

Schedule of Changes to NDP based on Cornwall Council and initial Mabe Steering Group Responses – May 22

Wording to be deleted shown ~~struckthrough~~

New wording shown in ***bold italic***

All policies will need to shown in a box to separate them from the rest of the text

I have set out the current page number and policy number but this will need to be redone once changes have been made

Comments/questions in blue KW comment in green

Page	Change to document
2	<p>Remove Policy 9 Local Green Space from contents</p> <p>Check policy numbers as there are 2 number 5's in the contents list and the list only goes up to Policy 14 housing K WEST Comment Insert page numbers and revision to each page footer. Check Contents page reference is correct Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
3	<p>Remove Policy 10 Local Green Space from table 1.1</p> <p>KW comment should this not be remove policy 9 Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p> <p>Check 7 & 8 Low Carbon Heat as there is only Policy 7 later in the Plan and Biodiversity is Policy 8 etc KW Comment. It seems the version you had was not the one on the web site or amended by Bea as policy 5,6,7,&,8 are on web site and Beas copy Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
10	<p>Evidence Documents for the NDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies (2010-2030) 2016 • <i>Cornwall Climate Emergency DPD – Submission Draft November 2021</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) January 2016 • The Strategic Housing Market Needs Assessment (SHMNA) 2013 • Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Landscape Character Study 2007 • Cornwall Renewable Energy Landscape Sensitivity Assessment December 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood Plan Survey - Summary Report <p>KW comment. I assume this relates to section 4 /supporting documentation. Add two lines of bullet point Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
13	<p>Evidence suggests that human activity in the Parish has existed since <i>the</i> Neolithic man <i>age</i>. Early Bronze Age gives us significant finds, indicating that Cornwall’s natural resources of copper and tin were exploited and commerce commenced. Evidence also exists to show that the mining and working of Cornish stone and granite was commenced in the early Bronze Age. Since that time Cornish Granite has played an important part in the construction industry throughout the world and forms an important part of Mabe History and employment and is an aspect that the community is keen to preserve.</p> <p>KW Comment / Somewhat pedantic notation. However, the main point being it is page 14 on Beas copy v19 and PDF web site copy Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
15	<p>The NDP sets out 21 20 Policies in order to help achieve the Objectives and the Vision for the area. Table 1-1 – Policy Index above, illustrates how each Policy contributes to each Objective and leads to obtaining the Vision of the MNDP</p> <p>KW Comment/ The Mind map is page 17 on V19 and web PDF. The Policy Index section 1 page 13 notes 27 policies. Both sections should be checked and amended once all policies have been removed or amended to marry page numbers and interconnecting sectors. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
16	<p>Remove Policy 10 from diagram and renumber other policies</p>

	<p>Check policies as it lists 27 policies</p> <p>KW Comment / see above, page 15 Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
17	<p>Community Identity and Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance the historic business heritage of the parish. • Ensure future development is matched by appropriate education and recreational facilities. • <i>Protect and enhance the Parish's wider historic character</i> <p>KW comment/ add text as suggested and re format page to suit. It currently spans pages 17 & 18. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
22	<p>Original policy text moved to supporting text KW comment./ separate to reasoning and intent to be consistent throughout the document. The actual policy should be highlighted to separate it from text. As previously advised by myself and PW.</p> <p>Sustainable development in Mabe: Reasoning Sustainable, appropriate development is development that meets current human need without compromising natural capital. It takes account of the needs of future generations, other species, and the carrying capacity of the planet. It recognises the intrinsic value of nature and the protection of the environment. It is intended that our community be resilient enough to withstand future shocks, notably climate change and resource depletion.</p> <p>The intent. Through the use of design codes (see Appendix 1) applications will be supported that have the potential environmental benefits to reduce dependency on fossil fuels and fuel transportation, while stimulating, supporting and facilitating, renewable energy and to ensure that all new builds and refurbishments embrace renewable energy potential at the planning stage.</p>

Applications will be supported that have the potential environmental benefits, reduce energy consumption and help resolve traffic flow problems in the village. When looking at a potential development opportunity, it is envisaged that this policy document will encourage and inspire applicants to use best practice and take a global perspective to climate change to help make the Parish a carbon neutral community.

New development in Mabe will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal is sustainable, embodying the social, economic and environmental aspects of sustainable development set out in the Plan's definition of sustainable development.

Proposals for the construction of new buildings and renovations of historic buildings will be ~~encouraged~~ **required** to conform to the Mabe Parish Climate Action Plan and Mabe Parish Design Codes.

To gain support Developers are ~~encouraged~~ **required** to accompany proposals with a statement setting out how the development promotes renewable energy, water conservation, minimisation of waste and energy reduction where:

- i. solar gain and highly efficient insulation is maximised;***
- ii. renewable technologies such as but not limited to solar, heat pumps or biomass boilers are included where ~~possible~~ **practical**;***
- iii. Facilities for charging low emission vehicles are included;***
- iv. Grey water storage is included, where ~~possible~~ **practical*****

Proposals for the alteration or extensions to existing buildings will be supported where the application can evidence the use of renewable energy, highly efficient insulation and carbon reducing technology.

	<p>Community led projects, designed to reduce levels of CO2 across the Parish as a whole, or that benefits specific sectors of the community (renewable energy; traffic reduction; cycle lanes; rainwater harvesting; tree planting and community open space initiatives; low voltage lighting or community car charging) will be supported.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
22	<p>New policy wording:</p> <p>Policy 1: Sustainable Development in Mabe</p> <p>New development should seek to achieve high standards of design and sustainable development, and proposals should demonstrate how design, construction and operation has sought to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce the use of fossil fuels, 2. Adopt and facilitate the flexible development of low and zero carbon energy through a range of technologies; 3. Promote the efficient use of natural resources, the re-use and recycling of resources, including rainwater, and the consumption of renewable energy; 4. New development should show how it meets the requirements of the Mabe Parish Design Code 5. Wherever possible-practical, new development should include electric car charging capability <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
23	<p>Policy 2: Community Led Renewable Energy. Any development proposals for renewable energy schemes in Mabe Parish will be supported, where they are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrated so that the energy generated can be supplied directly to domestic, business and other buildings in the Parish, thereby reducing energy consumption. 2. Fully or partly owned by Mabe residents, businesses or community associations, for the benefit of the local

	<p>community. This can be demonstrated by evidence that the development is fully or partly owned through an appropriate community energy enterprise.</p> <p>3. Comply with technology-specific other policies of this plan. KW comment/ make changes as proposed. Ensure policy is highlighted text to separate from reasoning and intent.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
24	<p>The purpose of this policy is to ensure that future wind turbine development will be in line with the landscape character, appropriate and proportionate to its location. The policy has been created at a local level in association with the NPPF, Policy 14 of the CLP, the Cornwall Renewable Energy SPD, and the Cornwall Renewable Energy Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and the emerging Cornwall Climate Emergency DPD.</p> <p>KW comment / no objection to amendment. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p> <p>New para moved from policy wording:</p> <p>For information:</p> <p>1 Shadow Flicker relates to the flickering effect caused by the rotating of wind turbine blades.</p> <p>2 The Cornwall Landscape Sensitivity Analysis (Mar 2016) classified wind turbine and solar according to band scaling.</p> <p>3 Applicants should use the CLP SPD on Renewable Energy Annexes 1 (P18) to inform their impact assessments.</p> <p>KW comment Assume this is to be moved and inserted after intent and before highlighted policy wording? Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
24	<p>Policy 3 Wind Turbine Development.</p> <p>KW comment / this is part of wind energy policy so should be the start of highlighted policy. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>

Proposals for wind turbine development should be located in the area identified as suitable for wind energy development in the 'Wind Turbine Deployment Zone' Figure overleaf: Potential Wind Development Area. Wind turbine proposals should address the planning impacts of the scheme in accordance with guidance in the Cornwall Renewable Energy SPD and ensure that the following potential harmful impacts on the following are appropriately avoided or mitigated:

1. Residential Amenity. Through noise generation, shadow flicker or overbearing visual impact.
2. Safety. Highways and our **Public Rights of Way (PRoW)**.
3. Landscape and Visual Impact. Particular regard for the sensitivity of the landscape in relation to wind turbines (e.g. within Landscape Character Areas CA10) should be taken; especially the negative impact of concentrations of such installations. The **Cornish Renewable Energy Landscape Sensitivity Assessment** landscape strategy is for occasional single or small clusters of turbines, comprising those up to the Band C scale (less in areas close to small scale historic features. Landscape is key to the NDP as identified in the LLCA. The primary aim is to provide a positive planning environment for development whilst retaining the heritage and agricultural environment and managing the visual impact of future development.
4. Heritage Impact. All applications must recognise and give due consideration to Mabe Parish's heritage assets and designations.
5. Cumulative Impact. Proposals for individual wind turbines or wind farms will not be permitted where, together with existing and approved turbines or wind farms, will lead to a concentration of wind turbines on a scale which would significantly change the character of the wider landscape.
6. De-commissioning. Once the development reaches the end of its operational life, it must be removed and the site remediated, though plans will be considered for the future repowering of both new and existing sites in line with the NPPF.

~~Wind Turbine Deployment Zones~~

- ~~1 Shadow Flicker relates to the flickering effect caused by the rotating of wind turbine blades.~~
- ~~2 The Cornwall Landscape Sensitivity Analysis (Mar 2016) classified wind turbine and solar according to band scaling.~~
- ~~3 Applicants should use the CLP SPD on Renewable Energy Annexes 1 (P18) to inform their impact assessments.~~

	<p>KW comment/ make amendments and ensure policy highlighted. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
25	<p>The intention of this policy is to ensure that future solar development will be in line with the landscape character and proportionate to their location. The policy has been created at a local level in accordance with the NPPF, Policy 14 of the CLP, the Cornwall Renewable Energy SPD, and the Cornwall <i>Renewable Energy</i> Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and the emerging Cornwall Climate Emergency DPD.</p> <p>Proposals should address the planning implications of any solar scheme and ensure that any harmful impacts on the following are avoided, mitigated or managed:</p> <p>KW comment/ this is part of highlighted policy? We should also separate the policy 4 from policy 5 Hydro. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p> <p>1. Residential Amenity. Through noise generation or overbearing visual impact.</p> <p>12. Landscape and Environment. The applicant can demonstrate that any significant adverse impact to the local landscape and environment are avoided and where necessary, mitigated effects on landscape character and visual amenity are avoided or the effects reduced through mitigation. Applicants should use the CLP SPD on Renewable Energy Annexes 1 & 3 and the landscape descriptions contained within CA10 to inform their impact assessments. CA10 Landscape strategy for solar PV development is moderate for a landscape with occasional PV developments (to Band C)79.</p> <p>23. Heritage and de-commissioning: They do not adversely affect designated Heritage features through direct damage and once their intended use ceases, it is conditional to decommission and remove the structures. *see historic comment should there be more text here? KW comment . clarify with Mark or whom ever wrote this part.</p> <p>34. Residential Amenity. They do not adversely affect residential amenity through noise generation, overbearing visual impact or have adverse impacts on highways and PRoW.</p> <p>45. Alternate Land Use. Regard is given to other uses of proposed land. In particular, how land beneath/surrounding the panels will be managed; and how they may have avoided land with high potential for agriculture (e.g. Best and Most Versatile Land) unless the proposal allows for continued agricultural use or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays and a net increase in ecological value.</p>

	<p>56. Design. Due consideration is given to best practice guidance (see BP2 and BP3 below) in relation to solar array design, maximising the potential for renewable energy generation alongside net biodiversity gains and agricultural activity.</p> <p>67. Cumulative Impact. Proposals for solar PV development will not be permitted where, together with an existing array, it would lead to a concentration of solar PV and significantly change the character of the wider landscape</p> <p>KW comment/ other than above question amend text and ensure it is highlighted policy</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
26	<p>CC questioned whether this was already covered in the emerging Climate Emergency DPD which goes to examination in June but Mark was keen to retain the policy. I have therefore reviewed it and don't think it is saying anything that is not in line with this so I have just added a connection to the DPD in the supporting text.</p> <p>12.7 - Policy 7: Low Carbon Heat</p> <p>Reasoning: 95% of survey respondents supported the use of Heat Pumps, 82% supported Anaerobic Digestion, 83% supported District Heating and 99% supported Energy Efficiency Schemes.</p> <p>Generating heat causes around a third of UK 'Greenhouse Gas' (GHG) emissions. In the UK domestic and commercial setting, 98% of GHG emissions from heat come from space and water heating; but in 2015 only 5.6% of the UK's heating came from renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Intention: This policy is to directly address the challenge of reducing heat related emissions across the Parish, currently hampered by higher levels of fuel poverty, high fuel costs and exacerbated by a lack of access to grid supplied heating fuels and consequent dependence on more expensive, environmentally damaging options like oil.</p> <p>The policy has been created at a local level in accordance with the NPPF, Policy 13 & 14 of the CLP, policies RE1 and SEC1 of the emerging Cornwall Climate Emergency DPD, Cornwall Renewable Energy SPD,</p>

	<p>Objective 5 of this NDP and the UK Clean Growth Strategy, which specifically recognises the opportunity presented by low carbon heat in domestic and commercial buildings.</p> <p>This policy may also provide support for applications that seek to retrofit low carbon heating and cooling solutions as part of any redevelopment proposals. Consideration should be given to potential impacts as outlined in the <i>emerging Cornwall Climate Emergency DPD</i>.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
30	<p>Policy 8</p> <p>All new development should be planned and designed to protect and enhance local wildlife species and habitats, demonstrating how they will deliver a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity, which is in accordance with the Cornwall Council's Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
31	<p>Deleted do to concerns over meeting specific definition of Local Green Space and considerable further work including a Green Space Assessment and consultation with landowners.</p> <p>KW comment / Consider moving some text to landscape or other section as part of narrative, given the emphasis of consultation responses on its importance.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p> <p>12.9 – Policy 9: Local Green Space</p> <p>Reasoning: 98% of respondents supported tree planting/reforestation and rewilding projects. 76% of respondents supported protection and enhancement of open space.</p> <p>The CLP provides protection for open spaces through its Policies 12 (Design,) 13 (Development standards), 16 (Health and wellbeing) and 25 (Green infrastructure). Moreover, in order to promote</p>

healthy communities, the NPPF provides for the designation by local communities of 'Local Green Spaces', thereby affording them special levels of protection from unwanted development while permitting improvements that will enhance their amenity value. Having limited open green space. Respondents to public consultation felt that the existing green spaces in the Parish were highly important.

Intention: The Parish is covered by a number of national and local landscape and historic designations, which are already afforded protected status through separate legislation such as the Area of Great Landscape Value, County Wildlife Sites, Minerals Safeguarding Area and a number of public rights of way.

NDP Policy 9 is intended to protect all qualifying open spaces within the Parish, while providing for improvements to them that will benefit the community, by designating them as Local Green Spaces.

Developers and application for any planning consents are encouraged to utilise the Landscape Assessment / Agricultural Overview and the Green Infrastructure documents within this NDP.

12.9.1 Applications will be supported that demonstrate adherence to the Mabe Landscape Character Statement, agricultural Overview and the green infrastructure appraisal contained within the appendix to this NDP

12.9.2 Maintaining the openness and accessibility to qualifying open space.

12.9.3 The following areas are identified in the appendix map detailing designated green open space. Development in these areas will only be supported in extremely exceptional circumstances and where local support can be demonstrated:

Spargo Court Amenity area

Mabe Youth Community Project (MYCP) / School Playing field and Play Park

	<p>☒ Green Buffer Zone KW comment /remove policy and re jig contents page and policy links page. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
32	<p>Mabe Policy: Community Identity and Heritage</p> <p>Objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance the historic business heritage of the parish. • Ensure future development is matched by appropriate education and recreational facilities. • To support development that ensures better and safer use of roadways and transport needs. • <i>Protect and enhance the Parish's wider historic character</i> <p>KW coment/ if this is added then also change the Objectives listings at page's 4, 17 & 18 Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
34	<p>Policy wording to include live/work KW Comment / we need to look at this section as there now appears to be two sections for reasoning. They should be in one section</p> <p>12.11.1 Applications for new employment work space will be supported only where the scale and nature of development is appropriate in size and character to the immediate surroundings and does not adversely impact on the locality, or amenities of local residents and or property.</p> <p>12.11.2 Applications for new local retail /service outlets and expansion of existing outlets or premises will be supported where the nature of development is proportional to the existing premises; is appropriate in terms of size and character to those of its immediate surroundings and does not have an adverse effect on the amenities of local residents.</p>

12.11.3 New build live/work units will be supported within the settlement boundaries as set out in Policy 15. Development outside of the identified settlement boundaries will be restricted to infill, rounding off, sub division of existing properties, brown field sites and the conversion of existing buildings [residential and or commercial] provided they are of an appropriate scale and do not detract from the appearance and character of their immediate neighbourhood, the wider landscape & secure Biodiversity Net Gain.

Proposals will need to be supported by evidence of need for a business unit with ancillary living accommodation and evidence that such a unit would *have long term viability*. In the case of a proposed new business, this evidence should include a minimum of a 3 year business plan.

Proposals for live/work development will also need to meet the following criteria:

- a) The residential use will meet nationally described *space standards regulations for habitable accommodation and be ancillary to the business use with floor space split at least 60% employment and no more than 40% residential;***
- b) The occupancy/ size of the living area will be restricted to the immediate family of a person working full-time in the business.**

If located within an area of housing, only uses compatible with residential amenity will be permitted.

KW comment / amend text to as above

SG noted 16.6.22 that this policy needs review against SG April 21st Meeting minutes and subsequent advice from Paul Webber. Revised text circulated for agreement following meeting.

Concept for measuring business case term and proportion of living space agreed in principle

How the approval reverts on cessation of business use to be clarified

SG passed, MW disagreed that this isn't creative industry specific and includes Bus Case requirement

36

TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

KW comment/ this is page 37 on v 19

Reasoning: When asked what one thing would improve Mabe for future generations the most significant responses related to traffic are road safety and a lack of alternative transport.

While predominantly a rural Parish the main residential area in is clustered around Mabe Burnthouse in the North East corner. The combination of local shops and facilities with a difficult road junction and a lack of pavement for pedestrians all contribute to making walking, cycling and driving within the village a hazardous and unsafe prospect.

Any housing development approved will undoubtedly place an even greater burden and safety hazard to those wishing to walk, cycle or even as a last resort drive to the village amenities. Recent reductions in bus services have also had an increase in the requirement for car use and resulted in making getting out and about for many, especially the elderly or those taking children to and from school a particular hazard.

The issue of traffic within the village is one of the most contentious issues raised in response to recent consultation. Despite a proposed traffic calming initiative, the junction at Antron Hill and Church Road will remain a significant barrier to pedestrian and cycle movements as the highway layout is dangerous to pedestrians and cyclists and people do not feel safe crossing.

~~Due to their proximity, there are transport links with Penryn and Falmouth and Cornwall Council are preparing a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for this area, which includes Mabe. Further information can be found by visiting: <https://letstalk.cornwall.gov.uk/falmouth-penryn-cycling-and-walking-infrastructure-plan>~~

Intention: To avoid increased congestion on the roads this policy will stipulate minimum off street parking requirements for new development. The policy also seeks to encourage measures to reduce the volume of traffic, encourage driving more slowly, enable pedestrians and cyclists to travel off-road and improve the provision of parking. It is envisaged that any long-term improvement in the situation will be the result of a combination of measures such as the appropriate extension

	<p>and relocation of footpaths; creation of cycle paths and provision of pavements alongside.</p> <p>KW comment /Whilst there last intention took over 12 years to materialize/ and was watered down to insignificance, include additional text . I would suggest as an italic footnote.</p> <p>SG Agreed 16.6.22</p>
38	<p>QUESTION - Policy 15</p> <p>As I have stated before during the development of the plan I think this repeats what you already have in Policy 9 of your Plan and this combined with the emerging Policy G2 – Biodiversity Net Gain of the Climate Emergency DPD will cover what you want it to.</p> <p>I would expect an Inspector to ask you why there is a need to repeat this in the Plan during the examination.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to remove this policy but if there is something in it that you think isn't covered you can move it to Policy 9.</p> <p>Do the Mabe NDP Group still want to include this policy in the Plan?</p> <p>Kw Comment/ Given open space was of significant importance to the residents a reference to support for the emerging DPD and reduce the text we have to reflect this. There seems no reason to remove policy when the DPD is not yet approved.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
38	<p>QUESTION – Policy 16</p> <p>CC comment:</p> <p>The Public realm policy is unclear – a planning officer trying to make a decision on an application would find it very difficult to assess whether this requirement had been met. Suggest something simpler like:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• demonstrate that they have no significant adverse effect on the integrity or continuity of landscape features and</i>

	<p><i>habitats of local and national importance for wild flora and fauna.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by providing net gains in biodiversity.</i> <p><i>Development which is likely to have significant harm on wildlife corridors will not be supported.</i></p> <p><i>And for the public rights of way policy, something like:</i></p> <p><i>‘Development proposals which remove an existing public right of way will not be supported unless a suitable alternative route which provides safe and convenient access, with no adverse impact on the character of the area is provided.’</i></p> <p>I don’t think that CC’s suggestions change the emphasis of your policy, biodiversity detail is already covered in your plan and Acts of parliament already carry statutory weight that doesn’t need to be repeated.</p> <p>Do the Mabe NDP Group want to amend to CC wording?</p> <p>Add the policy text but don’t remove existing text Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
39	<p>Policy 18. New tree Planting & Woodland</p> <p>12.13.12 <i>The reinstatement of historic planting and woodland should be prioritised in the first instance.</i> Proposals to plant trees, copse and woodland that reflect the landscape character in both location and species selected and that respect and maintain important identified views and vistas will receive positive support.</p> <p>12.13.13 Carbon offset plans will not be considered as sufficient reason for removing existing trees due to the time lag in the efficacy of replacing the lost carbon in removal of old trees for new trees relative to carbon capture.</p> <p>KW comment / agree</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
39	QUESTION Policy 19 Flood resilience & surface run off

	<p>CC comment: For flood risk, suggest a simpler policy but also review draft policy CC3 in the CEDPD which I think covers this:</p> <p><i>'Development proposals will be supported where they demonstrate that they include measures to ensure that they do not increase flood risk elsewhere and are appropriately flood resilient and resistant.'</i></p> <p><i>KW Comment agree to change wording and add the reference to CC policy</i></p> <p>Do the Mabe NDP Group want to amend to CC wording?</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
39	<p>QUESTION Policy 20 Species</p> <p>CC comment: I think the requirements around species are really covered by the biodiversity net gain requirements – check the policy in the draft DPD.</p> <p>PW comment: As I have stated before during the development of the plan I think this repeats what you already have in Policy 9 of your Plan and this combined with the emerging Policy G2 – Biodiversity Net Gain of the Climate Emergency DPD will cover what you want it to.</p> <p>I would expect an Inspector to ask you why there is a need to repeat this in the Plan during the examination.</p> <p>My suggestion would be to remove this policy but if there is something in it that you think isn't covered you can move it to Policy 9.</p> <p><i>KW Comment Check with Paul Simmonds to ensure what we state as a requirement is in fact in the policy referred to by CC</i></p> <p>Do the Mabe NDP Group still want to include this policy in the Plan?</p> <p>Retain in the plan. Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>

41

QUESTION Policy 21 Settlement Boundary

CC comment:

Suggest the following text for the **settlement boundary** policy:

A settlement boundary is designated for the village of Mabe Burnthouse as shown on ~~Map X~~ KW comment this is appendix item ? Development will be supported inside this boundary where

- 1. it complies with other policies in this plan and in the Cornwall Local Plan.*
- 2. It conserves and enhances the character of the area and maintains a distinct and recognisable barrier between Mabe and Penryn.*
- 3. It is of a scale appropriate to the location*
- 4. It does not cause a detriment to the residential amenity of any existing or neighbouring dwellings (e.g. through loss of privacy, or **overshadowing**) or to the character of the locality and it provides a safe means of access.*
- 5. It contributes **positively** to the delivery of local facilities, services or infrastructure requirements.*

Outside of this boundary, residential development in Mabe Parish will be supported where

- It is in accordance with Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan*
- It is to deliver affordable housing in response to a demonstrated **and supported** local need and in accordance with Cornwall Local Plan Policy 9;*
- ~~To~~ **It delivers** deliver Low Impact Development in accordance with policy AL1 of the Climate Emergency DPD*
- It is for a self build, affordable home in accordance with [self / custom build policy]*

PW comment:

I think this says the same as your existing policy but is presented differently which I think is fine and I like the addition of the explanation of the exception policies here.

I would however add the following to point 2:

- 2. It conserves and enhances the character of the area and maintains a distinct and recognisable barrier between Mabe and*

	<p>Penryn. (I've added this to the suggested policy above)</p> <p>Do the Mabe NDP Group want to amend to CC wording? KW comment agree to changes as above Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
46	<p>Policy Custom and Self Build</p> <p>CC comments:</p> <p>For the self build exception policy, we'd suggest something like the policy below:</p> <p><i>In addition to Policy 9 of the Cornwall Local Plan, proposals for single [self-build] affordable dwellings [and/or community led development] will be supported where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Applicants are able to demonstrate that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a. They require affordable housing and have a strong local connection and need to be located within the settlement that the site is proposed;</i> <i>b. There are no other reasonable options which address their housing needs, having regard to any other nearby settlements; and existing or planned rural exception schemes; and</i> </i> <i>2. the site is sustainably located, within or well related to the built form of a settlement;</i> <i>3. It will not result in development in an isolated location;</i> <i>4. The dwelling will remain affordable in perpetuity through a percentage reduction on market value agreed by legal agreement; the property may be rented at an affordable rent to persons meeting Cornwall Council's eligibility criteria</i> <i>5. The site area, including any access arrangements, is no more than 0.05ha;</i> <i>6. The dwelling is designed to meet current and future household requirements and should not exceed the maximum floorspace prescribed in the Nationally Described Space standards for a 6-person household, although the provision of a single detached garage to the maximum of 18 sq. metres would be supported in</i>

	<p><i>addition;</i></p> <p><i>7. The design and character of the affordable housing complies with the design requirements of the mabe design guide [and any local design code]</i></p> <p><i>8. It is served by an adequate access and infrastructure and has reasonable access to local services by walking, cycling or public transport;</i></p> <p><i>The development is not located in any protected landscape</i></p> <p>PW comments:</p> <p>CC amendments give more detail some of which is elsewhere in the Plan such as location, design etc but I don't think this is a bad thing and sets out clearly what will be acceptable.</p> <p>Note these suggested changes keeps these property affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>Do the NDP group want to use this suggested wording and does it cover what you are trying to achieve?</p> <p>KW Comment agree to changes as above.</p> <p>Agreed by SG 16.6.22</p>
47	<p>Policy Design</p> <p>CC recommend amended wording:</p> <p><i>Proposals for new development will be assessed against the Mabe Parish Design Code and Guidelines (Appendix 1) & the following criteria:</i></p> <p><i>KW comment add to the policy section a requirement for early pre planning engagement with both CC planning and Mabe PC is</i></p>

I. The development must demonstrate how it will take account of the character and appearance of the natural and historic environment, integrates into the existing surroundings and have regard to the Mabe Design Code and the Mabe Landscape Character Statement.

II. Development should ~~be visually attractive a very subjective term~~ have a strong visual local vocabulary fitting into the local vernacular through its architecture, materials and landscaping. Materials should be high quality, locally sourced and complement the local palette of materials used. Locally appropriate innovative solutions are supported.

III. Greater support will be given to proposals conforming to the latest Building for Life standards.

IV. Greater support will be given to zero and low carbon developments evidenced by an appropriate scheme e.g. Passivhaus. All development should exceeding the latest Building Regulations to align with Mabe Parish Climate Emergency Targets.

V. Street layouts should be attractive and safe, designed for low vehicle speed and good access for emergency vehicles and refuse collection.

VI. The development should have well defined public and private outdoor spaces that maintain the local character and appearance of the area. Private spaces should be large enough for drying washing, safe play, wildlife friendly planting and food growing.

PW Comments:

I think this says the same as your existing policy but is presented differently so I think it is fine to use their wording.

KW comment is reserved pending inspection of various documents referenced

Do the Mabe NDP Group want to use CC suggested policy wording in the Plan?

Agreed by SG 16.6.22

49

Policy: Principle residency

Both Mark and Keith want to keep as written so NO CHANGE TO POLICY WORDING.

I've looked on the website and might be missing it but you will need some evidence available for the Inspector to view on the website that you have undertaken around the level of student accommodation in the Parish and how this impacts especially if this is combined with other second home ownership.

Just for clarification as to why this evidence is important see the **Inspectors report on Ludgvan's policy below:**

Policy No LUD12 Second Homes

82. I am familiar with the pressure, particularly in the South West for new houses to be subject to a principal residency test as a result of issues surrounding second homes and holiday lets especially in coastal communities. However, **to introduce stringent controls, which have implications for human rights in terms of restrictions of people's ownership of properties, can only ever be justified on the basis that such a policy is supported by robust evidence**, both in terms of the current level of such uses affecting the sustainability of communities, or that second homes/holiday lets are artificially inflating house prices beyond what local people can afford.

83. **I have been presented with no evidence at this examination, beyond the fact that current levels are in the region of 4% or less, which is low compared to other neighbourhood plans, which have been able to justify such policies.** I also note that this was a policy arose from public consultation. Whilst I acknowledge that the Parish Council argues that "prevention is better than cure", I do not believe that the policy meets the Secretary of State's requirements that policy must be supported by evidence. I will recommend that the policy be deleted.

KW comment is to provide evidence in support / any assistance would be helpful

Agreed by SG 16.6.22

