>d) Infill or other options (depending on EA evidence) south of A390.</p> <p>8) Engage with landowners [Although JE suggested that this was already done via the SHLAA]</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

CONTINUED.....

Theme: Housing	Policy Area: Affordable Housing	Policy Number: SBNDP1
-----------------------	--	------------------------------

<p>COMMENTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eco-community plans within CLP so need to ensure that this is considered in light of policy formation and how this impacts on site locations etc. - Built up area and flood risk will impact on site locations.
--

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Preliminary conclusion at the May 11th Workshop was that Housing Policy should direct rather than Allocate Development (based on flood/road/land type etc) rather than allocate sites.</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained (from EA, Cormac, Imerys re: Eco-Community) 2. Seek information from Planning, HomeChoice, EA. 3. Define any other 'missing' elements that need to be followed up before consultation. 4. Produce consultation materials – with clear information about why policy areas been selected and giving information about what is necessary to comply with NP / NPPF, and asking for feedback on the key issues. 5. Engage with landowners and key stakeholders (including neighbouring parishes – will need to do this at later date as part of formal consultation but good idea to keep dialogue going as progress/activity taking place. 6. Consult widely – (surveys, events etc – consider how best to reach all community and make use of existing networks) 7. Collate/analyse all the above data and review policy area in light of results. 	<p>Further develop policy based on recommendations</p>	<p>Likely in terms of shaping development location</p>
	<p>Discard this from NDP</p>	<p>Not at this stage</p>
	<p>Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)</p>	<p>NO</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with Local Plan</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with NPPF</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required</p>	<p>YES /NO / TBC</p>

Theme: Housing Design Standards	Policy Area: Housing Design	Policy Number: SBNDP23
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
<p>Housing development will be supported where it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) can be shown that measures have been implemented to combat the flood risk and drainage problems. <u>(SUDS? – could have a policy to ensure that any new development incorporates SUDS measures to ensure that it does not flood risk.</u> b) Incorporates energy efficiency and other measures to lower running costs within the design. c) Allocate garden and parking provision within the design. d) Incorporates recreational/community facilities for developments of over ??? houses?? 	<p>Policy 13 of the CLP relates to design and refers to the Cornwall Design Guide as an SPD.</p> <p>Policy 14 relates to Development Standards. The Design Guide incorporates a number of the measures identified here – such as garden provision, energy efficiency. Drainage and water efficiency is mentioned in the design guide – but the specific issues in the area are more strategic and are discussed later. Incorporating recreation/ community facilities is referenced in policy 13.6 as a requirement for larger developments.</p>	N/A	<p><u>No evidence from documents (within Evidence Report Dec'14)</u></p>	<p>General consultation feedback about appearance of existing housing stock which could be further explored.</p> <p>Gardens, building materials and energy efficiency in Which Way to the Clay.</p> <p>Town Plan indicates support for moderately higher build costs as a premium for homes with high level of energy efficiency. Intended to go out via shop as a proposal for comment.</p> <p>Majority of documents comment on flood risk and the need for this to be tackled.</p> <p>Town Plan identifies need for parking.</p>	<p>Not specifically</p> <p>Market housing and sites not fully explored.</p>	<p>No – limited evidence of demand</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Evidence Report Update evidence report with further information as sourced e.g. current propositions out for consultation. Unsure if there has been additional shop consultation. Check. 2) Information to Public Stakeholders Ensure that residents/stakeholders understand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o That higher levels of design impact on housing prices. o That there are design guide measures in place (explain) 3) Planning Advice – clarify what design guide means in terms of practical measures and whether impacted by size of development? <u>Can require completion of design checklist, or a design statement.</u> 4) Gather information from EA and CC. 5) Planning Advice - Policy area check – is this needed or are they covered by new EA and CLP standards/policies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Inclusion of a housing design policy in the NP that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Existing properties that apply for a change/modification (via planning system) need to respond to flood issue i.e. mitigate b) New dwellings has to mitigate (or reduce flood risk) and implement procedures/actions that continue to be effective c) Energy efficiency measures to the highest practical standards welcomed <u>(encourage, not require)-</u> d) Garden and parking provision as part of policy (or as with Ocean, left to them to incorporate within design?) 6) Seek advice from Housing Enabler/CC re: viability if proposals in 4 go forward as policy area. 7) More widely consult (via different methods) on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Inclusion of a housing design policy in the NP once above 4 above clarified and if policy then required. 8) Engage with landowners and developers <p>The key question is what do the existing policies fail to do as they are quite thorough - and is it justified to go above and beyond these requirements bearing in mind the lack of constraints on the locality and the viability issues for delivery.</p>

CONTINUED.....

Theme: Housing Design Standards	Policy Area: Housing Design	Policy Number: SBNDP23
--	------------------------------------	-------------------------------

<p>Comments: The impact of incorporating higher housing design standards is that the capital cost increases thereby negatively impacting on affordable housing. Even if running costs are reduced the increased price of a house is likely to contradict the desire to provide affordable housing.</p>
--

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable / way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Preliminary conclusion at the May 11th Workshop was that although housing design standards (inc. energy efficiency) should be encouraged and will have long term benefits, this could adversely impact on affordability and viability.</p> <p>If existing standards, policies and practical actions (e.g. Ocean Housing seem to allow for parking within curtilage as part of good design) then no need for a new NP policy – unless to 'encourage and welcome' measures that exceed these whilst keeping them viable.</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained) 2. Seek clarification from planning officers and Housing Enabler. 3. Gather information to help clarify and make decision on need for policy. <p>(Ideally need to consult and prepare materials to ask for feedback, but also may need to explain why some issues included and not others i.e. why removed).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Produce consultation materials if required – with clear information about why policy areas been selected (or not selected) and giving information about what is necessary to comply with NP / NPPF, and asking for feedback on the key issues. 5. Engage with landowners and key stakeholders (including neighbouring parishes – will need to do this at later date as part of formal consultation but good idea to keep dialogue going as progress/activity taking place. 6. Consult widely – (surveys, events etc – consider how best to reach all community and make use of existing networks) 7. Collate/analyse all the above data and review policy area in light of results. 	<p>Further develop policy based on recommendations</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Discard this from NDP</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)</p>	<p>NO</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with Local Plan</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with NPPF</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required</p>	<p>YES / NO / TBC</p>

Theme: Flood Protection	Policy Area: Flood management.	Policy Number: SBNDP7 RENUMBER
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Stricter measures in place to provide greater flood management and resilience from developments causing flood harm.	<p>Partly</p> <p>The CLP Policy 26 f. supports community-led local solutions to manage flood risk.</p> <p>Policy 26 3 requires larger devts to provide a long term water management plan, which includes maintenance of surface water drainage systems, measures to improve the network of surface water drainage systems on and around the site (e.g. culverts etc) and identifies opportunities for future enhancement.</p> <p>The EA has identified Strategic measures to help resolve the problem – the NP could establish a policy that provides support for these measures and safeguards the sites for such purposes and also to direct funding</p>	No	<p>CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission) and Network Profile acknowledge the flood problems and objective BL5 in particular notes that consideration must be given to this – particularly within the St Blazey/Par area.</p>	<p>The consultations (Town Plan, Which Way for the Clay, Exeter Uni work, shop consultation etc) all highlighted the flood and drainage problems (and how this affects homes, business development and investment, and quality of life.</p> <p>The NP group have given weight to this in their own proposals.</p>	Yes	Yes	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Evidence Report: Update evidence report/this document with further shop results from current consultation statement work. Unsure if there has been additional shop consultation. Check. 2) Environment Agency documents/advice – review documentation and contact for further information (as per workshop 11/5/15) re: storage ops; flood zones, projects etc. EA funding. Also EA advice on Par Docks development and impacts re: tidal levels etc. Also seek information on flood patterns to date. 3) EA flood advice – tie in with housing, economic regen etc. 4) EA/Planning Advice: Re: viability and feasibility. 5) Review in light of St Austell Bay Investment Plan report by CDC (due 20/5/15) 6) Review information and short term/long terms projects and impact on other areas. 7) Engage with landowners/stakeholders 8) Information to Public Stakeholders Ensure that residents/stakeholders understand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is currently covered by EA/CLP o How flood links to other elements o What can be incorporated as policy; what is aspirational or project led (and which may be dependent on other factors – explain) o Par Docks development 9) More widely consult (via different methods) on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inclusion of a flood policy (over and above CLP) b) Projects/policy areas (make clear if aspirational).

COMMENTS:

Need to consider policy in light of EA map and information – policy can 'support and welcome' but a specific policy needs to be viable and backed up. Some areas may be aspirational/project ideas – need to be clear about these and not raise expectations. Also care about how flood can influence housing/economic (but also how or if these can be packaged to make it feasible). Weave EA suggestion into policies and use EA map to help direct development ie policy refer to EA map.

Considerable discussion over how flood links to housing/economic regeneration/green space etc and EA have costed for a St Blazey/Par major scheme. This will cost in region of £20m with EA possibly committing £13m (subject to meeting criteria via scoring system) plus will require match funding. However, may not be able to encourage economic regen without the flood scheme being in place and vice-versa flood scheme may not be possible without economic regen commitment. The overall scheme can be split into mini stages/projects that will need to be considered as potential areas to prioritise.

More widely (possibly) than the NP Town Council need to focus where investment should go and explore links with connectivity.

CONTINUED.....

Theme: Flood Protection	Policy Area: Flood management.	Policy Number: SBNDP7-RENUMBER?
--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Preliminary conclusion at the May 11th Workshop was that Housing Policy should direct rather than Allocate Development (based on flood/road/land type etc) rather than allocate sites.</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained (from EA, Cormac, Imerys re: Eco-Community) 2. Seek information from Planning, HomeChoice, EA. With particular regard to the EA – understand how the north of A390 could be dealt with as an exception site. 3. EA to identify how much 'storage' is needed for flood attenuation. 4. Define any other 'missing' elements that need to be followed up before consultation. 5. Produce consultation materials – with clear information about why policy areas been selected and giving information about what is necessary to comply with NP / NPPF, and asking for feedback on the key issues. 6. Engage with landowners and key stakeholders (including neighbouring parishes – will need to do this at later date as part of formal consultation but good idea to keep dialogue going as progress/activity taking place. 7. Consult widely – (surveys, events etc – consider how best to reach all community and make use of existing networks) 8. Collate/analyse all the above data and review policy area in light of results. 9. Consult with parishes up stream about flood impacts. 	Further develop policy based on recommendations	Likely
	Discard this from NDP	Unlikely – will probably be a policy area (and possibly part of a project list if created).
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	Potentially – some project areas
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Travel & Transport	Policy Area: Traffic Management	Policy Number: SBNDP4 RENUMBER?
----------------------------------	--	--

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Management of traffic – particularly A390	Para 32 of the NPPF states that 'development should only be refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative developments are <u>severe</u> ' Policy will need to be developed in this context. Policy 27 of the CLP doesn't really expand upon the above but makes reference to LTP3.	N/A	No specific policies within CNA info – more about reducing need to travel. Connecting Cornwall 2030 (LTP3) provides the evidence base but appears to conflict with the proposal for a by-pass i.e. congestion isn't highlighted as a significant problem. St Blaise Green Space Audit (2013) by Groundwork conclusions and recommendations suggests need for cycle parking and provision of a multi-story car park (to be combined with retail shopping) Conversely highlights that the car park at Stadium Retail Park is under used during weekdays.	Town Plan highlights concern over heavy/speeding traffic – but acknowledgement that there is good public transport; that the car features heavily as the main transport form for most residents; and that A390 is a main route. NP group wish to reduce impact of traffic; and a proposition has gone out to the community about re-exploring by pass option.	N/A – as insufficient information.	No	Yes	! 1) Evidence Report: Update with any community feedback and information gathered from sources below. 2) Gather Evidence from CC/Cormac: - From Cormac/CC o road infrastructure: A390 is Highways Agency territory – so limited local influence (check) - Do Cormac have an modelling available for the area? - Check plans for A391 Carluddon (as per Connecting Cornwall Implementation Plan 2015-2019). Don't think it is relevant but check out detail. - check plans to connect St Blazey to A30 (paper some years ago mentioned by Doug) - A by-pass is more likely to be a strategic policy rather than a NP one – therefore inappropriate to include – <u>the plan can't have a policy to build a bypass although support for such a scheme could be included in the plan</u> . Not sure by-pass as such is what is wanted more like improvements to access on A30. In any case, It will also need to be supported by evidence base (see LTP3 – this doesn't demonstrate congestion use as a massive problem here comparatively), any new evidence base will need to demonstrate that the safety of the highway is 'severe' (conformity with NPPF) – if this is the case this could support the principle but then it needs to be financed which will either be by govt grant (if exists) or large scale development to mitigate its impacts upon the road. - on pollution (St Austell Study mentioned at housing workshop; and annual checks mentioned by Doug) *Restormel Air Quality* - also check out access issues if housing was to be on north side of A390 (cross ref housing sheet) - feasibility of one-way system in St Blazey 3) Planning advice Planning policies on traffic more likely to be in regard to access/car parking etc (and parking provision in terms of new developments) and support for projects (if they are realistic). 4) Consider project areas – In light of above some traffic issues (where possible) might be more relevant to lobbying and projects rather than NP policies. These would need to be evidenced – ie if there are problems for on-street parking – this could justify off street provision. 5) Similarly, transport issues (other than those that require land allocation are more relevant as lobbying and projects than NP policies) 6) Refine policy areas/remit

								<p>7) Information to Public & Stakeholders Based on what comes out of above. But ensure that residents/stakeholders understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o What is currently covered by CLP o What is feasible and in remit of NP o What can be incorporated as policy; what is aspirational or project led (and which may be dependent on other factors – explain) <p>8) More widely consult (via different methods) on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inclusion of a traffic management policies b) Support for projects c) Other issues to be defined in light of CC/Cormac advice re: parking/road infrastructure/one way system; access to north of A390 and so on. <p>9) Other evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Restormel air quality report – 10 years old but worth a compare in terms of understanding congestion issues. b) CDC report on potential projects – has any research been done on access or travel to work areas. c) Review Town Framework as costs, viability and housing info in there – mentioned Andy Archer from Cormac having contributed to this document.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Comments:
 Does a Parking policy (i.e. car park) need to be explored in addition to parking as part of housing/business development? Needs to be justified by evidence on basis of making most efficient use of land. Could have a general policy that considers the impact of new development on traffic in the parish.

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Recommendations and next steps (reference numbers from above i.e. last column)</p> <p>At the workshop on 19th May this was not discussed in detail due to Cormac Rep not being present as expected. This also needs to be looked at in light of other workshop discussions. However issues around access to A30 (rather than all traffic along A390); parking; one-way system in St Blazey etc all areas to be explored with CC/Cormac before deciding next steps and what to consult on (and also what to explain/clarify with community)</p>	Further develop policy based on recommendations	YES / NO / TBC
	Discard this from NDP	YES / NO / TBC
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	YES / NO /TBC
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Travel & Transport	Policy Area: Connectivity	Policy Number: SBNDP5 RENUMBER?
----------------------------------	----------------------------------	---

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation / Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Support for cycle and walking routes that: a) Connect developments to services b) Increase access to coastal and leisure areas. c) Connect housing to Par Docks and Eden d) Reduce the need for car travel.	Yes in a generic sense – however specific issues about connecting to certain point could be developed	N/A Could perhaps map some routes as options for consultation?	1. CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission) encourages measures that reduce the need for travel. 2. St Blaise Green Space Audit (2013) by Groundwork conclusions and recommendations highlights need for network improvements bike/walking (some of this in relation to Footpath maintenance). Also need for guide defining routes; promoting facilities etc. Suggests creation of a historical walk (linked to WHS Luxulyan Valley and Charlestown).	All the community consultation (Town Plan, Big Local, Which Way for the Clay, shop consultation etc) data shows (to varying levels) support for the enhancement/c reation of cycle and walking trails.	Yes	More would help define specific projects	Yes	1) Evidence Report Update evidence report with further information as sourced e.g. current propositions out for consultation and evidence arising from further evidence gathering etc. 2) Gather Evidence: - Information from Sustrans re: Cycle routes viability/feasibility - Information from CC/Imerys etc as appropriate - current level of protection for coastal routes e.g. route via golf course. - consider how this fits with Env. Agency ideas/projects. - Does St Austell Implementation Plan cover walking/cycling routes? -Review CDC report regarding convergence projects 3) Planning Advice re: incorporating policies for 1) maintain/enhance and create safe walking routes (links to key areas: Eden, Par Docks and potential Canal route, Roundhouse, new developments, 'town heart/economic corridor' and possible heritage trail – and Stadium Retail Park); 2) cycle trail inland from coastal route. 3) protection of coast routes. 4) Liase with landowners when appropriate re: route ideas. 5) Inform residents/stakeholders and 6) More widely consult (via different methods) on a) Inclusion of a policy or policies in the NP b) Identification of routes? (footpaths & pavements and cycletrails) – particularly important in terms of links to eco-community. c) Identify what needs connecting. 7) Also need to consider interaction with flood defence measures – as these are likely to be green corridors with no devt potential they can act in a multi use sense for connectivity routes also.

Comments:

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>This worksheet not updated: At the workshop on 19th May this was not discussed in detail due to Cormac Rep not being present as expected. This also needs to be looked at in light of other workshop discussions but some thoughts are about connecting key areas; increasing opportunities for cycle and walking routes and link to those that already exist.</p>	Further develop policy based on recommendations	YES / NO / TBC
	Discard this from NDP	YES / NO / TBC
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	YES / NO /TBC
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Green/Open Spaces & Recreation	Policy Area: Preserve/enhance leisure & recreational space	Policy Number: SBNDP6 RENUMBER?
--	---	--

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Preservation of green/open spaces and contribution to environmental infrastructure, recreation and a leisure facilities.	No The Open Space Strategy only refers to the large towns – there is the potential therefore to preserve (and enhance) local areas where justified	Yes / No Query site allocation as per housing cf preserving identified green spaces and allotments	Not necessarily in support or against in terms of formal play areas: CC evidence within Cornwall Open Space Strategy for larger towns focuses, as expected on towns – such as St Austell. However, there is a suggestion that consolidation of play sites in areas such as St Blazey could result in fewer, but larger and better designed facilities. St Blaise Green Space Audit (2013) by Groundwork outlines current facilities – not just formal green space e.g. play areas/parks but also other areas such as churchyards etc. Many of the recommendations focus on improvements/cleanliness issues/maintenance. States play areas need enhancing.	Green/open spaces (parks/gardens/coast) and recreational facilities were clearly important within the consultations (Town Plan, Big Local, Which Way for the Clay, shop consultation etc); and further that young people and children need opportunity to access these. Allotments also featured. The NP group identified some specific areas e.g. King Edward Gardens. The propositions out for consultation in November highlighted all of the above, plus the need for a 'green corridor' to be maintained between St Blazey and St Austell.	Yes / No Clear link between draft policy and evidence types	Tbc	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Evidence Report Update evidence report with further information as sourced e.g. current propositions out for consultation. Also add in St Blazey/Par Green Space Audit doc which highlights need for allotments (c.50) 2) Obtain Other evidence Town Council to provide information on demand for allotments (currently no allotments in parish but about 27 on waiting list). Town Council to keep log of comments/letters re: green space provision. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2013 Green Space Audit also lists need for allotments 3) Engage with landowners e.g. Imerys; Company that own land by Co-op 4) Planning Advice on main suggestions/summary of workshop discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - new development to have green space provision - green corridor between settlements (St Blaise and St Austell?) - protection of existing (King Edward Gardens) - allotment provision - Par Docks/Co-op Land for green space allocation. Currently 5) More widely consult (via different methods) on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inclusion of green/open space & recreation policy(or policies) in the NP (If not covered within LP) b) Identify specific existing sites and uses (e.g. King Edward Gardens). c) What land do you value? d) Identify new requirements (allotments) and potential sites if desirable. e) Consider the Green Corridor policy area in terms of LP strategy and decide what action may or may not be required. 6) Engage with landowners and developers 7) Reviewing options to use flood mitigation as a way to create open space

COMMENTS: Need to map the green gap between St Austell and St Blazey and also any other green spaces that require protection. Community feedback on which sites they see as important and which ones they use will be important in providing any evidence to back up policies to protect these spaces.

CONTINUED....

Theme: Green/Open Spaces & Recreation	Policy Area: Preserve/enhance leisure & recreational space	Policy Number: SBNDP6 RENUMBER?
--	---	--

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Preliminary conclusion at the May 19th Workshop was policy needs to protect existing sites and earmark potential sites; ensure new development factors it in; provide allotment space and keep the 'green corridor'</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained (from Town Council, Imerys, landowners etc 2. Seek planning advice. 3. Consider EA plans re: flood attenuation. 4. Define any other 'missing' elements that need to be followed up before consultation. 5. Produce consultation materials – with clear information about why policy areas been selected and giving information about what is necessary to comply with NP / NPPF, and asking for feedback on the key issues. 6. Engage with landowners and key stakeholders (including neighbouring parishes – will need to do this at later date as part of formal consultation but good idea to keep dialogue going as progress/activity taking place. 7. Consult widely – (surveys, events etc – consider how best to reach all community and make use of existing networks) 8. Collate/analyse all the above data and review policy area in light of results. 	Further develop policy based on recommendations	YES
	Discard this from NDP	NO
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Economy-Development	Policy Area: Economic Development/Business Support (combine Eco Dev/Town Heart together?)	Policy Number: SBNDP8 RENUMBER?
-----------------------------------	---	--

Draft outline of Policy / Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	What Consultation/Engagement Evidence exists?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd ?	Recommendations
<p>Support for proposals that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Support existing businesses b) Maximise assets and facilities to bring in more economic investment. c) Specifically support Par Docks redevelopment (subject to it providing.... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improved access to harbour - at least 40% of housing stock to be affordable for locals - local employment opps d) training opps. <p>(development subject to flood risk criteria on site selection)</p> <p>Proposal options likely to be reviewed updated in light of St Austell Bay Investment Plan/Flood info. Par Docks and affordable housing element may not be realistic and may not be part of this policy area. Might however, be a separate policy on Eco-Community impact?</p> <p>Enterprise Zone policy?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Par Docks is supported through a strategic allocation in the CLP – however 40% provision is unlikely to be achieved and is no longer referred to as a specific absolute requirement in policy. See CLP and the St. Austell Area Regeneration Plan (ARP) Policy 1 of the CLP supports the following: ii. allocating mixed use development to deliver the eco community at West Carclaze/Baal and Par Docks; iii. supporting the economic regeneration of St Austell as a centre for retail, business and leisure with a focus on promoting 'green' industries; iii. iv. in supporting the St Austell, St Blazey & China Clay Regeneration Area small scale exemplar development will be supported which positively contributes to local objectives. Policy 5 of the CLP is permissive jobs policy which is reinforced by the ARP = this supports existing businesses and future investment.</p> <p>CLP more about Par Docks. ARP more general.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Query need for one re Par docks. Also flood risk criteria?</p>	<p>1) CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission Doc) identifies St Blazey town centre and local economy. A priority area for strategic regen and investment.</p>	<p>Parish Consultations (Exeter Uni work, shop consultation, Town Plan, Big Local) all wish to see more investment and support for businesses.</p> <p>NP Group proposal is to 'capitalise on existing advantages such as Par Docks, The Roundhouse, Football Club and iconic buildings.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes in terms of the principle - but need more to define what can be done.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1.Evidence Report: Update evidence report/this document with further shop results from current consultation statement work. Unsure if there has been additional shop consultation. Check. Also, what other evidence available (e.g St Austell Investment Plan/Enterprise Zone info/Market World plans etc. 2. Planning Advice re: Safeguarding 'economic strip' (Par Docks up to Football Club) – presumption in favour of defined uses; safeguarding businesses already there? 3. See what gaps exist if at all in the CLP – potential to allocate safeguard sites if justified but CLP policy 5 states that 'Existing and potential strategic employment land and buildings along with sites considered locally important will be safeguarded" 4. St Austell Bay Investment Plan implications and projects. 5. Geo-thermal project plans 6. Assess how or if heritage can play a part. How this links to 'Town Heart' and Heritage themes. Jenny Moore to liaise with English Heritage re: potential 'at risk' status and what this means in practical terms. 7. Gather Evidence re economic sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o EA has offered to provide (re: flood zone/sequential testing, plot size implications etc) – NP group to follow up o Find stats (register of vacant businesses);look at ELR – market demand info. 8. Engage with landowners/stakeholders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses; land/building owners inc. Roundhouse; Football Club

								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater consultation with local businesses and future space needs. Grow on\ <p>9. Information to Public Stakeholders Need to thrash out above before deciding particularly in terms of identify what is happening through St Austell Investment Plan – and what economic dev depends on in order to happen.</p> <p>10. More widely consult (via different methods) on (To be defined)</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

CONTINUED.....

Theme: Economy	Policy Area: Economic Development	Policy Number: SBNDP8 RENUMBER?
-----------------------	--	--

COMMENTS:
 ~ Impact of Ecotowns and Par Docks?
 ~ What about Eden and Geothermal (should that go in?)

Par Docks development will drive other action/regeneration. So need to bear this in mind.
 Discussion on developing an 'economic strip' (see other economic policy area sheet) but flood implications
 And also, heritage aspects – using Roundhouse for training, living museum, heritage trail. Roundhouse in private ownership – cannot force owner to use site in a way that the parish choose. Implications if it is on the 'at risk register' (as per Jenny Moore input).

St Austell Investment Plan mentioned by Doug and the EA – this is identifying projects and funding. Viability on St Blaise economic plans more likely to be ascertained if this plan goes into detail. CDC producing report. Any economic theme policies to be discussed in light of report. Doug/EA think this report will be very useful and help put detail into policy areas.

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Preliminary conclusion at the May 12th Workshop was that Economic Policies need to be considered once St Austell Investment Plan findings are available. Initial thoughts of group are the desire to create a 'economic corridor' (see next policy area); bring Roundhouse into the mix; and look at Eco-Community Impact.</p> <p>Market World/Par Moor Dev Area plans also need to be considered. All linked to flood plan issue and potential to overcome this (funding) to make change possible. Also, desire to see leisure facilities (sports centre) a retail/leisure link to make area more attractive to investors.</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column: 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained (from EA, Cormac, Imerys re: Eco-Community) 2. Seek information from Planning, EA; business/economic sources; Eden (re: Geo thermal project) and others e.g. CDC re: St Austell Bay Investment Plan and also Enterprise Zone initiative. 3. Information from above to shape next elements: 4. Define any other 'missing' elements that need to be followed up before consultation. 5. Decide if there are two sep economic policies (eco dev; and town heart/centre) or if this is one and the same. 6. Decide if eco-community policy to reinforce positive impact on St Blaise can or should be factored in. 7. Produce consultation materials – with clear information about why policy areas been selected and giving information about what is necessary to comply with NP / NPPF, and asking for feedback on the key issues. 8. Engage with landowners and key stakeholders (including neighbouring parishes – will need to do this at later date as part of formal consultation but good idea to keep dialogue going as progress/activity taking place. 9. Consult widely – (surveys, events etc – consider how best to reach all community and make use of existing networks) 10. Collate/analyse all the above data and review policy area in light of results.</p>	<p>Further develop policy based on recommendations</p>	<p>Potentially</p>
	<p>Discard this from NDP</p>	<p>Unlikely</p>
	<p>Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)</p>	<p>TBC – may be both</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with Local Plan</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with NPPF</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required</p>	<p>YES /NO / TBC</p>

--	--

Theme: Economic Development	Policy Area: Town Centre Economic Corridor	Policy Number: SBNDP9 RENUMBER?
------------------------------------	--	--

Draft outline of Policy / Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
<p>Support for proposals that:</p> <p>a) Help provide for the creation of a Town Centre</p> <p>Likely to be about 'economic corridor' rather than Town Centre.</p>	<p>Yes/Partly</p> <p>Policy 4 of the CLP support the vitality and viability of town centres and maintains and enhances a good and appropriate range of shops, services and community facilities</p> <p>St Blazey has an existing centre which is not specifically safeguarded in any forthcoming allocations document other than through policy 4.</p> <p>The acknowledgement of a possible 'new centre' within the supporting topic paper for the CLP provides an indication of support.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Also flood risk criteria?</p>	<p>1) CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission Doc) identifies St Blazey town centre and local economy. A priority area for strategic regeneration and investment.</p> <p>2) The St Blazey, Fowey & Lostwithiel Topic Paper - March 2013 states 'St Blazey town centre is in need of regeneration - Potential for new centre at Par as part of the Eco-community'</p>	<p>Parish Consultations (Exeter Uni work, shop consultation, Town Plan, Big Local) all refer to the need for more town centre and social facilities with some specifically referring to the need for a town centre (particularly the Exeter Uni work)</p> <p>NP Group proposal is to 'provide a heart for our town'</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes - in terms of support for facilities and town centre.</p>	<p>Yes/No</p>	<p>Workshop idea for an Economic Corridor (Retail/Leisure facilities) from Par Docks up to and including Football Club)</p> <p>1) Evidence Report - Update evidence report with further information as sourced e.g. current propositions out for consultation.</p> <p>2) Planning Advice - what is viable in planning terms for setting an 'economic strip/corridor with presumption in favour of certain uses. Safeguarding what's there (sequential testing)</p> <p>3) Gather Evidence/information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From EA (this is a flood plan area - what is feasible and realistic). - Assess how this fits with St Austell Investment Plan. - get stats/employment info (see SPNDP8) <p>4) How does this link with heritage and economic development ideas?</p> <p>5) Consult with stakeholders (businesses, land/building owners inc. Roundhouse, Football Club, Town Team etc.</p> <p>(Aspirational - how to make it happen? How realistic and what active policies AND projects could help with this?)</p> <p>The provision of a new centre has to be realistic and in basic terms will need a significant investment into the area to attract retailers - Eco-town at Par is the obvious driver - there is the potential for a policy linked to eco-town delivery and relocation of town centre - liaison with Imerys is clearly required about realism of the eco-town delivery and what their aspirations are for their development before exploring policy.</p>

COMMENTS: including

ACTION - NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Link this to SBNDP8 actions - as policy direction likely to be influenced by same things (flood, St Austell bay Investment Plan); etc.</p>	<p>Further develop policy based on recommendations</p>	<p>Probable</p>
	<p>Discard this from NDP</p>	<p>Unlikely</p>
	<p>Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)</p>	<p>TBC - potentially both</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with Local Plan</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Likely Conformity with NPPF</p>	<p>TBC</p>

	<p>Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required</p>	<p>YES / NO / TBC</p>
--	---	-----------------------

Theme: Community Regeneration	Policy Area: Marketing and Image	Policy Number: SBNDP10 RENUMBER?
--------------------------------------	---	---

Draft outline of Policy / Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/proposal?	What Consultation/Engagement Evidence exists?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
<p>Aim is to improve the image of St Blaise</p> <p>(Doug wanted the aim to be about making St Blaise more desirable to live and work – i.e. this is the vision statement?)</p>	<p>N/A</p> <p>Policy 1 of the CLP . supports the regeneration of the St Austell, St Blazey and China Clay as does the St. Austell, St Blazey Area Regeneration Plan.</p>	N/A		<p>Parish Consultations (Exeter Uni work, shop consultation, Town Plan, Big Local) highlight the lack of community facilities, how people are concerned about aesthetics of area; need to increase community pride and better quality of life.</p> <p>NP group highlight the negative perception of area.</p>	N/A	Yes	Yes	<p>This links to policy areas already listed but is mainly project work.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Engage with stakeholders (Police, Town Team, etc) to obtain list of project areas and what is already being implemented or planned e.g. Town Team projects for signage, marketing, events, rebranding etc. 2) Discussion over building appearance/style – what’s valued/worth protecting. Link to heritage audit. 3) Consider how projects fit in with policies and within NP. 4) Do discussions re: Enterprise Zone impact on this? 5) Engage with Ocean housing re: engaging with their residents – plans to improve appearance of properties etc. 6) Make use of existing facilities and interests to bring people together (inc. heritage) 7) Ensure better communication with community (this cannot be just written text – must be creative and across all sectors) 8) This is the vision for the NP and we need to ensure that any policies support this objective

COMMENTS: including

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obtain info on projects/ Enterprise Zone/St Austell Investment Plan to see how this might all mesh together 2. Is it policy or project 3. Consultation 4. Link other policies to community regen? (signposting mentioned in terms of connectivity etc) 	Further develop policy based on recommendations	TBC
	Discard this from NDP	TBC
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	Both?
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Heritage	Policy Area: Heritage & Historical Assets	Policy Number: SBNDP11 RENUMBER?
------------------------	--	---

Draft outline of Policy / Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
No policy more a link to economic development and possible community pride elements – consider what is wanted/needed.	Historic buildings (listed Buildings) and areas (Conservation Areas) are safeguarded through policies in the NPPF and the CLP. There is the potential for 'local' listings for buildings that are not covered through the above in the NP if identified and justified.	N/A		Parish Consultations (Exeter Uni work, shop consultation, Town Plan all have some reference to heritage but usually as part of other aspirations.	N/A	Yes	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Gather evidence from English Heritage: Group (JM) is in contact with English Heritage as there is possibility that the Roundhouse will go on the 'at risk register' and implications of this. Jenny to follow up 2) Gather info – Restormel info re: designations? 3) Mapping: Group to carry out mapping of historic buildings and features (e.g. facades etc – see marketing/image notes) 4) Evidence Report – Update with any info including audit of heritage assets and listing info. 5) Planning advice re: safeguarding heritage assets including Roundhouse through policy (but this does not force owner to sell/use it in a certain way). In terms of Roundhouse what use would be welcomed (e.g. living museum, training venue for engineering to keep rail history) etc. 6) Engage with owners of Roundhouse and other identified assets. 7) Decide whether heritage needs to be consulted upon in its own right i.e. Town Plan highlights its lack of focus on historical buildings or heritage (other than Roundhouse). 8) Consider links to Community Regeneration policies 9) Consider how this informs economic policies and projects. 10) Consult and engage with community as project/policy areas more clear.

COMMENTS: including
 Roundhouse is Grade II* listed. Cannot force owner to sell (and who would buy?) and cannot force owner to use in a certain way. If there is a policy area it is about safeguarding it in years ahead (separate to any heritage project that the parish may undertake).
 Need to identify what is important in terms of heritage (facades/character could be part of audit) Mapping exercise required.

ACTION – NEXT STEPS: This section to be completed when the sheet has been discussed with the group.

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Recommendations and next steps (reference numbers from above i.e. last column)</p> <p>In summary of recommendations column:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Update evidence report (and keep updating as engagement/consultation takes place, or as new information obtained 2. Gather evidence from English Heritage etc. 3. Undertake mapping exercise (more than just Roundhouse) 4. Define what policies this then steers away. 5. Seek planning advice. 6. Engage with landowners 7. Consider EA plans re: flood attenuation. 8. Define any other 'missing' elements that need to be followed up before consultation. <p>Produce consultation mate</p>	Further develop policy based on recommendations	TBC
	Discard this from NDP	TBC
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

Theme: Eco Town	Policy Area: Eco Town Eco Community	Policy Number: SBNDP12 RENUMBER?
------------------------	---	---

Draft outline of Policy / Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
It appears that there may need to be a policy to respond to the 'eco-town' if this comes forward	Par docks is a strategic allocation in the CLP and mentioned specifically in Policy 1. The delivery of this project will have a significant impact upon St Blazey and would justify a different approach to circumstances when it does happen – ie relocating the town centre, retail/ development opportunities etc. Potentially this may be an issue for the next NP after this one but it appears to make sense to anticipate responding to development if Par Docks does come forward.	N/A	Evidence itself exists but will require to potential for delivery – the policy will be required to inform the preparation of the scheme and not in response to it getting permission.		N/A	Yes	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with Imerys (deliverables/timescale) as and when possible. There are no definitive plans for when the Eco-Community development will take place. Also what impact re:contamination site. Consider how St Blaise should respond to the Eco-Community – linkages. Planning Advice on potential to influence Par Docks undertaking an assessment on how their plans would impact on St Blaise (viability of businesses, life of area; flood – tide locking issues etc. Consider if tourism ops for St Blazey and how this also impacts on leisure facilities. Gather evidence including EA flood info. Inform and consult as appropriate. <p>Policy could identify requirements for eco-town proposals to demonstrate how it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate the regeneration of St. Blaise Help contribute to local job creation - help support the vitality and viability of the centre or contribute to the delivery of a new centre Physical linkages by footpath and cycle ways to St Blaise via footbridge? <p>Prob. All of the above! – how does Eco-Com impact.</p>

COMMENTS: including

<p>Suggest timetable /way forward on recommendations above or indicate reason why this policy not proceeding.</p> <p>Initial step is: Planning advice on whether a policy can be included to respond to Eco-Community Project</p>	Further develop policy based on recommendations	YES / NO / TBC
	Discard this from NDP	YES / NO / TBC
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	YES / NO /TBC
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	YES / NO / TBC
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	YES /NO / TBC
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	YES /NO / TBC

REMOVED POLICY AREAS

Theme: Housing	Policy Area: Market Housing	Policy Number: SBNDP2 Not required.
-----------------------	------------------------------------	--

Draft outline of Policy Area/ Proposal	Covered by Local Plan	Site Allocation ?	What evidence supports this policy/ proposal?	What Consultation/ Engagement Evidence exists to support this?	Do these link?	Sufficient evidence?	More work req'd?	Recommendations
Market Housing	Yes – Partly? The CLP supports the provision for market housing (policy 3) – policies on affordable housing (8 and 9) allow for market to be provided alongside affordable to help delivery. Policy 7 seeks the provision of a mix of house types above 10 dwellings.	Potentially Sites put forward under SHLAA. NP Group suggested north of A390 Some potential synergy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) CNA Emerging Local Plan (Pre Submission) and Network Profile – development strategy within network area is to deliver a balance of market and affordable housing. 2) SHLAA in terms of sites being put forward by landowners 	<p>Much of the consultation materials do not drill down into type of housing and the finer details.</p> <p>In terms of sites: The Town Plan also states preference for brownfield sites.</p> <p>NP Group Proposition is for north of A390 (but no results yet to see if this is a consensus) and 'village settlements'.</p>	Not specifically Market housing and sites not fully explored.	No – limited evidence of demand	Yes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Update evidence report/this document with further shop results from current consultation statement work. 2) More widely consult (via different methods) on <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Inclusion of a market housing policy in the NP (If not covered within LP) b) Whether to set ratio for buy/rent allocation. c) Potential Site Allocations d) Is the noted 'premium' for more sustainable housing still applicable? 3) Engage with landowners 4) Obtain more information about Par Docks development and affordable/market housing split 5) Obtain other evidence (any Housing Needs stats or consider Housing Needs survey?) 6) Need to review CLP policy and establish where it is failing – is there a need to identify a specific type of market housing above and beyond those supported through the CLP – ie Code 6 houses?

Comments:

- Limited evidence
- Eco-community plans will impact on housing delivery within the area
- Built up area and flood risk will impact on site locations.

ACTION – NEXT STEPS:

<p>Discussion on information above resulted in decision to discard this policy from consultation (and NP) unless circumstance change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Workshop 11/5/15 did not identify any evidence of need specifically in terms of Market Housing. However, aware that in order to deliver affordable housing, that this will require market housing development. • Workshop attendees satisfied in having a focus on housing policy (and the ratio of affordable/market housing to be feasible) and aware that default position is that within the CLP. 	Further develop policy based on recommendations	NO
	Discard this from NDP	YES
	Potential Project (i.e. non-policy area)	NO
	Likely Conformity with Local Plan	N/A
	Likely Conformity with NPPF	N/A
	Please note further checks on conformity and compatibility etc and need for assessments will be required	N/A