

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
general	JK 19/02/2018	I note Feock asked by Inspector to number every paragraph - our layout a little irregular but can do. Also not all colours selected for Policies work when copied in black and white - pending graphic design review, all policy boxes to be the same colour	Renumbered
Para 3.1	Town Council 6/12/2107	Confusing as red line indicates Crantock in scheme.	Ask Callum if only Newquay Parish Boundary can be included.
Para 4	Town Council 6/12/2107	There are multiple references to external documents such as NPPF and CLP. If the NNP relies on these documents to add legal weight and in some areas define policy then they need to be linked. Should these be referenced properly referenced and hyperlinks included? . Similar to Harvard Referencing.	Will link online and include an Appendix on useful links
Para 4	JK 19/02/2018	Business respondents commenting on lack of Tourism Policy - is it worth saying that where the Plan is silent on any topic, we rely upon the policies of the higher level Local Plan	Amended
Para 5	CRCC 15/12/2017	may need more summarisation from the Consultation Document.	Will consider when Consultation document produced (by CRCC)
Para 7	CRCC 15/12/2017	Vision – this could still be tighter and make more of the environmental aspects (which as we know has been a clear and key theme for residents all the way through).	Awaiting comment from Newquay Town Council. The vision that the Allocation DPD quotes for Newquay is: <i>To be a high quality place to live, work and visit, building upon its role as the surf capital of the UK, whilst diversifying the economy, improving employment quality including the development of the aerospace industry</i>
Para 8	Steering Group 11/12/2017	Policies throughout : Rather than specific numbers from a single consultation, refer to general term and provide consultation in evidence report	Done

General	Natural England	Natural England is encouraged that the plan acknowledges the importance of biodiversity and landscape, and the coast path and wider coastal environment for recreation, promoting the wellbeing and health of the local community and visitors, and for the economic value it brings to the area through tourism.	Welcome comment
General	Crantock Parish Council	<i>A very comprehensive and well presented document that describes the approach and methodology behind the development of the policies. The segregation of the policies into well defined themes is logical and fits with the vision (we suggest that the Vision statement is too long) and objectives for Newquay.</i>	Welcome comment
General	Historic England	[following comments on Historic and shopfront]We therefore have no comments to make other than to congratulate your community on its progress to date and wish it well in the making of its Plan	Welcome comment
General	PCL Planning LTD	I write on behalf of our client Sands Resort Hotel Limited (who operate a hotel at Watergate Road, Whipsiderry) in connection with the consultation on the pre-submission version of the Newquay Neighbourhood Plan (NNP). Our client wishes to object to the content of the pre-submission version of the NNP. There are several policies in the plan which our client does not support and the plan has omissions which we wish to point out. Our comments on the content of the Pre-submission version of the NNP are set out in the remainder of this letter, however, before making specific comments we wish to draw to your attention the following key elements of the legislation and national planning policy issued in respect of neighbourhood planning. In order for a draft Neighbourhood Plan to be put to referendum and be made, the Plan must meet a set of basic conditions. The basic conditions are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) as applied to neighbourhood plans by Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and) which include (where relevant):	Conformity with the conditions are covered in the basic Condition Statement

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having regard to national policies and advice contained in the guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order; • The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development; and 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). Paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the "Framework") sets out (where relevant) that where communities engage with neighbourhood planning they should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Develop plans that support the strategic growth needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development; · Plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local plan. 	
General	Nick Pollock 16/2/18	The Neighbourhood Plan will need to conform with the Cornwall Local Plan, Cornwall Site Allocations DPD and related Proposed Modifications	Joanna is Representor on Inspection of Site Allocations DPD meeting - rescheduled for March
General	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	I have now had chance to look over the NNP and the attached comments are sent for your perusal . In general a very well thought through document which clearly benefits from the immense amount of work by yourself and Team . Policies are overall clear and address the main issues raised during the consultation. The process appears to follow /likely to meet the Basic Conditions ,	Welcome comment
4.3 & 4.4	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	Whilst both the NTP and NTF are both admiral documents it is not clear what is of status of both and if their policies etc are being given formal status of the NNP. Appreciate they form part of the Context but could be a little confusing to the layman	Text was fixed when comment received - will review as part on ongoing process

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response from Working Party 21/12/2017
Illustrations	Steering Group 11/12/2017	The final version submitted to Cornwall Council should be illustrated with appropriate photos and apposite quotes from the various surveyys	Probably text kept plain but art work on front and back cover. Discuss with Town Council document design consultant
FOREWORD	CRCC 15/12/2017	To be inserted / from steering group / Town Council. Suggested inclusions: NNP about recovery and enhancement, conserving the valued etc.	for final version - Letter from Mayor?
Contents	Working Party	Suggest back page of title sheet and following sheet are two pages of Index. Page 3 will be Foreword	
Appendix List	JK 19/02/2018	Appendix list needs renumbering	renumbered

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
G1	PCL Planning LTD (Sands Hotel)	<p>The imposition of development boundaries through policy G1 to restrict development to within them unless it is a 100% affordable housing proposal is inappropriate and not in conformity with national planning policy in the Framework and local planning policy in the CLP. As set out above paragraph 16 of the Framework requires neighbourhood plans to plan positively to support local development. By imposing development boundaries and only allowing one type of development to occur beyond them Policy G1 fails to achieve this. The draft policy is also not in conformity with the CLP because this does not set development boundaries or set out that these should be used to control where new tourism development is located. Policies 2 and 3 contained in the CLP support the focusing of development at the main towns within Cornwall (which includes Newquay) however development boundaries are not referred to as a means to determining the location and suitability of a proposed development. Also, policy 5 of the CLP (which supports the delivery of new tourism facilities) does not impose such locational constraints on the delivery of tourism development. Instead policy 5 sets out how proposals are to be determined by considering how appropriate there are in terms of scale and accessibility. In our view there is no reason why an appropriately designed and located development on land adjacent to and within close proximity to the existing built up area should not be supported by policy in the NNP.</p>	<p>It has long been established and established in case law that a properly defined development boundary aimed at protecting the character of the countryside is compatible with the NPPF - and indeed the Cornwall Local Plan.</p> <p>We should point out that there has been a misunderstanding. There is nothing in the NNP that limits new tourism business either within or outside the Development Boundary. Where the NNP does not include a policy, it is because we consider the higher level policy in the CLP is adequate with no need of a local input. In this case, it is the very detailed Policy 5 of the CLP that applies which specifically covers new or the expansion of an existing businesses outside the Development envelope.</p> <p>But we agree that we should clarify this point and specifically include the principle of the policy within our plan while referring to the CLP policy and will to include some extra text that makes this explicitly clear.</p>

Policy G1	PCL Planning LTD	On new Tourism policy: that the draft plan consulted on included policy G1, which introduced development boundaries and would prevent tourism development happening beyond them.	Not the intention - implicit that Policy 5 applies for businesses outside boundary - propose making it explicit. Suggest Policy <i>d. Proposals for new employment land and uses outside of the settlement boundaries will be supported where these are consistent with Policy 5 of the Cornwall Local Plan and where they do not conflict with other policies in the NNP.</i> plus add to justification vi " <i>or other commercial enterprises outside of the settlement boundaries</i> " Note: Will also, to square the circle, point out that the historic Settlement Boundary on the coastline matches the Exclusion definition
G1	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Justification: Regarding residential and none residential (tourism) development at Watergate Bay. 'Development for Tourism will be judged on their merits,' what does this mean? Who judges on and what basis?	Amended to " <i>judged against appropriate planning policies</i> " Development for Tourism outside the settlement boundary is covered by Policy 5 of the CLD - and any proposals will be judged by Planning Authorities against that policy. We will be making it clearer that Policy 5 applies.
G1	Natural England	It is not clear from the material provided what criteria were used to underpin decisions regarding the revision of development boundaries. There appear to be some places where the boundary is drawn quite generously, to include undeveloped sites, appearing to encourage development in these areas. For instance east of the hotel next to 'Pigeon Cove' and the Area of Special Character directly south of Jago's Island. These areas are very prominent and it is not clear why these areas are proposed to be included within the development boundary.	Map Amended. While the past Development Boundaries are out of date with reference to the proposed expansion of the town to the East, we have no intention of changing the boundary along the Coast. Our Coastal Change policies effectively define an exclusion zone along the edge of cliff which pretty much co-incides with the former Restormel defined Boundary (see Maps CCa,b,c and d). We will, however, replicate that boundary in Map G1 to avoid any confusion.

Policy G1	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although as a Developer we have some concerns in general regarding G1 SB and the use of boundaries as they seek to pre determine and possibly override the Local Plan support for infilling /rounding off but your boundary appears as reasonable as can be expected . 	Noted: No action required
Policy G1	Will Ashworth Watgate Bay Hotel 11/4/2018	While pleased with the Plan in general, some concern as to whether the boundary around Tregurrian was correct. He owns a residential house to the South west of the current boundary and there is a residential house opposite - would our boundary preclude him doing anything with the current house and garden	Explained Plan already frozen for submission but his queries would be recorded and raised at the Inspector's examination.
Policy G2i - Justificatio n vi	Steering Group 9/3/2018	i. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) needs review	Gus Horsley and Colette Beckham to review. Gus has provided a subpara on flooding, included
G2 general		Policy G2 contains elements that are not appropriate or required given national and local planning policies contained in the framework and the CLP.	The Basic Condition statement confirms that NNP policies are fully in compliance with both the NPPF and the CLD. The policies included in the NNP provide guidance to developers of the key issues that will be considered by local Planning Authorities.
G2	Cornwall Council – Fire Service	Propose extra policy on sprinklers on Housing and HMOs - see Housing	We have included an extra policy to cover this request.
G2	J kenny	Order of subparas not logical	Reordered
G2a now v.	Imogen Day 19/12/2017	Potentially misleading, as Newquay doesn't have any dark skies designations. You could maybe add to the justification that you wish to respect the rural areas of the parish with sympathetic external lighting.	Agreed. We adopted that wording but extended it to cover the River Gannel and the Sea.

G2c now h.	Nick Pollock	<p>Under Policy G2 (Development Principles), criterion (c) the policy states that “non-permeable hard landscaping will not be supported”.</p> <p>This is a good aspiration but will be difficult to comply with in practice where ground conditions and porosity are not suitable.</p> <p>Development should accommodate SuDS but permeable drainage is unlikely to be suitable in all circumstances.</p>	See suggested amendment to the working below
G2c now h.	PCL Planning LTD	<p>Criterion ‘c’ which seeks to prevent the use of non-permeable hard landscaping altogether is not appropriate and unnecessarily prescriptive. This should be considered in the context of wider flood risk and drainage considerations. The agreement of hard landscaping, drainage strategy and the detail of SuDS as part of an application for development already ensures appropriate use of non-permeable hard surfacing to avoid increased flood risk elsewhere/off-site. This criterion is therefore not required and can be removed.</p>	See suggested amendment to the working below
G2c now h.	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	<p>Blanket policy which takes little account of small scale development. The Householder team regularly get applications for hardstandings which exceed permitted development rights. Usually drainage is required to be dealt with on site by way of a planning condition if in a flood zone or critical drainage area.</p>	Add to policy G2h
		<p>Also hard landscaping can include footpaths, cycle routes and communal outdoor areas; also bear in mind inclusive access where a non-permeable surface may be the only option.</p> <p>The recognition that non-permeable hardstanding is a problem is welcomed but some flexibility will be of use to enable residents making applications to provide details of how drainage can be dealt with on site.</p>	

		Suggest a revision to: <i>"Non-permeable hard landscaping will not be supported. However, where non-permeable surfaces are the only reasonable option then justification should be provided and the proposal should be accompanied by details of how any surface water drainage will be managed within the site."</i>	Where non-permeable surfaces are the only reasonable option, however, then justification should be provided and the proposal should be accompanied by details of how any surface water drainage will be managed within the site.
G2d	PCL Planning LTD	Criterion 'd' on achieving high levels of sustainability is not required as the approach to sustainability in Cornwall is already covered by local planning policy (policy 14 of the CLP). Also, the Government's approach is that such matters are to be dealt with through building regulations as opposed to through planning policies. The fabric first approach now being adopted (which focuses on improving the build quality in terms of the insulation/air tightness of new development to reduce overall energy consumption) is enshrined through building regulations. There is no need to duplicate matters within the NNP therefore this criterion should be removed from the policy.	This is test that local Planning Authorities. But we are not specifying any particular solution just the principle.
G2d	Cllr Gardner 3`/12/2017	include something about 'Green features' in the new build section? This doesn't just have to be the traditionally expensive features such as solar panels etc, could we potentially encourage the use of recycling features in new build properties such as waste disposal units (topical given the potential changes to waste collection) and rainwater collection opportunities in new build properties (especially important as most properties on water meters). Some of these features could really enhance a new build and help to ease pressure on public services.	Added to examples in policy
G2 f	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Development Principles (f) Proposals to replace residential caravans with permanent dwellings will not 'normally' be supported. This may or may not meet the purpose depending who defines normally?	Propose an addition to the text that unless exceptional circumstances. At the end of the day, this will be a subjective judgement call.

G2i	PCL Planning LTD	Criterion 'i' regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) is not required because it duplicates both national and local policy related to the use of SuDS in new developments. The Framework (paragraph 103) requires developments to be appropriately flood resilient and resistant and give priority to use of SuDS. Policy 26 of the CLP requires developments to utilise SuDS. The use of SuDS in development is therefore effectively covered already so there is no need for it to be covered by a policy within in a neighbourhood plan. This criterion should be removed from the policy.	G2i is fully in conformity with the CLD. We expect the requirement for a full SUDS solution to accompany an application will be the exception rather the rule - for example where the physical constraints affecting any site require a drainage solution to be a pre-requisite.
G2i	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	This seems somewhat onerous for small scale householder development. For householder type applications a statement of how water will be managed within the site would be more helpful for applicants and in processing applications.	Even some household applications can be so physically constrained as to require a full drainage solution to be provided upfront. For example the recent application on Greenbank Crescent and it's possible effect on 'The Barn' below.
G2 Justification	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Para 4 calls for high quality development, however there is no qualification of this. Quality means different things to different people. How and by whom is the high quality judgement made? We recommend that reference is made to the Duchy Newquay Pattern Book as the basis for this assessment.	Agreed - we will include the Newquay Pattern Book as a useful guide here and elsewhere in the document.
G2 general	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	G2 Note the support desire for quality in design .The detailed consultation in the surrounding neighbourhood for say schemes up to 20 may be seen as onerous	Noted: Will review

G3 general	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Overall I can see the purpose of the policy and it is welcomed, however as a policy I am concerned that the Council would be unable to sustain refusal of applications at appeal where those applications do not provide the detail required by the policy. I recommend that an opinion is sought from Planning Enforcement, the Planning Appeals Team and Building Control. On a final note for this policy, given the focus on detail that would normally be left to the developer how is this message going to be circulated so applicants do not hit delays at the application stage.	We believe the obvious failures have been caused by thoughtfulness not deliberate action. The policy requires some evidence that the developer (or the householder) has considered the problems upfront. It is not looking for enforcement where a build has clearly failed to be appropriate for the conditions unless they have deliberately ignored the commitments made with the application. Mistakes are inevitable, deliberate avoidance of the quality needed is a different matter.
G3a	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Should this apply to small scale Householder type residential development? How will this be monitored and who would enforce? I doubt that a planning condition requiring the use of rust resistant fittings would be enforceable thus it will be difficult for Cornwall Council to apply this part of the policy.	We believe the obvious failures have been caused by thoughtfulness not deliberate action. The policy requires some evidence that the developer (or the householder) has considered the problems. It is not looking for enforcement where a build has clearly failed to be appropriate for the conditions unless they have deliberately ignored the commitments made with the application. Mistakes are inevitable, deliberate avoidance of a quality commitment is a different matter.
G3b	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Should this apply to small scale Householder type residential development? How will this be monitored and who would enforce?	The policy requires some evidence that the developer (or the householder) has considered the problems. It is not looking for enforcement where a build has clearly failed to be appropriate for the conditions unless they have deliberately ignored the commitments made with the application. Mistakes are inevitable, deliberate avoidance of the quality needed is a different matter.
G3c	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Render staining and failure is not solely down to rain overspilling gutters. Direct wetting from rain, the quality of the render and salts within it as well as its application during construction all affect how the building weathers over time.	True but there is enough experience of failure in this town for Developers to be aware of the pitfalls. What we require is some evidence that they have considered the problems

G3d	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	As above but how would the developer know the fitting is of suitable strength?	There is one common (and cheap) gate solution that warps at the first major storm - developers should be well aware of this and make it clear to their builders that for a few pounds more, the quality they expect.
-----	---	---	--

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
D1c	Devon & Cornwall Police	I note and support the comments within Policy D1 regarding community safety and security.	OK
D1	PCL Planning LTD	The key principles set out in this policy are not required because they only duplicate matters that require consideration as a result of existing local planning policy in the CLP. Policy 2 of the CLP covers the key principles and other policies (i.e. policies 12, 13, 27) cover specific matters in more detail.	We believe that these principles are worth repeating in our plan policies and and we expect applications to specify how they meet these principles.
D1 - Policy	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Could Duchy Pattern Book be included as a further reference document?	Done
D1b	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	b, some schemes for even single dwellings should follow principles in (a).	Noted: No action required
D1 Policy on CDRP and Justification final paragraph	Newquay Regeneration Forum	What is classed as significant? How and by whom is this judged? This need to be specified in detail. Who pays for the advice from Cornwall Design Review Panel? Is the advice enforceable?	The Applicant pays. The Design Panel is a tool that can inspire and encourage good sustainable design, it does not define policies and therefore their advice is not enforceable. It would be enforceable if planning conditions put on an application refer to a particular part of it, but the advice itself isn't enforceable. It is a material consideration and it will inform how a planning condition is determined though. We would expect Planning Officer and Committee to take notice of <u>the comments of the Panel</u> .
D1 final	Joanna Kenny 18/12/2017	What is a "Significant Development"	Significant? - awaiting a tighter definition from Cornwall Council

D2	PCL Planning LTD	<p>The policy essentially duplicates policies contained in the CLP. Policies 2 and 12 of the CLP already effectively cover matters related to consideration of scale, location, visual and landscape impacts in terms of determining the suitability of development proposals.</p> <p>The requirement for all development proposals to provide visualisations and formal landscape and visual impact assessments (LVIAs) is not necessary. This places an unnecessary financial burden on applicants. Applications should be considered on a case by case basis with further details in terms of visualisations and LVIAs requested only where necessary. Furthermore, Cornwall Council already have a local validation checklist document that is used to establish what information (such as an LVIA) should form part of an application. Given the above Policy D2 should be removed from the NNP.</p>	<p>We believe that including these policies will be of assistance to Developers as an indication of the key issues that local planning authorities will expect to be covered in their applications.</p> <p>There appears to be a misunderstanding, the Policy does not require all proposals to provide LVIA but only those that may have a detrimental effect due to their height, scale or location.</p>
D2 b	Newquay Regeneration Forum	By specifically mentioning blocks of flats and commercial development over two stories, are we in danger of allowing by default, developments that fit neither of these classifications? i.e. large residential, hostel type or mixed use.	Amended. Cornwall Council advises "non householder applications" would pick everything up
D3	Historic England	The associated production of the Shopfront Design Guide is particularly commendable, all the more so as in our experience few have been produced through the <u>neighbourhood planning process</u> .	Welcome comment
D4	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Attempts to encourage enhancements to public realm but vague comment to enhance overall appearance will not control the inconsistent and installation and sighting of items such as seating, litterbins, hanging basket posts and other items of street furniture and inappropriate road and footways surfacing. This policy should reference a Newquay Public Realm Design Guide or Strategy.	Referred to a post plan project to produce the Guide or Strategy

Comment from	Comment	Response
JK 19/2/2018	Typo in final sentence of policy. "very" should be "every"	
Historic England	This is an impressive document in its display of understanding of the area's distinctive historic character and the suite of policies and proposals it advocates for its bespoke protection and enhancement.	Welcome Comment
PCL Planning LTD	This policy duplicates matters already effectively covered by policies 2, 12 and 24 of the CLP. The policy is not required and should therefore be removed from the NNP.	We believe that these principles are worth repeating in our plan policies and we expect applications to specify how they meet these principles.
Newquay Regeneration Forum	Does reference to 5 homes mean dwellings and what is the relevance of 5? Not sure what this policy is looking for?	Cornwall Council Neighbourhood Planning team advises against including a trigger number so reworded.
Newquay Regeneration Forum	Careful consideration must be taken to ensure ALL non-designated assets are known and listed, together with a supplementary current detailed written photographic record. Where it is not possible to retain a non-designated asset as part of a development relocation, in the close locality, should be the first consideration.	Not appropriate to put living documents that could get out of date in the NNP but have expanded on the sources
Nick Pollock	In the first line of the justification to Policy HC1, I suggest you refer to "the Duchy of Cornwall's Pattern Book for Newquay"	Amended
Historic England	The associated production of the Shopfront Design Guide is particularly commendable, all the more so as in our experience few have been produced through the neighbourhood planning process.	Welcome Comment

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
Policy E1	Newquay Regeneration Forum	It is vital that existing employment sites are safe-guarded, consideration should be given to strengthening both the objective and policy in this respect.	Happy to receive suggestions to strengthen the wording
E1	Cornwall Council - Economic Development	Specifically with regard to Policy E1 is the issue around the length of time it takes to demonstrate and enable commercial viability is more complex in Cornwall.	Noted
E1	Cornwall Council - Economic Development	In addition, Nansledon and Tregunnel could be viable for appropriate live work schemes. Nansledon is specifically identified in the DPD for employment purposes.	Noted. Wording in text proposed by the Duchy
E1	Cornwall Council – Local Plan Team	Policy E1 includes reference to allocation of land covered by NQ-M1 in the Newquay section of the Cornwall Site Allocations DPD (SADPD). This strategic allocation in the SADPD proposes a mixed use redevelopment of the site, specifically including residential use. The NDP appears to specifically restrict residential development of the site and is therefore contrary to NQ-M1 and should be adjusted to allow some residential use as part of the mixed use in order to fall into conformity with that policy.	Defined Mixed Use
Policy E1	Tricia Varney	Omits Chester Road shops and indoor market	Agreed, will add to the list. Add retail to opening policy so that this covers the isolated convenience stores located out of the main shopping area (Tower Road, Minor, etc
Policy E1	NCS	A recent planning application and the comments in the Newquay Character Study indicated should consider Wesley Yard as 'Mixed Use'	Amended
Policy E1	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	E1. I seem to recall at the planning app stage a jobs estimate was suggested .Could a figure be included	In Allocations DPD?

Policy E1	Mr Halliwill (sp?) 3/4/2018	Phone call received 3rd April. Quarry Park Road - wants to develop 10 houses on this site preserved as an economy site.	Discussed with Steering Group - too late to make any decision before approval by Town Council - noted this site adjacent to the Mixed Use regeneration of the Railway Station Area approved for Mixed Use. Agreed to raise at Inspector's review
E2	Cornwall Council - Economic Development	The DPD states that there is a focus on providing employment opportunity in Newquay, including through an urban extension.	Noted
Policy E2	Newquay Regeneration Forum	New educational or training facilities should have the same conditions as new employment sites in respect of the impact on landscape and residential amenity?	Amended
Policy E2	Newquay Regeneration Forum	In respect of non-residential, there should be a requirement of connectivity to cycle ways, provision of secure cycle bays and shower facilities for employees?	Amended. Don't think we can demand showers but the should be considered.
E3	Working Party 12/12/2017	Instead of referring to a map, the Map Team recommend including a PDF of the Area as an illustration.	Callum seeking authorisation to use and insert
E3	Cornwall Council - Economic Development	The Economy and Commercial buildings section should include contextual reference to the Enterprise Zone and the connection that Goonhilly has in this regard. The opportunity of the EZ is also through supply chain employment opportunities across wider Newquay.	Wording amended, happy to receive suggested text
Policy E3	Steering Group 9/3/2018	Make tourism policy more 'visitor economy' based	Draft Policy has been revised to make it more 'Visitor Economy'based
Policy E3	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	E3 . This Policy is supported and more than justified in view of the importance of Tourism to Newquay	Welcome Comment
E4/H4	JK 19/2/2019	How do we cope with nominally residential blocks of flats aimed at 2nd homes and Holiday apartments - E4 more flexible policy might be more appropriate ?	Discussed at Working Party. Keep two policies separate and note where applicants claiming residential development also claim no need for parking spaces as not residential

Policy E4	Newquay Regeneration Forum	At (a) reference is made to loss of valued traditional buildings, who or what designates these. A current detailed written and photographic record should be made, supplementary to the Duchy Pattern Book and the CSUS Study.	Extra sentence included in justification. The record will be in the NCS and when it comes, the Conservation area
Policy E5	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Although proposed project list is not exhaustive, strong consideration should be given to including Harbour and Fly Cellars.	Both the Harbour and Fly are mentioned in the list. Happy to include any suggestions for additional projects
Policy E5	J Kenny	Not strictly E type projects - should this be a separate section?	Discussed at Working Party - stay as it is for present

E Missing Policy	PW Planning (Newquay View)	<p>Finally, the clear importance of tourism to the economy in Cornwall is recognised in the Cornwall Local Plan, including at Objective 2: <i>"Enhance the cultural and tourist offer in Cornwall and to continue to promote Cornwall as a year round destination for tourism and recreation."</i> CLP Policy 5 builds on this objective, and the NNP will have to be compatible with the adopted Local Plan. The Newquay Town Framework reiterates this clear policy objective thus: <i>"Tourism – maintain and enhance the stock of tourist accommodation and facilities in Newquay to meet the needs of the industry. Extend the tourist season and improve the quality and image of the town."</i> The NNP (at chapter 7) states: <i>"Development in Newquay is recognised and planned for in both the Cornwall Local Plan and also the Newquay Town Framework. This Neighbourhood Plan therefore does not seek to duplicate policies and direction of travel, but add specific development principles that will seek to enhance the development that is due to take place; and set standards and clear guidelines for future development in the parish."</i></p> <p>Chapter 7 continues: <i>"Each policy of the NNP is accompanied by an objective, summarising what the policy intends to achieve and is reflective (as far as planning law allows) of the community wishes."</i></p> <p>As referenced above, it is understood that the NNP is intended to build on the CLP in the form of guidelines for future development. As a Neighbourhood Plan, the NNP is not meant to be a tool to restrict sustainable development, rather it is meant to inform what types of development will be particularly supported, noting local preferences. However, in the draft NNP none of the policies directly supports or</p>	Agreed, new draft policy added.
------------------	----------------------------	--	---------------------------------

	PW Planning (Newquay View) (continued)	<p>It is not clear what sort of research has been conducted to determine the type of tourism accommodation that is required going forward. The NTF identifies that meeting the 'needs of the industry' is a core objective, however it is not clear from the draft NNP how the local tourism industry has been involved in the formation of the policies. Newquay View Resort has previously asked to be involved in policy discussions, whether as a member of a relevant stakeholder group, or through another mechanism. Newquay View Resort would like to be directly involved in any policy discussions that seek to introduce a new targeted policy to address tourism accommodation and facilities, as outlined above, to provide input and feedback from the perspective of a substantial local tourism business. As a local business providing accommodation for thousands of tourists each year, Newquay View Resort has direct insight into what Newquay gets right, and what it can do to improve the tourism offering. Newquay View Resort would welcome such further involvement in the NNP process. Accordingly, it would be sensible to include an additional policy specifically targeted to encourage improvements to the quality and range of offering at existing tourism assets, in addition to extending the season.</p>	New Policy added. Strategy added as a Post-Plan project
	PCL Planning LTD (Sands Hotel)	<p>Lack of support for tourism . Firstly and of the utmost concern to our client, is the fact that there are no specific policies in the draft NNP related to tourism and the provision of tourism facilities (including accommodation). Given the importance of tourism to the local economy and the future of the town this is very surprising and a clear omission from the draft plan. The NNP should therefore be amended to include a policy that specifically encourages and supports the development of new and expanded tourism facilities where this can be shown to be appropriate (i.e. in terms of scale, location, character, appearance etc.).</p>	Agreed. New policy added

Comment	Response
Strengthen policy by including special areas	Amended
How do we cope with nominally residential blocks of flats aimed at 2nd homes and Holiday apartments - E4 more flexible policy might be more appropriate ?	Working Party discussion. Leave it as it is - and let Developers and Highways argue the point at application. They cannot have it both ways.
Proposed Extra policy (plus providing justification): The inclusion of fire sprinklers in all affordable housing and those specifically for elderly or disabled residents and HMO's should be included as a requirement for developers	<p>Included in HMOs policies and an extra one for the vulnerable. Affordable Housing were requested to comment and replied :</p> <p><i>CC are looking to include sprinklers within all our development programmes (Housing Development Programme, extra care etc.). We can't insist on this as a planning policy, but if the Town Council want to include, then that's up to them but there is likely be a viability impact – so just need to be aware of that more considering. (sic)</i></p>
<p>I would perhaps suggest that this message of ensuring designing out crime issues are always considered is perhaps further re enforced within Policy H4 Parking for Residential Development.</p> <p>Perhaps something along the lines of "All residential parking must be designed to be safe and importantly feel safe for users, issues of natural surveillance and appropriate lighting</p>	Sentence included
The Affordable Housing Team can confirm that the plan as currently drafted has no direct or indirect conflicts with AH policy and/or delivery.	Noted
Policy . Again reference is made to high quality and valued traditional buildings with no further explanation? Who and how are these determined? Use the Duchy Pattern Book as a basis for this assessment as well.	Amended

Policy. Principles of the Newquay Character Statement noted in relation to extensions to existing homes, but not in relations to replacement of existing dwellings?	Amended
Policy: Consider alternative wording, 'Proposals for developments in residential areas will not be supported, unless it is proven that there is no negative impact etc.etc.	We are constrained to be positive with "unless" - not negative
Policy on development in sensitive areas only applies to residential gardens not Hotel grounds	Drafting error when combining two similar policies (post version 5)- Joanna to correct policy to cover all gardens or grounds of commercial enterprises in sensitive areas
In NCS, proposes an active policy to guide and manage change along the coast road around Porth Veor (applies to other coast roads and along the Gannel)?	Too late for inclusion in Draft, discuss at Planning Inspector review

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
Infrastruct. Theme	Joanna Kenny	I for Instrastructure is gettting confused with 1.	Community Infrastructure? CI - would that be clearly different from CC. Suggestions welcome?
I1	Devon & Cornwall Police	Policy I1 in relation to footpaths I would suggest that routes must again be designed to be safe and feel safe both for users and adjacent properties. Surveillance and lighting are again design issues which must be fully considered.	Included
I1	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Policy I1 Policy: Suggest in final sentence that pedestrian or cycle access must demonstrate connectivity has been implemented in the development proposal. ?	Amended
I1	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Masterplan too linked to Duchy site only	Amended
I2	Nick Pollock 18/12/2017	While car parking can be helpful for delivering heavy items to allotments, is it an essential component for the provision of allotments? Tools can be kept in sheds on site, while access on foot or by cycling should be encouraged. The Duchy has provided allotments at Tretherras and Quintrell Downs. Further allotments will be provided, co-located with childrens' play space.	Amended
I2	Newquay Regeneration Forum	I2 Policy: Replacement facilities must be local to the development and within the settlement area, not just suitable and accessible? New allotments should link to footpaths and cycle ways. New developments of more than 50 homes must include provision for allotment space. How much or how many? Suggested benchmark eg. 5 public allotments per 50 residential dwellings	Environment Service:

I2	Cornwall Council – Environment Service (Open Spaces)	<p>There is a risk that the requirement on developments to provide allotments, will either result in tiny, unviable facilities, or could be at the expense of other public open space requirements. Developments cannot be forced to address existing deficiencies. Allotments are one of the six different types of open space categorised in Open Space Strategy. As such development would be expected to deliver a level of allotment provision proportional only to its size & impact. Based upon the provision standards we would only expect to see approximately 175sqm of allotments per 50 homes. This is far too small to meet proper standards, and we would recommend that a new allotment of no less than 2500sqm be properly planned by the NDP, which would then allow future developments to make off-site contributions towards the cost. Other sources of funding may well be required also, because there is already an apparent deficiency, based upon waiting lists. Alternatively, the NDP team might wish to consider whether the Tretherras Allotments could be extended, or whether the Newquay Growth Project development will deliver more allotments than required. Newquay Community Orchard offers an alternative to traditional allotment holding, which might have an effect in the long term.</p>	Paragraph to justification added
I4	Mervyn Mitchell	The possible loss or reduction in current off-road parking as mentioned as possible in the document should be prohibited.	See Car Park policy

I3	Cornwall Council – Environment Service (Open Spaces)	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (para 73) requires that planning policies should be based on robust & up to date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision. This work was done in Newquay in 2013, and was presented to the town council. In July 2014 Cornwall Council adopted the Open Space Strategy for Larger Towns in Cornwall as interim planning guidance pending the adoption of the Local Plan. It has recently been updated to be taken forward as an evidence base for a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Newquay is one of the study areas and the latest standards should therefore apply – for further details see http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/parks-and-open-spaces/open-space-strategy-standards. The NDP makes no mention of the assessment or the resulting quantity standards, which are necessary to meet the three tests for planning obligations, and policies for delivering open spaces, design requirements and minimum accessible distance thresholds. Policy I3 replicates protection already afforded by NPPF(2012) para74, whilst not considering whether the existing provision will continue to keep up with changes in recreational demands.</p>	New Paragraphs included in justification, refer to post plan project
I4	Newquay Regeneration Forum	<p>I4 Policy: Tregunnel Hill should be classed as a Town Centre Car Park due to its proximity to Town Centre, beaches and Long Stay means it is highly used by visitors in the Tourism Season. Car Parks valued for their open space should also include Trenance.</p>	Done for Trenance, Bid did not support Tregunnel as a Town Centre Park. All car parks are fully used in August but for much of the year this asset is unused

	Additional paragraph for CC Open Spaces	<p>"The Open Space Strategy for Larger Towns in Cornwall (2014) has assessed the current and future requirements for 8 different types of open space in the town. Whilst Newquay benefits from considerable coastal & beach environments, there is already an overall quantity deficiency in children's equipped play areas and equipped outdoor youth provision. Investment in the quality of provision at spaces such as Trenance, St Columb Minor, Atlantic Road and Newquay Skate Area, will help to some extent, but some areas of the town are expected to continue to have deficits, unless the distribution is addressed. For instance the residential area of north Tretherras and Porth, is less likely to benefit from new or improved play facilities in the town, whilst young people in the west of the town and the St Columb Minor area could need their own youth provision. Furthermore, with the anticipated growth in housing, the existing level of outdoor sports pitches will be insufficient across Newquay.</p> <p>To address these problems it may be beneficial that following the Neighbourhood Plan project, a project delivery team should consider the findings in more detail and facilitate the identification of locations and the prioritisation of projects. This could be through identifying sites for new equipped facilities and supporting funding awards from S106 or CIL, or by engaging local sports pitch providers in order to develop a sports pitch strategy for Newquay.</p> <p>The figure for allotment contributions of 175sqm per 50 dwellings equals a standard of 1.52sqm per person, which should be fine for Newquay. I have amended the future standards slightly to match."</p>	Text amended
CI general	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	C13 Although outside the NNP area the significant amount of open space/amenity /events etc approved as part of the 455 residential scheme at Trevithick Manor provides for the surrounding area as identified on the Councils strategic open space plan .	Noted

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
General	Joanna Kenny	Suggest we change identified to L or LE (Landscape & Environment) to ensure no confusion with the E policies	Done
E generally	Crantock Parish Council	<i>Our only concern would be that the Plan is, if anything, too detailed and potentially dilutes the impact of the primary policies directed at sustaining and enhancing the natural environment (views, open spaces, beaches, surf, etc.) and particularly those associated with the maritime "boundary". The Cornwall Design Guide covers a number of the detailed issues identified within policies (for example General Development, Housing, Environment & Landscape). Perhaps there could be more reference to the Cornwall Design Guide?"</i>	Noted
EL1, now LE	Nick Pollock	I am not sure it is realistic to ensure that development results in no impact. I would suggest you change "no impact" to "no significant adverse impact". With any greenfield development there will be harm (positive and/or negative) and so the judgement and related policy ought to refer to significant adverse effects on landscape character. Under GLVIA 3rd Ed, negligible and minor adverse impact is not significant whereas moderate to major impacts are deemed significant	Amended
EL1, now LE	PCL Planning LTD	Policy EL1 duplicates matters already effectively dealt with by policies 2, 12 and 23 of the CLP. Policy EL1 is therefore not required and should be removed from the NNP.	Preserving the Landscape is the top issue of concern to the Local Community and they require the issues of the Landscape and Environment to be included. We believe that including these policies will be of assistance to Developers as an indication of the key issues that local planning authorities will expect to be covered in their applications.

EL1, now LE	Natural England	We welcome the progress made with the Newquay Neighbourhood Plan. We acknowledge the hard work it takes to prepare a Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst the plan area is largely urban, the town has a beautiful landscape setting and contains valuable biodiversity assets. We have a number of comments which we hope are useful in ensuring that you will maintain and enhance the biodiversity and landscape assets of the area.	Noted
EL1, now LE	Natural England	Natural England is encouraged that the plan acknowledges the importance of biodiversity and landscape, and the coast path and wider coastal environment for recreation, promoting the wellbeing and health of the local community and visitors, and for the economic value it brings to the area through tourism.	Welcome Comment
EL2, now LE	Natural England	We recommend that you consider not only the existing green infrastructure in the area but also how the Neighbourhood Plan could help to achieve additional green infrastructure. We refer to the green infrastructure strategy as prepared by Cornwall Council, in conjunction with the town frameworks that were developed some time ago and underpin this Neighbourhood Plan and the Allocations DPD currently in Examination. The green infrastructure strategy map can be found via this link: http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/26750197/allocations-dpd-newquay-section.pdf	That map is included at HB2.
EL2, now LE	PW Planning	Accordingly, the 5 sections of land highlighted as being part of Newquay View Resort in the attached LLCA Landscape Area Key NVR edit plan (Sports Field, The Venue, Newquay View Resort main site, Camping area and recreation area) should be removed from the land highlighted as a 'Valued Landscape' on plan 'EL2'. (i.e Porth Valley)	The local designation 'Valued Landscape' does not prevent development but identifies where development that reduces the visual and/or recreational amenity of any site so designated would not be supported. The Newquay View Sports Field has not significantly damaged the visual amenity of this area. All of the Porth Valley remains a 'Valued Landscape' and any future development plans would be expected to continue to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment of this special place.

EL2, now LE	NNP Working Party 22/02/2018	Following on from a recent application, the policy needs a slight reword to cover developments that would affect the visual value of a site both by damaging the view to it and also from it. The policy, therefore, should be extended not just to development "on" the site, but any development that might affect that visual amenity.	Reword last sentence of policy to " <i>Development that would reduce the visual and/or recreational amenity of any of these important areas will not be supported</i> "
EL4 now LE	Natural England	Local Green Spaces : We welcome this policy	Welcome Comment
EL4 now LE	Paul Summers	Include Alexandra Gardens. If not Green Space, should it be 'Open Space'	Included
EL4 now LE	Town Clerk 02012018	Add Gannel Boatyard Picnic area and Gannel Car Park as Green Spaces	Will do but need text for Appendix 3b as justification?
EL4 now LE	Mervyn Mitchell	+ Appendix 5 Green Spaces. Omits 'East Pentire Headland Green' although it meets all the criteria and is a registered Town/Village Green VG694(2010). It is used by local residents and Townspeople all year round for dog walking and exercise as well as tourists	Will include because it is a formal Town Green. Needs to be mapped and Appendix altered
EL4 now LE	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Newquay Football Club Ground Mount Wise to be included?	Playing Fields. We have suggested a post plan project to consider needs in the light of the increased population
EL4 now LE	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Map references should be EL4 as well as EL2 to follow previous principles?	Tricky, the need to have Shopfront guide as App 2 make numbering look mixed. It's appropriate to put both Valued and Green areas on same map to show overlap - maybe call it EL2&3? And the Appendices 3a and 3b
EL4 now LE	Cornwall Council – Environment Service (Open Spaces)	<u>Policy EL4</u> designates all of the key open spaces as Local Green Spaces (LGS). Whilst I am not advocating the development of Newquay Golf Course, I doubt that its designation as a LGS would stand up to serious challenge, as I am unsure how it meets the criteria. The Appendix 5 explanatory table suggests that it is important from a landscape perspective, and therefore relates more to EL2 & EL3.	While agree it should be incorporated in the Valued Landscape, the Golf Course is as a managed space that we believe qualifies as a Local Green Space - particularly with the long history of the Golf Course established after the common land riots of 1897. Will adjust Appendices and Map LE2

Now LE4	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Suggest additions to existing EL3 list Views from Esplanade Road and Green towards Towan Head and across Fistral Beach and Bay. Views to and from the roads, beaches and public spaces around Newquay Harbour Views to and from the beaches, roads and public spaces around the Island	We probably should not list at all and rely on Appendix but adjusted list
EL5	Newquay Regeneration Forum	No EL5?	?

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
Summary	JK 19/02/2019	Typo in in opening (the CC1 line)	Corrected
CC2	Natural England	<p>Policy: CC2 – Development in locations vulnerable to coastal change</p> <p>We welcome this policy. We recommend that clause 4 of the policy is strengthened to safeguard the ability of biodiversity to adapt to a changing coastline, where relevant. We recommend the following addition to clause 4: ...'and there will be no material adverse impact on the environment, and the ability of biodiversity to adapt to the changing coastline is safeguarded'</p>	Agreed and amended.
CC2	Cornwall Council – Strategic Environment	<p>the word "buffer zone" is used interchangeably for the exclusion zone and CEV zone . I wonder if this might cause confusion? My understanding is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The exclusion zone for Newquay CCMA is 16.6m from the cliff edge. • The CEV zone is 30m from the landward edge of the exclusion zone (46m from the cliff edge). <p>For clarity perhaps the word "buffer zone" should be replaced by exclusion zone or CEV zone, whichever applies?</p>	Corrected . Buffer should just refer to the 10m added to the erosion line
CC2	Newquay Regeneration Forum	<p>CC Policy:</p> <p>Should include Time-Limited approvals.</p> <p>Suggest – <i>The use of Time Limited approvals for development in Locations Vulnerable to Coastal Change will only be supported where there has been a recent details geographical survey, by professional structural geologists and engineers who affirm that the proposal is viable for the period proposed. Such approval shall only be given where the applicant posts a bond with the relevant council, before works begin on site, that is sufficient to enable complete removal of the structure and full safe reinstatement at the end of the approved Time-Limited period.</i></p>	<p>Agreed and amended. Government guidance has been included in the Justification - and it seems to support the proposed policy.</p> <p>Flood & Coastal Strategic Resilience Lead commented. "The inclusion of a clause on time-limited applications seems sensible and is covered within the NPPF, though I imagine that there will be objections from developers about having to put up a bond for removal, though I believe it has been done before."</p>

CC3	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Has Policy CC3 been reviewed by the Council's Sustainable Drainage Lead Officer - Jackie Smith. The proposal for surface water to go to the mains sewer may not be supported by South West Water.	This policy has been reviewed by CC Cliff protection. Referred to CC SUDS but no response as yet
CC3 Justif. Para 4	Cornwall Council – Strategic Environment Flood & Coastal Strategic Resilience Lead	Replace "Developers therefore, rather than be asked to supply a drainage plan will be required to provide their development proposals as part of their application and provide appropriate specialist advice that the proposals will work." by "Developers must supply a drainage plan that considers the location of the development in relation to the cliff edge and how drainage will be managed to prevent damage, instability or erosion and provide appropriate specialist advice that the proposals will work."	Replaced as recommended
CC Policies	Newquay Clifftop Residents 20/02/2018	The Policy for Coastal Change should be put by our Town & County Councils and the recommendation of our MP for Newquay to the Department of Housing and Local Communities, Environment Minister for consideration of halting all coastal developments NOW until the NNP is in place. To have had the PI approve a recent application in a front coastal garden is outrageous when so much has been learnt of late regarding CCMA and surface water drainage. With so many rock falls, landslide in the area. Experts in CCMA stating that we should not be building in what they refer to a 'Dynamic Zones' which is the coastal fringe. Recent months have seen huge impact of erosion in Newquay and no doubt the whole country let alone county. This is being televised and reported on the radio and newspapers. This needs to be flagged up to Parliament not a case of oh well we tried to say and we just didn't get our Neighbourhood Plan in place in time.	Take this as an example of Community Support. We are constrained by Planning Law. Until the Plan is 'made' (i.e. through Examination and Referendum) it is not given full weight. As it is now in its formal stages there is likely to be some consideration/reference to it, but it only attains the full consideration when it has gone through all stages.

	Cornwall Council – Strategic Environment Flood & Coastal Strategic Resilience Lead	The main issue I have at the moment is with the NCERM coastal erosion mapping. It is rather generic and is throwing up a few issues. An alternative is the SMP erosion mapping, which is coming out quite differently, but in some ways is better quality. These are issues that I am presently following up with the originators of both datasets.	Amended as recommended
		In the meantime, would it be possible to include reference to "latest erosion mapping as used on the Cornwall Council flood risk interactive mapping website - https://map.cornwall.gov.uk/website/ccmap/index.html?wsName=sfra ". That way we can update the mapping as and when better datasets become available.	
CC Policies	Justin Ridgewell Environment Agency 18/03/2018	I was involved closely with the development of the SMP2 for Cornwall and Isles of Scilly, and whilst Cornwall Council is of course the responsible authority for coastal erosion at the local level, the Environment Agency has an important strategic overview role on this. Therefore I'm pleased to see the SMP being used in Newquay's case to provide the strategic background and regional policy direction as a backdrop to the development of more bespoke and detailed policy guidance for the planning system via the NDP.	Welcome comment

CC1 CCMA	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	We support the focussed use of CCMA's as a planning system tool to help address erosion risk in certain areas. Whilst the CCMA approach isn't applicable everywhere (and we don't necessarily want to 'water down' their effectiveness through a blanket approach in applying them), in Newquay's case it seems wholly appropriate to designate the entire frontage. It's also another way of linking planners back to the evidence base provided by SMP2, which is useful in providing the strategic argument for why a sustainable and precautionary approach to planning and new development, with reference to both coastal erosion and flooding, is essential for our coastal communities.	Have permission to include comment in justification text
CC2b (4,5 & 6)	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	In terms of specific text, I think it's important that there is as little ambiguity as possible regarding cliff stabilisation (with reference to items 4, 5 and 6). With a mix of both short-term Hold The Line and longer-term No Active Intervention policies covering sections of your coast line through the Bay, that will be important. The key thing is to avoid situations where developers are arguing for ad-hoc cliff stabilisation in discrete locations, as that is exactly the type of non-strategic intervention that the SMPs seek to move us away from.	Justin Ridgewell suggested wording clarification included plus will quote SMP objecties

CC2	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	Also important to clarify that where a HLT policy exists, this is primarily a strategic policy direction to the operating and responsible authorities and does not necessarily give the green light to private developers undertaking such works, (even where a policy of HTL exists into epoch 2 or 3). However the ambiguity can creep in when landowners are told that they are responsible for any section of cliff within their title and for ensuring safety of beach users below, together with responsibility for clearing up debris resulting from any slip or fall. This can lead to applications for individual cliff stabilisations or coastal protection measures at the base of the cliffs. To my mind this can represent a conflict between local planning advice provided at an individual level and what we are trying to achieve in terms of an overall sustainable and strategic approach through SMPs and as such becomes a bit of a grey area which is unhelpful.	Justin Ridgewell suggested wording clarification included
CC2	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	Also important to clarify that where a HLT policy exists, this is primarily a strategic policy direction to the operating and responsible authorities and does not necessarily give the green light to private developers undertaking such works, (even where a policy of HTL exists into epoch 2 or 3). However the ambiguity can creep in when landowners are told that they are responsible for any section of cliff within their title and for ensuring safety of beach users below, together with responsibility for clearing up debris resulting from any slip or fall. This can lead to applications for individual cliff stabilisations or coastal protection measures at the base of the cliffs. To my mind this can represent a conflict between local planning advice provided at an individual level and what we are trying to achieve in terms of an overall sustainable and strategic approach through SMPs and as such becomes a bit of a grey area which is unhelpful.	Justin Ridgewell suggested wording clarification included

CC2	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	Worth noting as well that the impacts of even minor / temporary works, including those facilitating beach access, can be problematic. Anything which results in the driving of supporting posts (such as fencing) can increase the amount of water percolating through the surface and sub-soils, together with a general de-stabilising effect on cliff tops, leading to enhanced sub-aerial weathering, which is a key part of the process by which localised cliff slips and landslides occur, (as demonstrated by the recent slip at Lusty Glaze).	Justin Ridgewell to suggest wording clarification
	Justin Ridgewell EA 18/03/2018	And with that event in mind, I think it's important that along with looking at the cliff top, local planning guidance delivered through the NDP also considers existing development and the types of activities which take place at the rear of the beaches and at the foot of the unstable cliff sections, as there can be considerable risk involved.	New Policy proposed by the EA included (but not included in public consultation). Included as proposed policy simple common sense in the light of the Lusty Glaze fall.
CC3	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	CC3 ..Although we currently do not have any projects close to cliffs this Policy is clearly justified in the light of past/recent instability issues .	Welcome Comment

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
HB1	Steering Group 11/12/2017	No SSIs but map old RIGS geology sites, County Wildlife Sites. Check BAPS sites to see if relevant	BAPS reference omitted until evidence received where we have them
HB1	Natural England	We welcome this policy. We advise that the first sentence of the policy is changed in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy as set out in the NPPF and the Cornwall Local Plan. We recommend the following wording: ...'to ensure that significant impacts on biodiversity are avoided, or effectively mitigated where impacts are unavoidable or, as a last resort impacts are compensated for, for instance through the creation of habitats elsewhere'.	Amended (into a policy)
HB1	PWP Planing	This policy duplicates matters that are already appropriately covered by policies 2, 12 and 23 of the CLP. It is therefore suggested that the policy can be removed from the NNP.	Other consultees welcome the inclusion of these policies. We believe that including these policies will be of assistance to Developers as an indication of the key issues that local planning authorities will expect to be covered in their applications. We have, however, summarised some of the detail.
HB1	Cornwall Council – Forestry Team	There is little or no reference to trees and hedges. It is important to include habitat, biodiversity and ecology as part of a Neighbourhood Development Plan, of which trees and hedges are an important factor. I have attached a the Councils Neighbourhood Planning document specific to Wildlife, trees and Woodland which you may wish to incorporate in the current document.	Added Trees - and reference to Document

HB1	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Biodiversity, Nocturnal Wildlife and Hedges and Hedgerows Policies appear fine, however the Species Policy we believe would be better framed in terms of the others where development proposals are required to demonstrate net gains for by producing a balance sheet or table setting the losses and retention or gains in each of the areas. The Species Policy could indicate that all of the species currently listed need to be considered and included.	Referring back to the higher level document that does this.
HB1	Nick Pollock	Policy HB1 is quite prescriptive and onerous as worded and could prove unworkable. The following change is suggested to replace the current policy wording, <i>"Developments demonstrating compliance with best practice, as set out in the Cornwall Draft Biodiversity SPD, would be viewed favourably. Appropriate measures might include for example provision for bats, birds and invertebrates via purpose designed boxes and bricks, strategic hedgehog access points in fences, or establishment of new native hedges and flower-rich habitats."</i>	Wording amended as recommended
HB1 policy	Cornwall Council DM – Householder	Barn owls: Does this apply only to new dwellings? What of extensions to existing buildings. What is meant by a main road, is this Class A, B, C and trunk roads? Some clarification would be useful.	Removed detail - and referred to higher level document
Map LE2 (formerly EL2)	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	Within the Environment and Landscape section there is reference on Map EL2 of County Wildlife Sites. It would be useful to also add County Geology Sites onto this map. This information is available from the Environmental Records Centre for Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly (ERCCIS), www.ERCCIS.org.uk .	We are producing another map for Biodiversity. The four Geological sites (one has recently been added) are being added to that but need more information on extent - and included in Valued Landscape justification. We are moving County Wildlife Areas to new Biodiversity map as well.

HB PoliciesA10 :D13	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	We support the reference to Biodiversity SPD and inclusion of wildlife specific development measures in line with it, e.g. one bat or bird box for each new build dwelling.	Noted
	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	It would be useful to add some supporting text in Policy EL2 for these local non-statutory designated sites in line with the Cornwall Local Plan: Policy 23.3 c: Local Sites - Development likely to adversely affect locally designated sites, their features or their function as part of the ecological network, including County Wildlife Site Local Geological Sites and sites supporting Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species will only be permitted where the needs and benefits of the development clearly outweigh the loss and the coherence of the local ecological network is maintained	Expand on Biodiversity to include County Wildlife Sites, Local Geological Sites and sites supporting Biodiversity Action Plan habitats and species to mirror policy 23c.

	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	<p>There is no reference in the Plan to Cornwall's Environmental Growth Strategy. Whilst this strategy is non-statutory, it has been adopted by Cornwall Council and it is everyone's responsibility to deliver it. We would encourage a reference to be included with specific reference to Target Outcome 9, which states: Target outcome 9: Nature in Cornwall is abundant, diverse and well connected. For this we need: The designated landscapes and sites are vital to the success of this Strategy, giving us an ecological and cultural network to grow from and helping us to test ideas and new approaches. The designations of these sites provide them with a high level of protection in terms of Planning, recognising the conservation and enhancement of their special qualities is essential. The potential for these areas to also deliver environmental growth is a crucial opportunity and this Strategy seeks to provide additional strength to the value these areas are ascribed in decision making. It is essential that we view these areas as both outstanding for their special features but also as a guide for our environmental quality in other areas. Ideally we would have more outstanding landscapes, biodiversity sites and heritage features to be recognised as nationally and internationally important in future.</p>	Will refer to Cornwall's Environmental Growth Strategy
--	-------------------------	--	--

Map	Comment from	Comment	Response
Map conflict	Newquay Regeneration Forum	<p>G13 (G1b?) and EL3 and EL4 and HBC2 (HB2?) appear to conflict where descriptions of places and/or indication on the maps differ for the same place/area. Which ones take priority?</p> <p>http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/adopted-plans/development-plan-documents/cornwall-site-allocations-development-plan-document/newquay-evidence-base/</p>	<p>G1b (NQ1 Newquay Strategy Map) and HB2 (NQ3 Newquay Green Infrastructure Strategy) are Cornwall Council maps. Technically, we are constrained by the higher level maps but we queried them missing the Jewsons site from their economy site map - to receive the response that it was too small to be included but the NNP were entitled to put in areas they excluded as area of local interest. As a result of that query, Joanna has been invited to attend the hearing on the DPD Allocations plan on March 1st. I know that the Duchy have queried NQ1 - and Newquay View have queried to NQ3 (query passed that onto CC) . There's a more recent version than the NQ3 used in NNP- but it still missed out Trevean Green.</p>

	Newquay Regeneration Forum	<p>There are omissions on more than one map and differing descriptions on another: Ia and EL2, EL4 and HBC2 show the same areas differently Landside fields of Porth Island are not shown</p> <p>They all need to be correctly shown on all reference maps to avoid errors and confusion.</p>	1a (Public Open Spaces) and EL2/4 (Valued Landscapes and 'Local Green Spaces' are showing different things - and the formal planning term 'Local Green Space' does not cover every green area - only that meet the strict criteria. The 'Open Space' allocation is more flexible. The areas to be considered as 'Local Green Spaces' were identified by Town Councillors. The individual queried allocations are discussed below - There will be another public consultation before the inspector's review - any extra areas to be considered that have not been considered as meeting the criteria can be put forward at that time
G1b	John Marshall Kingsleys RealEstate 26/3/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure NQ1 does not show correct info on planning status at Trevithick Manor Farm. I understand this was provided by others and we would be happy for the authors to contact us direct ? as it clearly needs to be corrected/updated throughout. 	Passed comment to Cornwall Council
E1	Working Party	Employment Area at Quarry Park Road does not match Town Framework report	To be corrected
EL2		[All coastal strip] should be treated as a 'Local Green Space'	An issue that needs to be judged by the independent Inspector - will bring the query to his attention.
		Grass area to the East of the King Edward Crescent is not shown	This is designated as 'Valued Landscape' but was not put forward as as formal Green Space. Analysis indicates, like the rest of the Coastal Strip, does not meet the criteria but these comments will be passed to the Inspector, and there is another public consultation run by Cornwall Council at which other candidates for 'Local Green Spaces' designation can be put forward.

		Esplanade Road Green to Lewinnick is not shown	Valued Landscape but as above, does Coastal Strip meet 'Local Green Space' criteria?
		Towan Head land side from the Old Lifeboat House to the Fly Cellars is not fully shown	Agreed - land outside grounds of Headland Hotel and not in Headland Road should be included in 'Valued Landscape but as above' doubt it qualifies as a 'local green space'
		Landside fields of Porth Island are not shown	Included in Valued Landscape. Passed query onto Cornwall Council for NQ3.
		Gannel North-side grassed areas from California Hotel to the Old Boat Yard are not fully shown as Local Green Spaces.	Trevean Green - will be corrected
EL2	Town Clerk 02012018	Add Gannel Boatyard Picnic area and Gannel Car Park as Green Spaces	Will do but need text for Appendix 3b as justification?
EL2	Mervyn Mitchell	Include East Pentire Headland Green as a 'Local Green Area'	agreed on the base it is a Town Green - need the Green map.
EL2	Mervyn Mitchell	Also the designation of the East Pentire Headland Green as a full Wild Life Conservation Area is suspect as the Green legal status precludes any restrictions on residents access or usage according to DEFRA. The priority designation of the East Pentire Headland Green over the lesser Wild Life Conservation Area should be noted in the NNP descriptions.	A query we have passed onto Cornwall Council. As we understand it the areas allocated as County wildlife designations are correct but public access is permitted. There is no question that public access to the Headland will continue.
EL2 (also Ia)	Mervyn Mitchell	The area of Trevean Green as shown on the map is too small in extent. I also strongly suggest that the missing information on the whole of the Trevean Way Green Area is essential as there is otherwise no protection for those areas. This is a major flaw and is surely necessary to make the NNP viable. Colouring in a couple of maps is not a major effort and is a resultant part of the consultation process	Error on Ia and EL2/4 maps, will be corrected. Trevean Green extends to the zigzag path running down to the East of the California Hotel. The CC version gets that wrong too. http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/8030040/Newquay-Open-Spaces-Final-A3-v1a.pdf
EL2/1a	Mervyn Mitchell	Area of public use Grass and scrubland missing from Green Places Plan. Area centred on 50°24'30.5"N+5°05'58.2"W/@50.4084757,-5.1005972,338m. This needs to be included on the maps as well.	???? Will include Grid references .

EL4	Newquay Regeneration Forum	The designation Valued Landscapes needs to be restated by the Designation Local Green Spaces on Map EL4, where applicable, to avoid any further doubt as to their need for protection.	Does this mean including a legend to cover the areas are blue and green? If so, agreed
Ib	Newquay Regeneration Forum	Map Ib omits existing foot/cycle paths in Pentire – from the end of vehicle access along Esplanade Road to Pentire Avenue – the entrance to the East Pentire Headland Car Park. There may be others?	Agreed. Will amend map
EL2	PW Planning	The category of 'Valued Landscapes' on plan 'EL2' appears to derive from the 'NNP APP4' document. Newquay View Resort is located in the area covered by 'Valued Landscape – analysis against criteria: Porth Valley'. However, the high-value landscape features identified in this section do not apply to the Sports Field (and are not claimed to apply to the Sports Field).	The local designation 'Valued Landscape' does not prevent development but identifies where development that reduces the visual and/or recreational amenity of any site so designated would not be supported. The Newquay View Sports Field has not significantly damaged the visual amenity of this area. All of the Porth Valley remains a 'Valued Landscape' and any future development plans would be expected to continue to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment of this special place.
HB2	PW Planning	Given the submissions and associated revisions to the landscape plans to date, it is incongruous for the Sports Field to also be included as an 'existing ecological resource' on plan 'HB2'. This is clearly a mistake, as it includes most of the Sports Field and all of the developed area to the north, including The Venue, the car park, the swimming pool etc. For the avoidance of any doubt, I attach a phase 1 habitat survey update report from 2016, which concludes that the Sports Field " <i>remains of negligible ecological interest in its current form.</i> " Accordingly, the section of land highlighted as being part of Newquay View Resort in the attached LLCA Landscape Area Key NVR edit plan (Sports Field and The Venue) should be removed from the land highlighted as an 'Existing ecological resource' on plan 'HB2'.	Cornwall Council Map. Passed concern to Cornwall Council.

HB2	PW Planning	Accordingly, the section of land highlighted as being part of Newquay View Resort in the attached LLCA Landscape Area Key NVR edit plan (Sports Field and The Venue) should be removed from the land highlighted as an 'Existing ecological resource' on plan 'HB2'.	Cornwall Council Map. Passed concern to Cornwall Council.
-----	-------------	--	---

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
	Historic England	The associated production of the Shopfront Design Guide is particularly commendable, all the more so as in our experience few have been produced through the neighbourhood planning process.	Welcome Comment

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
APP 4 VALUED LANDSCAPES			
Page Nos	JK 19/02/18	Need page numbers	Done
Page 4	JK 19/02/18	Typos Spolit - twice!	Done
Porth Valley	PW Planning	<p>However, the Sports Field at Newquay View Resort is for some reason still highlighted within the category of 'Valued Landscapes' on plan 'EL2'. This land has been drained, filled, levelled, and seeded to grass. It has the appearance of a completely flat (i.e. man-made) recreational field, and includes an access track running the entire length and surface infrastructure (man-holes for the mains sewer pipes running below ground, water connection points etc). Due to the topography of the area and the surrounding hedgerows, the site is not very conspicuous from longer distance vantage points and can only be seen in a limited number of localised positions. It is noted that in the earlier public consultations, the Sports Field was not mentioned by any members of the public as contributing towards any valued landscape. The category of 'Valued Landscapes' on plan 'EL2' appears to derive from the 'NNP APP4' document. Newquay View Resort is located in the area covered by 'Valued Landscape – analysis against criteria: Porth Valley'. However, the high-value landscape features identified in this section do not apply to the Sports Field (and are not claimed to apply to the Sports Field). For example, in the 'quality of the landscape' category, the small river referred to does not run through or adjacent to this site, and the Sports Field is not a semi-natural landscape, nor does it contain 'semi natural scrub or a large range of flora and fauna'. Under the 'scenic' category, and unlike other areas of the valley, the Sports Field is well managed and has the appearance of a maintained recreational/sports</p>	<p>The local designation 'Valued Landscape' does not prevent development but identifies where development that reduces the visual and/or recreational amenity of any site so designated would not be supported. The Newquay View Sports Field has not significantly damaged the visual amenity of this area. All of the Porth Valley remains a 'Valued Landscape' and any future development plans would be expected to continue to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment of this special place.</p>

Porth Valley	PW Planning (continued)	<p>The Sports Field has no conservation importance and is not within the CWS. The site does feature under the 'recreational value' category, though it is not clear that this should contribute to a 'valued landscape'; the qualities including: caravan park, recreational and holiday accommodation. The irregular layout and low-quality design of the animal home that sits immediately above the Sports Field considerably detracts from the landscape value, while the large recreational facility known as 'The Venue' to the north of the Sports Field further reduces the sensitivity of the landscape value at this location. This is compounded by the fact that The Venue and the associated infrastructure, including a large outdoor swimming pool, are also included in map 'EL2' as being a 'valued landscape'. Accordingly, the 5 sections of land highlighted as being part of Newquay View Resort in the attached LLCA Landscape Area Key NVR edit plan (Sports Field, The Venue, Newquay View Resort main site, Camping area and recreation area) should be removed from the land highlighted as a 'Valued Landscape' on plan 'EL2'. Given the submissions and associated revisions to the landscape plans to date, it is incongruous for the Sports Field to also be included as an 'existing ecological resource' on plan 'HB2'. This is clearly a mistake, as it includes most of the Sports Field and all of the developed area to the north, including The Venue, the car park, the swimming pool etc. For the avoidance of any doubt, I attach a phase 1 habitat survey update report from 2016, which concludes that the Sports Field "remains of negligible ecological interest in its current form." Accordingly, the section of land highlighted as being part of Newquay View Resort in the attached LLCA Landscape Area Key NVR edit plan (Sports Field and The Venue) should be removed from the land highlighted as an 'Existing ecological resource' on plan 'HB2'.</p>	<p>We will amend the Appendix to mention specifically the Sports Field. Map HB2 is not owned by the Neighbourhood Plan but is an illustration from the Local Plan Allocations DPD which we have included in the NNP for information. The DPD is currently going through examination and we have copied your concerns and your submissions to Cornwall Council so they make the appropriate amendments - and will, if we are permitted, raise your concerns at the formal Inspector's examination of the DPD. It is the map that is in the approved DPD that will be included in the NNP package.</p>
--------------	----------------------------	---	--

Paragraph	Comment from	Comment	Response
General	J Kenny	Include Grid references	Done, though sorting via Post Code makes better sense in associating adjacent sites
Tregurrian	J Kenny	Typo ' <i>171 hectares</i> should be <i>.171 hectares</i>	Corrected
East Pentire Headland	Mervyn Mitchell	Omits 'East Pentire Headland Green' although it meets all the criteria and is a registered Town/Village Green VG694(2010). It is used by local residents and Townspeople all year round for dog walking and exercise as well as tourists. I strongly suggest that the East Pentire Headland Green should be included as a Designated Local Green space as I mentioned previously. If it is not included then it will not get the added security of the NNP which is the point of doing all this. If the Frozen can be included with its 171 hectares (according to the document) then the 16.3 hectares of the East Pentire Headland Green surely should. The identification as a Valued Landscape is not sufficient	Will include - the process involves the independent inspector reviewing each site and deciding if it meets the Criteria. On the face of it, the Headland may fail the "size" test but since it is a Town Green, that might not matter. Need to map the limits of the Green - request confirmationary maps
General	Mervyn Mitchell	The 40 other important green space areas mentioned in the document need to identified within the NNP and should have been so identified for the consultation process for examination.	They are evidence presented to the Inspector and will be available - happy to provide a copy
EL2 now LE3	Town Clerk 02012018	Add Gannel Boatyard Picnic area and Gannel Car Park as Green Spaces	Will do but need text for Appendix 5 as justification?
EL2 now LE3	Cllr Paul Summe	Add Alexandra Gardens	Will do but need text for Appendix 5 as justification?