

## Wadebridge Area Neighbourhood Plan – 1<sup>st</sup> Circulation Draft Comments @ 27<sup>th</sup> February 2017

<p><b>Policy SD01 Built-up Area Boundary and Growth Area</b>  <b>Inset Map C1 defines the built-up area boundary of Wadebridge. Development or redevelopment proposals within the built-up area boundary will be supported, subject to the other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</b>  <b>The growth of Wadebridge over the plan period should generally be contained within the built-up area and that area inside the by-pass (A39/389) as indicated on map C1. Development proposals for housing, economic and community-related development within this area will be supported if they are in accordance with the strategic policies of the Cornwall Local Plan and comply with policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p>	
David Jowett (2)	No new houses within 1 mile of town centre or better still within 5 miles of Wadebridge
C E Buchanan (6)	The by-pass is an artificial boundary and appears to be limiting sensible development.
Anthony Poole (12)	There is only one area suitable for further house building which avoids town traffic problems. That is the land opposite side of the main road to the Royal Cornwall Showground. Low agricultural value and some residential properties.
C J Phillips (13)	Important that any new development demonstrates minimum traffic movement. Only potential site that addresses all concerns is the Sladesbridge application behind Trelawney Garden Centre. Flat safe walkway to town and pubs, restaurants play park, tennis courts, playing fields all close walking distance.
Margaret Wiltshire (15)	Why the need to build exclusively inside the A39 when a more discrete alternative lies just outside this boundary?
Paul Tofi (19)	I feel it would be prudent to determine which development areas should be removed from the NDP if currently refused areas were to be approved on appeal. This also applies to any large development being successful in the planning process that is not currently shown as an area to be developed within the NDP.
Malcolm and Diane Dingle (22)	The Plan shows only three areas for hundreds of houses. This is not how development needs to be approached in Wadebridge. Small development around the town over the coming years would negate the problem of traffic congestion and keep the appearance of the town as attractive as possible. Research should be done to find smaller sites.
F and A Gardner (30)	The fields between Gonvena and the By-pass are protected in the North Cornwall Plan. Why is development on Phillips Field at Egloshayle not included?
A G Carruthers (34)	I agree with the main theme of the Plan to contain growth within the main road hierarchy. There is no argument to grow the town on the outside of the A389 at Trelawney/Sladesbridge.
Stuart Mockford (47/55)	The NP fails to adequately explain why some developments to the east and south are encouraged while others are not. The validity of the NP is therefore questionable.
J Skinner (49)	Development should be kept within the by-pass.
Jon Hughes (52)	Any development that requires access through the existing road system will severely compromise this and should be discounted. It will therefore require some creative thinking to satisfy the house numbers.
Bob Spiller (54)	My main comment would be around residential development. I have been to a number of public consultation meetings with developers and they all appear to come from up country and use their own workman and have no feel or interest for our community or culture. Wouldn't it be better for Cornwall developers and builders to be constructing them which would also help Cornwall financially.
Bob Spiller (54)	Wouldn't it be better if estates are built over a number of years as a large influx of people at the same time into an area are less likely to be absorbed into local society and allow infrastructure to slowly be established?
Stuart Mockford (47/55)	I have reviewed the information available in detail on all planning applications for the housing development so badly needed within the NHP area and have come to the unavoidable conclusion the Church Park development will have far less impact on Wadebridge than all other proposed developments.....The NHP fails to adequately explain why some developments to the east and south of the A389 are encouraged while others are not. The validity is therefore

	questionable and tends to support the claim made by some that regardless of the benefits proposed it seeks to prevent the Church Park development at all costs.
Influence on behalf of Greg Hingley (60)	<p>OBJECTION - Attached to this representation is a plan coloured pink which shows an area of land situated off Trenant Vale in Egloshayle Parish which is requested to be included within the new development boundary for Wadebridge.</p> <p>The reasons for this request is that the land is not countryside and to designate it as such fails to take account of the existing residential development on three sides of the site. To the west is Winwell Field a residential housing development of relatively recent construction, Trenant House is located to the North whilst to the east is an existing road (Trenant Vale) with further residential development beyond.</p> <p>The land is sited in a sustainable location, well related to the town and existing residential development within Wadebridge and could comfortably accommodate between 5-9 dwellings. The site was identified by Cornwall Council in their Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012-2015 (SHLAA) given the reference of S631 as shown on the Plan below.</p> <p>The site would meet many of the objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan: It would help deliver a portion of the 1100 homes required within the Community Network Area and would provide housing development within the bypass limits an objective of the plan.</p> <p>Map C1 as produced in this consultation document shows the land as 'countryside'. The site is clearly not countryside. With the development boundary revised to include the site it would be considered as 'suitable and appropriate for development' in accordance with the NHD Plans objectives. Furthermore, the site would meet the criteria set out in proposed Policy HS03 'Infill Housing'.</p> <p>Objection to Policy SD01 – Inset Map C1 defines built up area of Wadebridge – The wording then states 'development within the built-up area will be supported if they are in accordance with strategic policies of the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP)'. The site is within a town location and should be supported as a sustainable development site in accordance with Policy 3 of the CLP. Policy 3 identifies Wadebridge as a named town. The site to be included in the town boundary is 'within the town or well related' whichever way this policy is read, the site would comply with its intentions of Policy 3 of the CLP.</p> <p>Para. 9.19 – 'Land that is not designated as built up area by SD01 is regarded as countryside'. The land identified in this submission cannot reasonably be referred to as countryside and should not be restricted.</p> <p>Para. 9.20 explains large parts of Egloshayle Parish is covered by the AONB designation, this land is undesignated and adjacent to existing residential development, it is suitable for development and deliverable.</p> <p>If the development boundary is amended to include the land at the northern end of Trenant Vale as shown on the attached Plan the objection to Policy SD01 would be removed.</p>
WYG on behalf of Hawks Meadow Properties (61)	<p>We support the inclusion of the site at Higher Trenant Road within the built-up area boundary and the general thrust of Policy SD01 which seeks to support development proposals for housing, economic and community-related development within the built-up area and growth areas (inside the by-pass), providing they are in accordance with policies of the Cornwall Local Plan and the NP. However, we would comment that the built-up area boundary in this location should accurately include the site at Higher Trenant Road which has an implemented planning permission for foodstore) development and as outlined in the attached site location plan. Map C1 of the NP appears to exclude part of the northern most section of the site and also a strip along the eastern boundary of the site from within the built-up area boundary.</p> <p>The highlighted line on the attached plan (Appendix B) shows the correct limit of the built-up area boundary of Wadebridge around the site at Higher Trenant Road.</p>
WYG on behalf of Hawks Meadow Properties (61)	<p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) recognises that local planning authorities should identify key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period (paragraph 47). The NPPF also notes at paragraph</p>

	<p>47 that local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements.</p> <p>The county-wide Site Allocations DPD 'Preferred Options' consultation document (September 2016) recognises that Wadebridge (amongst five other towns) has no allocations within the Site Allocations DPD as the town wishes to "produce their own Neighbourhood Development Plan that will include allocations and/or policies to address how the Cornwall Local Plan targets will be delivered".</p> <p>In the absence of any site allocations for Wadebridge within the county-wide Site Allocations DPD, the purpose of the NP is to act as the Site Allocations document for Wadebridge to accord with the requirements of the NPPF and to ensure that housing targets within the Cornwall Local Plan are met.</p> <p>The Objective (Technical) Review of Land Supply for Housing and Employment produced by the NP Land Supply Group (November 2016) identifies that the residual housing requirement in Wadebridge as of August 2016 (excluding commitments and completions) is a further 660 dwellings up to 2030 to meet the Cornwall Local Plan target of 1,100 dwellings between 2010 and 2030. However, despite there being an identified housing requirement in Wadebridge, the NP does not identify any sites for housing allocations. Given the foregoing, the NP should allocate suitable sites in Wadebridge for housing to deliver the housing requirement as set out in the Cornwall Local Plan. Otherwise it will fail its main planning purpose.</p>
<p>WYG on behalf of Hawks Meadow Properties (61)</p>	<p>Following on from the above, the site on land off Higher Trenant Road (site 27) should be allocated for housing development. The site offers a highly sustainable location for housing development and benefits from the follow characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It is located within the built-up area boundary and so the principle of developing the site for housing is in accordance with NP Policy SD01.</li> <li>· It is not subject to development constraints like other potential housing sites within the built-up growth area, which the NP recognises might be difficult to overcome.</li> <li>· The site is in a highly sustainable and accessible location within Wadebridge. The site is accessible by a choice of travel modes, including walking, cycling and public transport, is only 1km from Wadebridge Town Centre and within 500m of the nearest primary and secondary schools.</li> <li>· The site offers a more sustainable location for housing development than sites located beyond the A39 in the area identified as the 'direction of growth' in Map C3 of the NP.</li> <li>· It has been accepted by Cornwall Council that the site is not required to meet employment land targets in Wadebridge set out in the Cornwall Local Plan (the site is subject to Saved Policy WAD7 which allocates the site for employment).</li> <li>· The NP evidence base notes that the Wadebridge &amp; Padstow Community Network Area has already over-provided against the Local Plan employment land requirement.</li> <li>· The site is suitable and readily deliverable given the previous history of the site and its implemented retail planning permission means that the site is cleared, benefits from a new access and is ready for development.</li> <li>· The site could deliver up to 95 dwellings, which would positively contribute to the housing supply in Wadebridge and to the council's five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.</li> </ul> <p>Saved North Cornwall Local Plan Policies (as saved in the Cornwall Local Plan)</p> <p>The site on land off Higher Trenant Road is the subject of Policy WAD7 of the North Cornwall Local Plan (NCLP) (as saved in the recently adopted Cornwall Local Plan (CLP)).</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that this saved policy currently carries very little weight because it conflicts with the evidence base for both the CLP and the NP, the NP should make clear that saved policies from the NCLP (as saved in the CLP) will be superseded by the NP when it is adopted and as such will cease to exist upon adoption of the NP.</p>

<p>Abby Richardson (68)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My main concern is with the Built-Up Area Boundary. At the moment, it feels that all major development would be hemmed in the town and will put acute pressure on traffic pinch points. To meet the level of housing that we are going to be required to by Cornwall Council / Central Government we are going to have to accept some sizeable developments, as much as we would rather have small in-fill type development. It is these developments that will be able to contribute to very necessary infrastructure improvements. I do not feel we can fit these within the boundary area as stated without a hugely negative impact on the town – and I feel that some of the potential sites are not suitable – for instance around parts of Gonvena.</li> <li>• A lot of focus has been put on the link road via Bodieve but I cannot see that this will hugely alleviate the pressure of traffic on the town centre, especially as it is dependent on a large residential development being built that will add to the problem. Anyone living in this area will still cut down to town via Rock Road/Gonvena. Also in the summer people staying in Rock/Polzeath will continue to come into town for the amenities, Camel Trail etc and will use the most direct route. I would be interested to see if there are any projections /estimates re the level of traffic this link road is likely to take away from the town and whether that will outweigh the increased traffic from the development? This is a very costly piece of infrastructure and I'm not convinced it is the something that is at the top of a 'wish list' for the town when we are faced with other very pressing issues, such as those around education for instance.</li> </ul>
<p>Turley on behalf of Redrow (64)</p>	<p>Policy SD01 of the draft Plan seeks to identify the built-up area boundary for Wadebridge. The Policy states that the growth of Wadebridge over the plan period should generally be contained within the built-up area and within the A39/389 bypass.</p> <p>At this stage there appears to be no evidence to demonstrate that this restrictive Policy could sufficiently meet the housing or employment needs set out in the policies of the adopted Cornwall Local Plan.</p> <p>In addition, there is no evidence that suggests the options presented are the most appropriate or that reasonable alternatives have been assessed. As set out previously, a fundamental requirement of the SEA and therefore a basic condition the Plan must meet.</p> <p>For example, on Map C1 which accompanies the Policy, four sites are identified as preferred areas for growth. There is no evidence that these sites are the most appropriate sites for development in the settlement. For example, on the 'Trevarner/Above Town' site, an application was submitted under reference PA16/00721 and was recommended for refusal by Cornwall Council Officers for two reasons, the principle one being severe highways impact on the junction of Bodieve Road/Gonvena Hill/St Matthews Hill. The decision has now been appealed by the Applicants. As it stands, development on this site is contrary to several Policies of the Cornwall Local Plan and suggested policies within the draft Neighbourhood Plan itself, principally Policy TT01: Impact of Traffic.</p> <p>The only 'evidence' of assessment which suggests support the inclusion of Trevarner/Above Town as opposed to Redrow's Land South of Cleavelands appears to be in the accompanying 'Objective (Technical) Review of Land Supply for Housing and Employment'. Following review of potential sites and a random scoring exercise, in Table 2 of this document, the Trevarner/Above Town site is rated as 'land deemed optional for development' and commented on as follows:  "Highway Officers report states there would be no objection if a Bodieve Road relief road was constructed"  Whereas the Land South of Cleavelands (Land to the South of Culvery) is rated as land deemed 'unsuitable for development' and commented on as follows:  "Access along Trevanion Road not considered suitable for development if unimproved"</p> <p>These assessments and the resulting preferences of sites included in the draft Plan fundamentally lack logic and coherence. The assessment has failed to take account of numerous important considerations, initially and most obviously, the fact that the Land South of Cleavelands (Land to the South of Culvery) was recommended for approval by Council Officers, as it offered suitable improvements to Trevanion Road, whereas the Trevarner/Above Town site was</p>

	<p>recommended for refusal by Officers, and did not offer a suitable highways mitigation package. By disregarding evidence on the sustainability credentials of these two sites, the 'Objective (Technical) Review of Land Supply for Housing and Employment' at this stage fails one of the basic conditions.</p> <p>We also note that in the supporting text for suggested Policy SD04, the draft Plan acknowledges that the Land at Govena (identified as a sustainable growth area) could be undeliverable and unsustainable.</p> <p>Given that the two largest areas of growth identified in this Policy are potentially both unsustainable and undeliverable, it already seems unlikely that this Policy will be capable of delivering the adopted Local Plan housing requirement.</p> <p>The lack of consideration of material evidence in this Policy fundamentally undermines the reliability and robustness of the site assessments and demonstrates that no proper consideration of alternative options has been undertaken.</p>
Environment Agency (69)	<p>In our opinion the document would be significantly strengthened by including an approach to flood risk management within those communities most at risk.</p> <p>The evidence that we hold on flood risk identifies the need for flood risk management investment in Wadebridge. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss how the Neighbourhood Plan can set out policy objectives to provide a platform for delivering the necessary resilience. It could be the case that any progress made on delivering sustainable development and economic improvements could be undermined if the issue of flood risk now or in the future is not appropriately managed.</p>
Luke Richards (71)	<p>Objection is raised to the principle of continuing housing development within the boundaries of the A39/A389. This approach will place significant additional burden on the existing road network, other infrastructure and services. Housing development should be on the edge of town to ease pressure on the centre but recognising that it needs to contain a range of facilities.</p>
J P Renals (73)	<p>The proposed development on sites 25 and 30 should not be considered they are outside of the previous agreed boundary for building. This is prime agricultural land. They would result in major traffic congestion in the Gonvena area. Where possible development should be prioritised to brownfield sites rather than agricultural land.</p> <p>Site 27 was originally agreed for development for retail. This should be changed to housing.</p>
Burton (75)	<p>I feel strongly that Wadebridge takes the time to allocate gradually and not build them all in the next year or two. If they are built over the next 14 years the town would be more likely to be able to deal with the influx of extra traffic and residents, giving more time to build more schools, doctors and dentists.</p>
Helen Rowe (76)	<p>Hopefully new development will be confined to the town side of the by-pass. This is particularly pertinent where new development would impact on the existing hamlets</p>
J Westlake (79)	<p>The town can't accommodate the traffic. These developments need to be smaller and slower.</p>
Maureen Wakeham (80)	<p>It is foolish to build outside the by-pass when so much land is available within its limits. Wadebridge should be kept a compact town. Development outside the by-pass sets the pattern for an urban sprawl.</p> <p>I would strongly object to developing the land between the by-pass and Bradford's Quay. The beauty of the sloping fields and trees is worth preserving.</p>
Paul and Angie Readfern (82)	<p>With the development east and west of Wadebridge school we are concerned that the full implication for traffic on Bodieve Road has not been taken into account.</p>
Adam Phillips (85)	<p>The NHP is comprehensive and is obviously the result of a lot of thought by its authors however I feel that its basic premise of housing development taking place within the bypass is somewhat outdated and to a certain extent belies societal changes. Ever increasing domestic car ownership combined with the latest scientific data on the negative impact to health of combustion derived atmospheric particulates would, to my mind, strongly mitigate against any development which would force vehicular usage to increase through, or adjacent to, areas of existing residential development.</p>

	<p>The 1991 bypass was designed to alleviate the horrendous traffic congestion in the town at that time (although the concomitant impact on health was unknown). However, as all who experience Wadebridge recognise, the volume of traffic “in town” increases year on year and any development which exacerbates this process would be a retrograde step seriously impacting on quality of life for residents. There are already indications that “rat-runs” are taking shape in areas such as Trenant Vale and Tower Hill in Egloshayle.</p> <p>The onus on the town to cater for an increasing population, with all that that entails with regard to 21st century infrastructure and support, has to be counterbalanced with the health considerations of the residents, the aesthetic impact on the beautiful Camel estuary and with due consideration to future generations from an environmental standpoint. A review of all existing and putative major developments has led to my firm belief that the Church Park development best meets scrutiny under all these parameters.</p>
Penelope McBreen (102)	I think it short sighted to contemplate any housing scheme which will significantly increase the volume of traffic within Wadebridge, throughout the year and on already congested roads.
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Recognition in para 4.15 of Gonvena side of the river in respect of raising its profile and reclaiming it for the benefit of the town is welcomed. This is a key area for development within the bounds of the A39. Para 9.18 indicated that preferred development should be within the bypass area indicated on map C1 and we would support that statement. Policy SD01 sits well within the policy framework of the newly adopted Cornwall Local Plan.
Mr and Mrs Markham (92)	Can developers use empty premises in town centres first before green belt areas.
Rick and Sue Gould (95)	We are in favour of the Higher Trenant and Trevarner/above town development. We are opposed to the proposed Gonvena development as compromising to the Camel river frontage.
Caroline Buchanan (96)	<p>Gonvena Fields are designated as open area of local significance adjacent to an AONB and as such they should not be designated for development.</p> <p>In my view we don't need to bung up more of Wadebridge within the by-pass to extend outside the by-pass makes more sense.</p>
Wadebridge Primary School (99)	Please consider leaving some fields in the proposed Gonvena development. We currently use the fields for cross-country. Events. I would suggest leaving the field nearest to Bradford's Quay and developing the area nearer to the school and sports centre.
Diane Dingle (108)	Our general concern is that so many possible developments are so large. Small developments in discreet areas of the town would be a far better option for everyone.
WYG on behalf of Cornwall Care (123 – late)	<p>Land at West Hill Wadebridge benefits from outline planning permission for a care village development (PA14/01844). The site location plan and planning permission are attached for information. This permission is extant but expires on 23 June 2017. Cornwall Care is preparing to take the necessary action to secure the planning permission, either by submitting reserved matters applications or a fresh planning application for an identical scheme</p> <p>With reference to the attached site plan, the settlement boundary includes three of the four field parcels that comprise the application site (the parcels in the west, the central parcel and the parcel to the east of it). The fourth field parcel in the far south east of the application site is not included within the settlement boundary. However, this field parcel is part of a larger area of land identified under Policy SD04 Direction of Growth and associated Map C3 on page 28. Policy SD04 identifies areas for growth and sets out criteria for considering applications to ensure significant community benefit. Cornwall Care supports the inclusion within the settlement boundary of three of the four field parcels associated with its planning permission. However, it requests that the settlement boundary is extended to include the fourth field parcel. This would provide a more logical and consistent basis for both the NP and for consideration of the forthcoming application(s), such that the application site as a whole is subject to the same policy criteria.</p>

Eimear Luxton (121- late)	I think that new housing development would be better limited to being located within the A39 and by-pass. If development is allowed outside these main roads then more car use will occur.
Cornwall Council (124 – late)	<p>We are broadly comfortable with the approach taken providing that the strategic allocations can be delivered within the expanded settlement boundary. We would normally recommend specific allocations of sites to provide a greater degree of certainty and allow the group to make site specific recommendations on housing type, design, density, facilities etc. I understand that the group has chosen not to do this; however we believe that your approach to develop close to the town centre represents sustainable development and meets the basic conditions.</p> <p>Ensuring that the work of the Land Supply group is publicly available to demonstrate and defend the approach taken in determining the enlargement of the boundary will be important to explain the inclusion of some areas but not others. Highways have confirmed that although there are some issues around access to the site at Gonvena (which have been discussed with the group previously), they see no particular issues with the proposed NDP in terms of strategic transport. As discussed, part of the land at Gonvena should be protected as Local Green Space in policy NE07 and reflected in Map C1.</p> <p>There may be an issue with an assessment of the landscape capacity to consider the ability of the revised boundary to accommodate the planned growth – any issues arising here should be identified through the SEA / SA process.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>Amend the title of the policy to avoid confusion between the ‘growth area’ and the ‘direction of growth’ policy SD04 - possibly amend to <i>‘BUAB and development within Wadebridge town’</i> or similar?</p> <p>Ensure that there is a clear assessment of the number of homes that can be delivered on the sites within the revised boundary to demonstrate that the strategic allocation can be met on available sites within the boundary (this work has already been largely done by the LSA group but a document summarising the potential deliverability is important in defending this policy); this should be included within the evidence base.</p>
<p><b>Policy SD02 Development in the Countryside</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals on land outside the built-up area and growth area that are designated in policy SD1 will be supported where they propose:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. small-scale business/commercial schemes which will benefit the local rural economy; or</b></li> <li><b>ii. housing that meets an identified rural need conforming to Local Plan Policy 9 or conforming to Local Plan Policy 7; or</b></li> <li><b>iii. tourism and recreation related development appropriate in terms of scale and type in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy SR7; or</b></li> <li><b>iv. re-use of redundant or disused buildings for agricultural or business purposes in accordance with Neighbourhood Plan Policy JE3; or</b></li> <li><b>v. the optimal viable use of a heritage asset or enabling development to secure the future of a heritage asset; or</b></li> <li><b>vi. extensions to existing buildings, including extensions to dwellings, which are subservient to and respect the scale and appearance of the existing building.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>In all cases the development proposal must demonstrate that its location, scale, design and construction materials will protect or enhance the rural nature of its setting.</b></p>	
Trevor Wiltshire (16)	I am not in favour of building on the pasture land adjacent to Bradford’s Quay Road, Trevilling Quay and the A39. This lovely area with mature trees is visible from much of the town and the Camel Trail and A39. Too much urbanisation and we lose this important aspect. Development should be discrete. Much better small developments such as Sladesbridge new town where development proposals include infrastructure.
Paul Tofi (19)	I now wish to see development at Sladesbridge and this area should be included in the NDP
Charlotte Lyon (21)	Extremely disappointing to see Church Park excluded from the area suitable for development. It is location that will have the least negative effect on Wadebridge while creating long-term employment opportunities and community support.

Vera Beare (24)	If you have to build more houses I am in favour of them being built at Trevilling Quay up at Bodieve and over on the road at Egloshayle on the A389. I am in NO way in favour of building more homes up on Burlawn Road.
Tina Davis (26)	I strongly feel that the Sladesbridge site should be included in the NP. This would seem to be the most appropriate site on the outskirts of the town and would cause considerably less traffic congestion. It would also bring benefits like a proposed school, medical centre, shops and a number of self-build plots.
Hugh Davis (27)	I would like to see the site at Sladesbridge included in the NP as this would be the most sustainable and cause less traffic problems.
Dominic Comonte (32)	I am generally against ribbon development as the Plan seems to be.
Mark Nash (41)	I support development at Sladesbridge.
Sue Tofi (42)	I support the possible development at Sladesbridge as I know there will be a new school.
Stuart Mockford (47/55)	The garden centre continues to grow exponentially on what the NP would have us to believe is the wrong side of the A389.
Kevin Smith (63)	I think there is merit in the "Church View" proposed development between Egloshayle and Sladesbridge. This would provide a high proportion of the required housing for Wadebridge, whilst not putting additional (and sometimes insupportable) strains on existing roads, sewage, etc, which other proposals and some recent or underway developments appear to do. The additional primary school contained in the proposal is needed by Wadebridge already, never mind when the 1100 extra houses are built. I ask Wadebridge Town Council to reconsider its opposition, and for the neighbourhood plan to be revised in this respect (mainly section 9).
Turley on behalf of Redrow (64)	Policy SD02 seeks to control development on land outside the built up-area boundary and growth area. The Policy states that proposals will be supported only when meeting the prescribed criteria. Redrow Homes accept such a policy in principle, but would like to highlight that such a policy could only be found sound and meet the basic conditions if suggested Policy SD01 is capable of meeting the needs set out in the strategic policies of adopted Cornwall Local Plan in full.
Helen Rawe (67)	I welcome protection of minor village status for Burlawn and Whitecross, and trust that this will be extended to allow other small settlements, like Bodieve, to retain their identity. Hopefully future development will be contained within the bypass so that it will continue to be a bypass, rather than going through the town.
Emma Pate (72)	I support development in the Sladesbridge area. I support the development of a new primary school in the Sladesbridge area. I am against any housing development leaving the town via Trevanion Road.
Burton (75)	Try not to impact on villages/hamlets as they are small communities on their own and should not be drawn into Wadebridge.
Helen Rowe (76)	Please allow small rural communities to retain their identity.
Jan Derry (77)	Building all the housing we need in one area would enable all the necessary infrastructure and not cause disruption to the people of Wadebridge. A new town at Sladesbridge would include a new primary school, plenty of affordable housing, self-build sites, improvements to the rugby field and a network of leisure paths and tracks.
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy SD02 relates to sites outside the C1 area. Are you certain that enough provision has been made for meeting the housing needs of the area? Policy 3 of the Local Plan expects that new development up to 2030 will be accommodated on sites identified in the neighbourhood plan for Wadebridge. As Wadebridge is a main town it is not expected that housing need should be met through Policy 9 provision, as this is reserved for settlement not listed in Policy 3.
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	The village of Egloshayle should be conserved to retain what is left of its original character. This is in danger of being lost to modern development and is irreplaceable.

Cornwall Council (124 - late)	We are supportive of the policy approach taken here, other than some minor suggested wording changes to the policy (to clarify the intention). i.e. <i>“Development proposals on land outside existing settlements will be supported where they propose:.....”</i>
<p><b>Policy SD03 Employment Growth</b>  <b>Comprehensive development proposals to provide a new business park and local employment opportunities on land to the north west of Ball Road Roundabout (as shown on inset map C2) will be supported provided:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the transport network and parking conditions;</b></li> <li><b>ii. they will not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity; and</b></li> <li><b>iii. they will not have any other unacceptable environmental impact.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Proposals for B8 warehousing/storage uses that create low levels of employment in relation to the floor space provided and provide buildings that have a strong negative impact on their surroundings, will be resisted.</b></p>	
Jeremy Varcoe (EM5/2)	<p>Paras 9.24 to 26, Policy SD03 and map C2 refer to and describe a parcel of land to the west, rather than north west as stated in Para 9.24, of the Ball roundabout. This piece of land, currently occupied by Wadebridge Football Club (WFC), forms the remainder of a larger area that was designated under the North Cornwall Local Plan of 1999, under Policy WAD6, as being for the development of employment. Since this policy is saved under the now adopted Cornwall Local Plan our draft NDP has in policy SD03 retained the employment designation for the one remaining part of this area which has not yet been developed or received planning approval for an employment proposal.</p> <p>Since this part of the NDP was drafted there have been a number of changes which bear on this site. In particular, there have been applications, currently being revised, from one developer (Merriman) to use the site for housing whilst another developer has an application for outline approval for a large development in two sections either side of the B3314 which falls to be considered under our draft Policy SD04 since it is outside the proposed built up development boundary. Whilst this application does not take in any of the remaining WAD6 area it adjoins it. In the event that this application, or a variant of it, is approved housing would largely surround the WFC field. Thus, this area would be less suitable for employment use because of the potential impact on the residents in conflict with one of the SD Aims, namely that a new development should be “properly integrated with the uses and activities around the site.</p> <p>There are other reasons for enabling this site to be available for residential development rather than employment. The site has not been developed, other than for recreational use for at least twenty years suggesting that it is not required for development. The CLP does not stipulate that any additional employment land be allocated for Wadebridge but despite this we anticipate that an additional business park will in time be required. In part, existing businesses along Trevilling Quay are expected to relocate to a more suitable site. Under our Policy SD04 this could be on land to the north and north east of the Ball Roundabout. The Land Supply Group’s technical assessment of the WAD6 site considered that it was more suitable at the present time for residential rather than employment use. Unfortunately, this was not picked up when the steering committee considered the draft SD policies.</p> <p>There is one further reason why the remainder of WAD6 should be available for development, purpose unspecified. Recent planning applications for housing at Higher Trenant and Trevarner Farm have been refused, in part because of potential traffic congestion around the new roundabout on Gonvena Hill feeding in from the Council offices and the Higher Trenant site on which there is still extant planning approval for retail use. A consequence of this is that the assessed traffic flows, which are those for a supermarket still have to be taken into account when other planning applications that would have a potential effect on that roundabout are considered by the LPA. The best way to unblock this problem would be to construct a link road (or ‘bypass’) from the B3317 near Bodieve to the ball Roundabout at</p>

	<p>proposed in Para 9.25. Indeed Para 9. 29 warns that if such obstacles cannot be resolved the NDP target may not be achievable.</p> <p>The great advantage of a residential site is that the proceeds of a S. 106 agreement will almost always be greater than those from a site for employment use. This would apply to the WFC field. Whilst any residential development in the Wadebridge Area is under the CLP normally required to construct 30% of dwellings as affordable homes, the Steering Committee regard provision of a link road as, in this particular situation as having a higher priority.</p> <p>If the WFC site gains approval for residential use it would, of course, be necessary to relocate the Club and its pitches. Under the Merriman proposal this would be achieved by moving WFC across the B3317 to land adjoining the school who, apparently would welcome this. Clearly the school would gain from the sale of their land and there would be a condition that the school could make full use of the WFC facilities thus creating synergy. There would still be ample land to allow the school to expand if this becomes necessary.</p> <p>Recommendation: The draft plan should be amended by deleting Policy SD03 relating to WAD6 and that Paras 09.24- 26 should be rewritten to enable this remaining parcel of land inside the development boundary to be available also for residential development. Since the NDP does not allocate specific sites within the boundary there is no need to identify it by name.</p>
C E Buchanan (6)	Land at the football ground is classed as employment land in the LP. CC seem content to allow house building on the football site, why?
Margaret Jacob (20)	The football field would only add to the overcrowding of the town, roads, schools and doctors.
Grenville Stanbury (59)	<p>Map C2 shows the current football pitch, although within the revised 1999 Built UP Area Boundary, is coloured with hatched purple and referred to as Employment Land and Saved WAD 6 Policy.</p> <p>I do not consider the football pitch needs to be individually identified because any land within the revised Built Up Area Boundary is covered by:- Policy SD01. Surely this policy covers employment as well as any other type of development as long as it complies with other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan?</p> <p>Conversely if you wish to specifically identify the use of land within the Built Up Area Boundary it would be logical for the Land at Higher Tenant also to be specifically identified. As pointed out in the recent planning application the land has an extant planning consent for a supermarket and as I have pointed out in previous correspondence it is extremely unlikely that Sainsbury will wish the land to revert back purely to employment use rather than retail use and, in my opinion, it would be illogical for it to be identified as employment land.</p> <p>In one respect it will not matter how you deal with this piece of land as far as the Neighbourhood Plan is concerned as the recent planning application for residential use was refused against the recommendation of the planning officers and will no doubt be subject to an appeal the lands use will no doubt be decided before the Plan documentation is finally ratified. I would recommend that no areas of land within the revised Built Up Area Boundary are specifically identified.</p> <p>The land supply group identified an area of land to the North East of the Ball Roundabout for Employment use to replace the area of land that would have been loss should planning consent for residential development be eventually granted on the football pitch and Sainsbury sites.</p> <p>This was clearly identified on the Assessed Sites Plan in the Objective (Technical) Review of Land Supply for Housing and Employment.</p> <p>If the Steering Committee decides there has been an error in the section on Employment Land basing most of the section on WAD 6 of the redundant NDCD Local Plan the whole section will require re-writing.</p>
Jan Derry (77)	I am most concerned about the loss of green land between the by-pass and Gonvena. The last plan drawn up by NDDC shows all the fields as Open Area of Local Significance and the football ground as employment land. Why did this change?

	According to the AONB guidelines any land adjacent or visible from an AONB should be treated with consideration for the AONB. The land is grade 2 farm land. Are you going to go against your Natural Environment aims? There are many more sites in Wadebridge where we can achieve the numbers. If the town has to allow building on greenfield sites I suggest a re-think on land at Sladesbridge.
David and Jan Derry (87)	We do not agree that the football club needs to move at all or have housing built on it.
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy SD03 relates to a historic area from within the North Cornwall Local Plan allocated for employment uses. Since that time there has been an approval for a 66 bed hotel on this site and the football club anticipate on relocating next to the school. Would it be prudent to review the employment site opportunities in your area and allocate other land as well?
Peter Collis (105)	<p>The narrative has focussed solely on WAD6, the area West (Not North West) of the ball roundabout which is known as Bodieve Park. The site is currently owned by the Wadebridge Football Club. This area was designated for employment and a small part of it close to the roundabout is occupied by a branch of Jewsons the builders merchants. A hotel is being developed on a relatively small piece of land on the edge of the roundabout adjacent to Jewsons. No other employment projects have been proposed for this site for the past 17 years other than the failed application for a Morrisons supermarket several years ago. Since then The Football Club working with a developer have been progressing several applications to move the club grounds to another site and redevelop all of the available WAD6 land for housing. On carefully reading the narrative sections the thrust of the justification for policy SD03 is focused solely on WAD6 employment potential. In section 9.25 there is a Highways statement on the need for a relief road from the B3314 near Bodieve to connect near to the Ball roundabout. So far any form of relief road through the WAD6 area has been rejected and focus has moved another area North East of Ball but north of the A39 by-pass.</p> <p>The “Objective (Technical) Review of Land Supply for housing &amp; Employment” report (November 2016) discusses employment land potential. For information refer to pages 14 -15 of narrative, the map on page 19 and site assessment (Table 2) on pages 20 - 25 of the report. In summary the narrative stated that there were 4 sites historically designated for employment/commercial development at Wadebridge i.e. Trevilling (river frontage), West Hill (near Tesco), Higher Trenant (near the Council Offices - WAD7) and Bodieve Park (Football club - WAD6). The West Hill area has been significantly developed for a mix of employment and retail businesses. Much of Trevilling is derelict and has been registered as brown field status. Both Trenant and Bodieve Park are being progressed to application and pre-application for housing by the developers. In planning terms the Land Supply technical assessment believe that these proposals are viable and sustainable.</p> <p>As part of the LSA review we investigated the Town Framework Study 2012 (Tech Report pages 9-13). The map on page 10 shows site 2 North of the A39 and outside of the development boundary. This was recommended for potential employment growth by Cornwall Council. Subsequently land owners started to investigate the potential for developing this area both for housing and employment with the added incentive of providing the relief road mentioned in Draft plan document. Following investigations and discussion with local councillors and Cornwall Council several options were considered related to the relief road and pre-applications are currently being considered. A site North East of the Ball roundabout (site 32 on map Page 19 Tech report) was selected of having the potential for an employment/commercial area to compensate for the relocation of businesses at Trevilling, and proposed housing at the Bodieve Park and Higher Trenant sites.</p> <p>To some extent the Direction of Growth Map C3 in the Draft plan shows where the employment area might be. We have designed the arrows to point in three directions. The right hand arrow swinging to the North East flank of Ball is effectively pointing to site 32. There is no specific narrative about this employment area in policy SD03 or SD04 related to what potential use of land is North of the 2016 BUAB and East &amp; West of the Ball roundabout is other than housing.</p>

	The Steering Group were offered three options A, B, & C. On the face of it SG colleagues seem happy with an A/B combination and a hint of C to give a growth indication. A/B clearly defines what & why but the C element is far from clear unless our community is prepared to dig deep into LSA documents.
Caroline Buchanan (96)	I do not agree with plans to move the football club and takeover Wadebridge school fields. It is nonsensical to block in the primary school.
Cornwall Council (124 – late)	Intention to remove this policy is noted. It may be worth including some of this text in the direction of growth policy, SD04 to support the potential development of a business park there instead? I confirm that we are happy with a policy to replace saved policy WAD 6 to amend the status of the football ground so that this becomes a developable area also suitable for housing (indeed, this is a positive as it will increase the options for housing sites within the settlement boundary). This amendment could be included here in, or policy SD01 or as a stand-alone policy. Would suggest the following text: <i>'The land identified as 'Land between A39 bypass and B3314', as indicated on Map X is suitable for C3 housing development or B1 or B2 commercial uses. This supercedes saved policy WAD6 of the former North Cornwall Local Plan . Any development of this site is contingent on a suitable relocation plan to provide recreational facilities of the same or better standard those that are to be lost. Any such relocation must take place before development can commence.'</i> I think that you do need to mention this site by name in a policy as you are replacing an existing saved policy, however there is no requirement to give further detail, once the status of the land is amended, it would be governed by policy SD01.
<p><b>Policy SD04 Direction of Growth</b></p> <p><b>Major development proposals in the area indicated on Map C3 will only be supported if they:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. meet a local need for affordable housing;</b></li> <li><b>ii. make a substantial contribution to the economic, employment, social or cultural circumstances of the neighbourhood area;</b></li> <li><b>iii. deliver sustainable development and growth;</b></li> <li><b>iv. address satisfactorily any issues relating to:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic and highways,</li> <li>• flooding, and</li> <li>• infrastructure capacity;</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>v. include pedestrian and cycle links to the town centre; and</b></li> <li><b>vi. do not include, or adversely affect, an area that is protected from development.</b></li> </ul>	
Paul Tofi (19)	Over development on the eastern side of the town and to the north and west of will only increase pressure on the Platt where it meets the Old Bridge and at the end of St Matthews Hill. For these reasons I am against development to the north and west of Ball roundabout.
Margaret Jacob (20)	The proposed development at Sladesbridge would include a school and surgery which would be much preferable in my opinion and would benefit our lovely market town which will lose its appeal if more building is allowed in its midst.
Stephen Knightly (36)	The most important area to be developed is the land north of Ball roundabout. The scheme delivers an important route from town taking traffic away from St Matthews/Rock road junction. The scheme also provides for employment with the benefit of removing existing employment from the centre and allowing businesses to grow.
Mark Nash (41)	I do not support proposal to build north of the main roundabout on the A39. Any development will lead to an intolerable situation at the bottom of Gonvena Hill at the mini-roundabout to the bridge.
Sue Tofi (42)	I do not wish to see development on land north of Ball roundabout

Welch (43)	I object to the proposed direction of growth in the area of Bodieve and west of the by-pass. You should protect the countryside and maintain separate identity of the Bodieve community.
Jon Hughes (52)	To cater for the required numbers it is inevitable that development will be required outside the perceived boundary of the by-pass and as such, land at church Farm, Sladesbridge and land between Ball roundabout and Bodieve caravan park should be supported.
WYG on behalf of Hawks Meadow Properties (61)	Policy SD04 should make clear that development in the identified area for the direction of growth, to the north east of Wadebridge (beyond the A39), should only take place if housing and employment land targets cannot be met within the built-up area boundary and proposed growth areas immediately adjoining it.
Turley on behalf of Redrow (64)	<p>Policy SD04 proposes a 'direction of growth' to the north east of the town and states that major development proposals in that area will only be supported if a set of criteria are met:</p> <p>Development on Redrow's Land South of the Cleavelands was acknowledged by Cornwall Council Officers in their determination of the application having regard to the above criteria.</p> <p>The relationship of suggested Policy SD04 to Policies SD01 and SD02 of the draft Plan is conspicuously vague. There is no reference to timing or any trigger mechanism for the release of development in the growth area, or to what scale of development could be provided there. Development in this location would be a) outside the A39/389 bypass and b) beyond the built-up area boundary. Any application would therefore be contrary to the spatial strategy set out in suggested Policies SD01 and SD02.</p> <p>In summary, Redrow Homes consider there to be numerous fundamental flaws in the approach taken to the draft Plan. Without considerable amendment, the Neighbourhood Plan will not meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>There remains a notable amount of work to be undertaken, particularly on the production of a robust SEA, which should guide and inform the spatial strategy for Wadebridge, and not be produced in isolation.</p> <p>It remains our firm view that the Land South of the Cleavelands should be considered as a sustainable location for development in the Plan. The Land South of the Cleavelands remains available for development, with demonstrable sustainability credentials and significant benefits arising from its development as confirmed by Cornwall Council Officers in their determination of the previous application on the site.</p>
Diana Smith (66)	<p>I would like to see the plan for a satellite village between Egloshayle and Wadebridge revisited. This would provide a good number of homes, some infrastructure, and be accessed from relatively major roads. Policy SD04 proposes a 'direction of growth' to the north east of the town and states that major development proposals in that area will only be supported if a set of criteria are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Meet a local need for affordable housing;</li> <li>(ii) Make substantial contribution to the economic, employment, social or cultural circumstances of the neighbourhood area;</li> <li>(iii) Deliver sustainable development and growth;</li> <li>(iv) Address satisfactorily any issues relating to:</li> </ul>
Phillipa Richards (70)	I object – development would be on the opposite side of a major infrastructure route. It is too remote from the town and existing development which will result in un-related development unconnected to facilities. The area does not have suitable infrastructure connections and the new road to rock will significantly affect the quality of living for the residents. An alternative direction of housing growth should be proposed to the east of the town adjacent to and behind the Garden Centre.

Maureen Wakeham (80)	With regard to the area alongside the B3314 at Bodieve. This is outside the by-pass an entrance to a new estate would cause further traffic problems. At present, it would be difficult to exit Bodieve were it not for the traffic lights. Bodieve should be allowed to keep its identity and not be subsumed into a large town.
Paul and Angie Readfern (82)	Looking ahead to further development around Bodieve, the residential character of the area should be preserved.
I and G Welch (83)	We are strongly against any development: Bodieve will lose its identity as a hamlet; yet another roundabout will be required; the local stream has inadequate capacity to take discharge; water run-off will increase flooding. The separate identity of Wadebridge must be retained by prohibiting development on Bodieve side of by-pass.
Clark (84)	There are several reasons why residential development north of the by-pass adjacent to Bodieve Road should not happen: traffic already overwhelms the capacity of the B3314 at sometimes of the year; there is no gas main or mains sewerage to the north of the by-pass.
Gemma Dunn (106)	Bodieve has always been a small hamlet. I feel any further development would spoil its appeal and sadly turn it into a suburb of Wadebridge.
Anne Burton (107)	I am opposed to any building development on land adjacent to Bodieve. Many residents live here because of the peace and tranquillity. The noise and light pollution would be of detrimental significance to all. Also we have no mains gas or sewerage. We suffer flooding here also on the main road.
Cornwall Council (124 – late)	There needs to be some scope to deliver any housing that is not delivered within the WB town boundary in case some sites do not materialise or are otherwise deemed unsuitable for development. This possibility is noted in the supporting text but in order to meet the allocation, you could not limit development solely to meet AH need. Suggest an additional bullet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to meet an agreed shortfall in the required housing allocations where it can be clearly demonstrated that it is not possible to meet the requirements through sites within the revised development boundary set out in policy SD01. You may also want to make specific reference here to the development of employment space, incorporating some of old policy SD03.</li> </ul> There was some talk of phasing in relation to development here – if you want to include some commentary relating to delivery before development takes place here, then it should be included in this policy. Bullet point 2 now includes reference to policy 9 to ensure that these are developed as Exception sites. i.e. <i>“Major development proposals in the area indicated on Map C3 will only be supported if they:</i> <i>i. to meet an agreed shortfall in the required housing allocations where it can be clearly demonstrated that it is not possible to meet the requirements through sites within the revised development boundary set out in policy SD01; or</i> <i>ii. meet a demonstrated local need for affordable housing in accordance with policy 9 of the Cornwall Local Plan; or</i> <i>iii. make a substantial contribution to the economic, employment, social or cultural circumstances of the neighbourhood area;</i> <i>ii. and, in all cases,.....”</i>
<b>Policy SD05 Local Character</b> <b>Development proposals should:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. respect and relate to local character;</b></li> <li><b>ii. utilise sustainable building techniques and materials; and</b></li> <li><b>iii. include the use of locally appropriate materials wherever possible.</b></li> </ol> <b>Development proposals will be supported where they achieve all of the following:</b>	

<p><b>a. protect, conserve and enhance the natural, built and historic environment</b>  <b>b. protect, conserve and enhance the setting and views;</b>  <b>c. minimise the loss of trees and hedgerows;</b>  <b>d. incorporate features connected with sustainable design; and</b>  <b>e. meet all other policy requirements in the Plan</b></p>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Maintain unique qualities of Wadebridge so that its very popularity does not destroy the attributes that make it popular at present.
Margaret Wiltshire (15)	I am in favour of building on brownfield sites and general infill to help meet needs by housing that does not affect the overall appearance of Wadebridge. Any development that are detrimental to appearance of town or Camel estuary should be regarded as extremely foolish.
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	Natural vistas should be retained, for example the view from the town across to the fields at Gonvenna. The riverside, rural setting of Wadebridge is key to its attractiveness and continued prosperity. Development can take place in other locations in and around the town without spoiling such views.
Cornwall Council (124 – late)	Minor change to wording proposed. i.e. <i>“b. protect, conserve and enhance the setting and views of landscapes and townscapes;”</i>
<p><b>Policy NE01 Protection of the Natural Environment</b>  <b>The highest level of protection will be given to sites of European and/or national importance within the area. Development proposals having an adverse impact on the integrity of such sites will not be permitted, other than in exceptional circumstances. Measures to avoid any adverse impacts on these sites will be sought as a first principle.</b></p>	
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	is this duplication, as designated areas already afford the highest protection and maybe the wording should relate more specifically to the protection of non-designated sites? Policy NE02 seems to have embraced that idea.
<p><b>Policy NE02 Areas of Ecological Significance</b>  <b>The following areas (listed below and identified on inset Map E) are designated as being ‘areas of local ecological significance’ and should be protected from development and the impact of development:</b></p> <p><b>A. Treraven Meadows</b>  <b>B. Walmsley Bird Sanctuary</b>  <b>C. Clapper Marshes</b>  <b>D. Hawkes Wood</b>  <b>E. Colquite to Dunmere Woods</b>  <b>F. Hustyn to Grogley Woods</b>  <b>G. Croan Wood</b>  <b>H. Kestle Wood</b></p> <p><b>Development proposals that may affect ‘areas of ecological significance’ will only be supported where:</b></p> <p><b>i. there are no adverse impacts on the local ecology; or</b>  <b>ii. if such impacts are unavoidable, they can be satisfactorily mitigated; and</b>  <b>iii. if mitigation is required, new additional local areas of ecological significance are created or other existing ones enhanced and agreements made to ensure their future management and maintenance.</b></p>	

CWT Camel Branch (3)	We understand that sometimes development is unavoidable and that system of mitigation comes into play. In the case of Clapper Marsh, Walmsley bird sanctuary and especially Treraven Marsh (which is of national importance) we feel that no development should be allowed in these areas and that the system of mitigation is inappropriate.
Malcolm and Diane Dingle (22)	Land at Burneire Farm is of great concern to Natural England. This land is still classified as 'area of environmental importance'. Many walkers enjoy the freedom provided by the public path passing through these fields these fields are beautiful sight as you drive over the by-pass bridge. Building here would be inappropriate and destroy an area that can be seen from many parts of the town.
Jon Hughes (52)	Open land should be preserved especially the land to estuary. the north west of Gonvena House. This is significant when viewed from the by-pass bridge and the Camel
Adrian Langdon (65)	Having been personally involved in trying to draft some ideas for the protection of the wildlife and environment in the Wadebridge area I was very pleased that many of these ideas have been taken on board and feel a little happier that there may be some protection built into the planning process for these things. I am very aware that Wadebridge is now becoming a green tourism hub with many people coming out of season to take advantage of the fabulous wildlife viewing facilities we have to offer. Many people just offer the Camel Trail as a viewing area for wildlife but there are now 4 birdwatching hides on the Amble marshes and the newer marshes at Clapper & Treraven are being watched by many people. These areas and the close proximity to the coast offer a host of opportunities for wildlife watching whether it be birds, mammals or cetaceans and this must bring money into the town. As such these places must continue to thrive and be protected. The NHP has the prospect of doing that.
<p><b>Policy NE03 Protection of Landscape Character</b>  <b>Development should be of a scale, mass and design that reflects local landscape character.</b>  <b>In particular, where appropriate, development should seek to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. maintain and restore Cornish hedges, stone walls, hedgerows and other boundary features whilst respecting the varying pattern of ancient field systems;</b></li> <li><b>ii. protect against insensitive development/alterations impact on rural character, ensuring that the massing and materials of the development cause minimal negative impact;</b></li> <li><b>iii. include the use of locally appropriate materials;</b></li> <li><b>iv. retain expansive open views from both within and out of the area.</b></li> </ul>	
Charlotte Barry (31/56)	I support the draft plan rejection of development that encroaches in to the picturesque and environmentally sensitive Camel and Polmorla valleys.
Mrs Rowe (35)	The fields above Bradford's Quay going along to the villages should be kept green. Who wants the river bank covered in concrete?
<p><b>Policy NE04 Nesting Boxes</b>  <b>New developments will be required to provide one nest box or nest brick for swifts on every dwelling and other appropriate building that has an eaves height of 5m or more.</b>  <b>Nest boxes for barn owls should be installed during the conversion of any barn or other derelict agricultural building that is 1km or more from main roads.</b></p>	
William and Pauline Delacour (29)	We would like to see planning consents include the need to make provision for wildlife such as bat/swift boxes.

Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy NE04 is very prescriptive and whilst we would support the protection of bird habitat, should each case be assessed individually and the related ecology report make recommendations?
<p><b>Policy NE05 Wildlife Corridors</b>  <b>Development proposals effecting wildlife corridors including hedgerows, verges and other micro-habitats will require an ecological assessment to ensure measures are taken to protect local ecology and, where necessary, mitigation to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</b>  <b>Opportunities to create new wildlife corridors into, through and between housing developments, linking to adjacent corridors and wherever possible out into open countryside should be an important design and layout consideration. Development proposals that fail to make adequate provision will not be supported.</b></p>	
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy NE05 has a typo 'affecting' not effecting. Any development affecting such habitats would require an ecology assessment which is covered by the Habitat Regs and also the Cornwall validation requirements, does this need to be duplicated?
<p><b>NE06 Camel Trail</b>  <b>Proposals for new access routes to the Camel Trail, including a link across the River Camel from Sladesbridge, and new walking and cycling routes readily accessible from Wadebridge will be supported.</b></p>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Extend tarmac on Camel Trail from Guineaport on the riverbank into Wadebridge
William and Pauline Delacour (29)	Concern that the potential for the railway track to be re-laid on the Camel Trail and strongly oppose this. This very well used facility must be preserved for the benefit of current users. Running steam trains again would also have a major negative affect on the environment. We support the extension to Sladesbridge.
D Walters (38)	Camel Trail is not safe for pedestrians, also not maintained and poor signs.
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	Welcome the idea of an additional cycle trail from Wadebridge to Sladesbridge and beyond to Hingham Mill
<p><b>Policy NE07 Local Green Space</b>  <b>The following areas (listed below and identified on inset Map H) are designated as Local Green Spaces where new development is ruled out other than in very special circumstances:</b></p>	
'Influence' on behalf of Greg Hingley (60)	OBJECTION – The NHP Consultation document does not provide either a map of the proposed local green spaces or a list as stated in the plan. The consultation in relation to this policy is invalid and needs to be undertaken again, no weight can be attached to this policy. This policy rules out new development other than in 'very special circumstances'. This seems to be an extremely onerous and high bar with no indication whatsoever what may constitute 'special circumstances'. As a result of no information being provided in the NHP Consultation relating to this policy an objection to Policy NE07 is lodged.
Roger Priestley (62)	I suggest the allocation of the field separating Higher Whiterock and Coronation Park as Local Green Space. This is the field, used as horse/pony paddocks, between the footpath leading into the Coronation Park woodland area and the embankment upon which the War Memorial stands. From the Egloshayle side of town and from the old bridge this open field acts as a green foreground to the War Memorial. Importantly, on looking out from the Park there is a panoramic view over a huge tract of North Cornwall towards Delabole, St Breward, Roughtor and Brown Willy. This is not a private view - it is very much a public view which has been enjoyed over the years by the community. It is plain to see that the

	<p>embankment upon which the Memorial stands and which extends the whole length of this boundary with the adjoining field, was purpose designed with such views in mind. There are seats on the embankment from which this landscape and townscape can be enjoyed - the field below the embankment, by reason of its openness, significantly contributes to this community amenity.</p> <p>Designation as a Green Local Space would entirely meet the required criteria set out in NE07.</p>
Mark Innes (81)	<p>Welcome the suggestion of protected open spaces and leisure areas and that these offer a variety of relationships with the town's urban development. Would wish to see more dotted throughout the town and Gonvena/Egloshayle.</p>
<p><b>Policy JE01 Existing Business</b>  <b>Proposals for change of use of existing business premises from employment use will be supported only if they have been empty for over 12 months and during that time actively marketed at the current market rate without securing a viable alternative employment use.</b>  <b>Development proposals which lead to the improvement, modernisation or upgrading of current employment sites and premises will be supported where:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. they will not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity through noise, lighting, hours of operation etc.</b></li> <li><b>ii. they will not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the transport network and parking conditions</b></li> <li><b>iii. they will not have any other unacceptable environmental impact.</b></li> </ul>	
J Skinner (49)	<p>The boat building and repair facilities along Bradford's Quay should be encouraged to stay as they are – vital to boat moving and maintenance.</p>
<p><b>Policy JE02 New Employment Opportunities</b>  <b>Development proposals to provide new business space and/or employment opportunities within the built-up area boundaries will be supported where:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. they will not have a negative impact on residential amenity through noise, lighting, hours of operation etc;</b></li> <li><b>ii. they will not have an adverse impact on the transport network and parking conditions; and</b></li> <li><b>iii. any other environmental impact can be appropriately mitigated.</b></li> </ul>	
Abby Richardson (68)	<p>In terms of employment there is a lot of focus on this being of a light industrial type on land near Ball roundabout – with no consideration for other employment in the town itself. As a skilled, self-employed person who has moved back to the town after a number of years away from Cornwall for University/employment, I feel we should be encouraging more self-employed people/small but highly skilled businesses to locate to the town. There is a real need for hot-desking/office space and this ideally needs to be centrally located. This is especially relevant for those working in creative industries, marketing etc where working remotely, as well as collaborating with other like-minded businesses, is increasingly common. Encouraging this in town will have a positive knock-on effect for retail / leisure / food service businesses etc in the town centre. This leads on to my next point...</p> <p>There are references to an Innovation Centre as follows (page 8, page 10 and page 40). However as far as I can see there is no suggestion as to where this could be or what form it would take / how it could be funded etc. I think centre that would encourage a highly skilled work force to move back to Wadebridge (reverse the brain drain and encourage young people to return after university) / relocate to the town is a great idea.</p>
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	<p>Welcome broader ambition to try and provide better quality employment for young people</p>
<p><b>Policy JE03 Farm Business Diversification</b>  <b>The conversion of existing agricultural buildings for commercial purposes to support farm diversification in the interests of viability will be supported where the proposal can demonstrate that there would be:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. no harmful impact upon the surrounding rural landscape;</b></li> </ul>	

<p>ii. no unacceptable conflicts with agriculture and other land-based activities;  iii. no harmful impact on the local road network;  iv. no harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents or businesses; and  v. no requirement for rebuilding or substantial extension</p>	
<p><b>Policy TR01 Town Centre Development</b>  The Wadebridge Town Centre is defined on inset Map K. Proposals for retail and associated commercial development within this area that add to the centre's vitality or community benefit will be supported.  The loss of shops and commercial units within the defined area will not be supported unless:  i. it can be demonstrated that the use of the premises for these purposes is no longer economically viable; or  ii. the proposed alternative use would provide equal or greater benefits for the local economy and community than the current use.</p>	
David Jowett (2)	There's too many charity shops
Des Berriman (14)	Instead of Wadebridge being known as a town of individual shops it will become a town of charity shops.
M Fraser (37)	Would be great if no more charity shops were encouraged.
D Walters (38)	Too many charity shops
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	A limit on the number of charity shops; they have their place, but a balance is required.
<p><b>Policy TR02 Major Retail Development Outside the Town Centre</b>  Proposals for new large scale retail development or major extensions to existing retail outlets, including the use of temporary, seasonal retail space, outside of the town centre will only be supported where it can be demonstrated there will be no adverse impact on the economic viability or vitality of Wadebridge Town Centre and of its retail businesses and it can be demonstrated that the development will meet an un-met need for such a facility.</p>	
<p><b>Policy TR03 Pedestrian Priority in the Town Centre</b>  Proposals to pedestrianise further the area of Molesworth Street delineated on Map K will be supported provided suitable access arrangements for deliveries can be made.  Proposals that extend pedestrian-priority across other areas of the Town Centre will be determined on their merits and impacts.  All developments should recognise the potential improvements to pedestrian and cycle movement within the town centre and include such measures if possible.</p>	
C E Buchanan (6)	Certainly not.
Margaret Wiltshire (15)	Better walking and cycling routes needed, perhaps pave the Platt and the Bridge so that cars have to drive very carefully and pedestrians and cyclists have priority.
Trevor Wiltshire (16)	We really do need to create a town less in love with the motor car
D Walters (38)	Shops will close if people cannot get into town because of traffic
M Reynolds (45)	Yes have more pedestrianisation but enforce the areas we already have Proper disabled access for Town Hall Drop kerbs in Fair Park Road
M J Menhinick (100)	The pedestrianisation of Molesworth St should be policed to ensure no unnecessary access.

<p><b>Policy HS01 Meeting Local Housing Need</b>  <b>A range of housing sizes, types and tenures is required, to ensure that all sectors of the community are catered for.</b>  <b>New housing development will, first and foremost, be required to meet the needs of the local community as identified in the most up-to date identified housing needs data.</b>  <b>All housing development proposals should demonstrate how they contribute to meeting current local housing needs, including an adequate supply of smaller, lower cost housing.</b>  <b>Development proposals for affordable and community-led housing schemes will be subject to occupancy based on local connection policy criteria set out in the Cornwall Local Plan.</b></p>	
Mark Halliday (18)	I think Wadebridge lacks some quality 3-5 bedroom houses for aspirational hard working residents. Producing too much small affordable housing at the expense of a more properly balanced housing stock will change Wadebridge for the worse. Housing should be developed for the good of the town as a whole and not skewed to one part of the population – neither local first time buyers nor others looking to move up the ladder.
Malcolm and Diane Dingle (22)	The need for bungalows doesn't seem to have been addressed. This would then free up larger houses for local families.
Mrs Rowe (35)	We do not need any more second homes why not make a stand like St Ives?
Claire Tregaskis (53)	On the need for new housing, there is no mention (apart from in the Glossary at the end of the Plan) of building new stock to Lifetime Home Standards. I am aware that some on your committee believe there is no need to include this stipulation because Cornwall Care plan to build an old people's settlement on West Hill. I disagree with this approach, because it assumes that a) the only people in need of accessible housing are elderly, and b) that all people needing accessible housing want to/are happy to live together in one segregated space up on a hill away from the main town, where those without transport could end up being stuck in isolation from the rest of the community. Requiring new developments around the town to include at least a proportion of houses built to Lifetime Standards would help ensure a mixed community going forwards, and would also be consistent with wider county practice such as the Cornwall Home Solutions Policy, which aims to keep older and disabled people living independently in their communities for longer. I hope the team will consider reinstating this policy approach in the Plan.
'Influence' on behalf of Greg Hingley (60)	<p>OBJECTION - The Policy states 'All housing development will be required to meet the needs of the local community. All Housing development should demonstrate how they contribute to meeting current local housing need'.</p> <p>The proposed NHP Policy as worded is in conflict with Cornwall Local Plan Policy 6 (Housing Mix) which sets a threshold of 10 Units for the mix of units to be scrutinised by the Local Planning Authority. The proposed NHP policy has no thresholds and the requirement for all housing development to demonstrate how they will contribute to current local housing need is onerous and in conflict with the adopted Cornwall Local Plan. The CLP has already set a minimum requirement of 1100 dwellings for the Community Network Area (CNA) (PP10) and explains Wadebridge is a main strategic town in the CNA will be expected to deliver the 'majority' of the dwellings in the CNA. The need for residential dwellings is already established; the Neighbourhood Plan should not apply a more onerous tier of assessment below the Cornwall Local Plan.</p> <p>NHP Paragraph 13.13 – 'All housing gained through Cornwall Local Plan Policy 8 (infill and allocated) should remain part of affordable Housing stock'. For clarity, this Paragraph should state all affordable housing gained ..... 'as it is only the affordable units that can be secured via a legal agreement in perpetuity and given the 10 unit threshold for towns as set out in Policy 8 and that Wadebridge falls within Value Zone 4 requiring 30% affordable housing provision.</p>
M J Menhinick (100)	Any proposed residential development should in this day and age follow the principles of lifetime homes.

<b>Policy HS02 Retaining Affordable Housing Stock</b>	
<b>Affordable housing provided in compliance with either Local Plan Policy 8 or Local Plan Policy 9 should be subject to a Legal Agreement ensuring that it remains an affordable dwelling for local people in perpetuity.</b>	
Margaret Jacob (20)	Come on Wadebridge be the forerunner in making this “first-time buyers” possible.
Vera Beare (24)	If you build more homes please make them affordable for the ordinary working class people.
Charlotte Barry (31/56)	I support the overwhelming need for much more affordable rented housing for people already resident in the Wadebridge area.
Helen Rawe (67)	The need for affordable housing for locals, especially young people, is widely acknowledged. The Plan cites the developments initiated by St. Minver Community Land Trust, which have convinced me that there cannot be a more affordable way of providing the homes that are needed in perpetuity, and that if every community did something similar what a real difference that would make. CLTs are worthy of promotion, both self-build and alternative tenure. An umbrella Cornwall CLT and National CLT are supportive.
J P Renals (73)	When the planning department grants permission there is a need to build in a restriction to the developers on the sale of social/1 <sup>st</sup> time housing to be ring-fenced for local people only.
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	The spirit of Policy HS02 is applauded however the banks appear to have a monopoly on s106 restricted dwellings and they have the final say.
<b>Policy HS03 Infill Housing</b>	
<b>Development proposals for infill sites within the settlement areas will be supported provided they:</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. fill a restricted gap in the continuity of existing frontage buildings or on other sites within the built-up area of the town or village where the site is closely surrounded by buildings;</b></li> <li><b>ii. are of a scale, massing, density and design in keeping with the local character of neighbouring buildings;</b></li> <li><b>iii. have access and parking arrangements that do not result in an unacceptable direct or cumulative impact on congestion or road and pedestrian safety; and</b></li> <li><b>iv. where the scheme is for one dwelling, the proposal respects and relates to its surroundings in relation to the historic development patterns or building/plot sizes</b></li> </ul>	
Charlotte Lyon (21)	Disturbing to see a dramatic increase in gap-filling taking place and even demolition of some buildings. The resulting increase in density within a small area has a number of associated problems and contribute little or no new long term employment or improved economic activity.
<b>Policy HS04 Innovative Housing Solutions</b>	
<b>Development proposals that provide socially and architecturally innovative open market housing solutions will be supported. This will include self-build, modular and community led schemes, and the provision of low-cost housing for those who cannot afford to buy or rent larger properties and who would not qualify for social housing allocated on the basis of social need and vulnerability.</b>	
A G Carruthers (34)	Only development of social housing will make any impact. This means the council and housing associations should be given resources for this purpose not developers.
<b>Policy HS05 Self Build Dwellings</b>	
<b>Development of more than 10 dwellings must offer 10% of plots to local self-builders registered on the Cornwall Council list and living within the three parishes. Those intending to purchase a self-build plot must demonstrate that they intend to live in the property once completed.</b>	

<b>Any such plots may be excluded from affordable housing calculations.</b>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Self-build important in providing affordable housing for young people
Claire Tregaskis (53)	I too support the idea of allowing more self-build and Community Land Trusts for use by local people who are priced out of the housing market.
<b>Policy HS06 Layout and Design</b>	
<b>Developments of 10 or more dwellings must demonstrate design variety in site arrangement and building form.</b>	
<b>Site arrangement, layout and design should respect and relate to topography and features of local distinction.</b>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Any new housing to be in keeping with the area. Provide open green space/play parks for all ages.
Des Berriman (14)	Any new development must have an acceptable exit and entry which does not compromise those of current houses in the town.
William and Pauline Delacour (29)	We must only allow houses to be built that are of a minimum size with more outdoor space. They must of course be affordable.
<b>Policy HS07 District Heating Schemes</b>	
<b>Proposals for the use of district heating schemes in new developments preferably using renewable energy sources such as biomass to provide low cost heating will be supported.</b>	
<b>Policy RE01 Micro Energy Generation</b>	
<b>Whenever practicable, new development must meet 20% of its energy requirements from on-site renewable and low carbon energy generation.</b>	
<b>Proposals for micro-generation within the Built-up Area identified on Map C1 will be supported where any negative impacts on the built, natural or historical environments can be acceptably mitigated and where there are no unacceptable impacts on neighbouring properties.</b>	
<b>Policy RE02 Solar Arrays</b>	
<b>Development proposals for small ground-mounted solar PV arrays of less than 1MW capacity will be supported provided they comply with all the requirements of the Local Plan and are sited so as to be associated with existing buildings or a settlement.</b>	
<b>Proposals for medium sized arrays (between 1 and 2 MW capacity) must demonstrate that they are sited entirely on a brownfield site, where one is available, or otherwise on land which is assessed as Grade 3B or below and is in full compliance with Cornwall Council guidance on siting for the relevant Land Character Area.</b>	
<b>Development proposals for larger (over 2 MW capacity) solar arrays will not be supported.</b>	
<b>Policy RE03 Wind Turbines</b>	
<b>Development proposals for all wind turbines other than those considered to be micro-generation must be sited at least 1.5km away from settlement areas and the AONB, SAC and SSSI, as indicated on Map O.</b>	
<b>Proposals will be supported where:</b>	
<b>i. there are no adverse impacts on landscape character or it can be demonstrated that impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated; and</b>	

<p>ii. there are no adverse impacts on the setting and character of heritage and historical assets</p> <p>iii. there are no adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity or habitats, or it can be demonstrated that impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated; and</p> <p>iv. the turbine is situated within the curtilage of, or adjacent to, the farm, dwelling or enterprise for which the power is largely to be used and</p> <p>v. the number, siting, scale and design of turbines and associated infrastructure and buildings have no adverse impact on:</p> <p>a. local amenity of nearby dwellings (including visual amenity, noise, vibration, electromagnetic interference, shadow flicker)</p> <p>b. the enjoyment of or access to public rights of way and other access routes; and,</p> <p>c. public safety</p> <p>or, where there are any adverse impacts, these can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>In addition to the above, proposals for more than one turbine or turbines exceeding 25m in height (including the blade tip) must undergo screening for Environmental Impact Assessment with their application. Such proposals should demonstrate that there is no adverse impact on the residential amenity of occupants of dwellings within 500 metres of turbines up to 45 metres or 1000 metres for larger turbines. Where any adverse impacts are identified, these must be satisfactorily mitigated.</p>	
<p><b>Policy RE04 Visual Impact of Wind Turbines</b></p> <p>All proposals for wind turbines shall be required to include a cumulative assessment of the visual impact of all such turbines using the matrix contained in an Annex to the Supplementary Planning Document on Renewable Energy which forms part of the Cornwall Local Plan.</p>	
<p><b>Policy RE05 Community Energy Projects</b></p> <p>Support will be given to community energy projects which have as their primary purpose long term and inclusive economic, social and environmental benefits for the community and: fall within the definitions of community energy contained in the Cornwall Council's Revised SPD on Renewable Energy;</p> <p>i. meet the local community ownership criteria*, and</p> <p>ii. is acceptable to the local community (as represented by its Town or Parish Council)</p>	
Kevin Smith (63)	I support policy RE05.
<p><b>Policy TT01 Impact of Traffic</b></p> <p>Proposals for all major new developments, as defined by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, will need to demonstrate, as part of a transport assessment, how vehicular access and circulation to and from the development will mitigate the impact on roads, road users and residential amenity in the Plan area, in particular the following roads:</p> <p>A. Trevanion Road</p> <p>B. Whiterock Road</p> <p>C. Trenant Vale</p> <p>D. Tower Hill</p>	
Ann Curtis-Clarke (10)	Site 25 is a particular concern with regard to additional traffic on Gonvena Hill. It is always blocked during busy periods. Building houses on site 25 would further stress the already at capacity surrounding roads.
Ray Curtis-Clarke (11)	Gonvena Hill – traffic calming or even traffic lights may be needed if more traffic is to use this road.
Anthony Poole (12)	Consider problem of restricted access to Wadebridge via old bridge. At busy periods tailback of traffic beyond Rock turning and along Eglogsgayle Road. This already serious problem must not be worsened by any further development.
Mrs K E Medlyn (44)	Make Fair Park Road a one-way system to protect Wadebridge because of no adequate pavements.

J Skinner (49)	Re-routing the Rock road to Ball roundabout would considerably reduce congestion in the school area.
Emma Pate (72)	I am against any housing development leaving the town via Trevanion Road.
M Reynolds (78)	There is a need for a one-way road system n part of Fair Park Road (drawing attached)
Peter Starling (91)	With over 1,000 houses planned this will cause a very large increase in local road traffic.
Emma Sanders (97)	Trevanion Road traffic goes faster than speed limit; need to enforce limit and double-yellow lines so road is wider and safer.
Sally Green (98)	A seasonal park and ride would reduce the traffic in town.
R A Richards (109)	Would it be possible to improve the unction from estate into Trevanion Road by widening the visibility splay?
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	New development should not be allowed up hill of the bottle neck on Trevanion Rd without measures to address/alleviate the bottle neck.
<b>Policy TT02 Trenant Vale</b>	
<b>Proposals to improve the safety of road users in Trenant Vale are supported.</b>	
C E Buchanan (6)	Probably not
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy is an obvious statement
<b>Policy TT03 Town Centre Parking</b>	
<b>An increase in public car parking provision on land within or adjacent to the town centre that is consistent with the overall parking and/or traffic management strategy for the town centre will be supported provided:</b>	
<b>i. it includes a designated area for coach parking if required; and</b>	
<b>ii. it meets the County Highway's requirement for parking for people with disabilities.</b>	
Claire Tregaskis (53)	On recent visits to Bodmin I have noticed that the public car parks in town are now very busy since the temporary introduction of 3 hours free parking. I believe that on-street congestion would be reduced, and businesses in Wadebridge would benefit similarly from increased footfall, if a similar policy were introduced in our town centre car parks. Certainly, as a disabled driver who can't use parking meters I would much prefer to be able to park safely off-road in a level access car park at the bottom of town, rather than having to park on the double yellows in Polmorla, which is becoming increasingly dangerous as through traffic tends to drive at you in anger at frustration at having to wait, not understanding that you can't jump out of the way or park elsewhere.
Nicola Wills (5)	Wadebridge should consider multi levels of car parking. It could have a picnic/green space on the top level and be fully landscaped to enhance the river location.
Barbara Bell (17)	Provision of short-term half hour parking is poor.
Emma Sanders (97)	Parking needs to be provided for town centre workers, so their cars don't log up roads.
<b>Policy TT04 Safe Cycle and Pedestrian Links</b>	
<b>All major developments should provide safe cycle and pedestrian routes, including links to and from Wadebridge town centre and essential public facilities such as schools and health facilities. These routes and links should be designed to benefit from natural surveillance as well as adequate lighting.</b>	

Paul Tofi (19)	I applaud support of encouraging people to walk and cycle but Wadebridge is surrounded by hills and we have a significant number of elderly people. With poor public transport it is inevitable that people will use their cars to travel to town.
M Fraser (37)	I think the idea that people will actually bike in from new developments is unrealistic i.e. mothers with toddlers.
Mr Munden (93)	Anything that improves the safety of cyclists must be a good thing.
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	Existing footpaths should be improved, maintained and preserved as a requirement of new development, with new walking routes at the heart of development, connecting housing throughout the town. The painted line on the road as a walkway between Fernleigh Rd and Trevanion Rd alongside the recent Lindon homes development is a very poor measure: a family housing development should have proper paved access for safety
<b>Policy TT05 Local Shopping</b>	
<b>To encourage local shopping on foot, proposals to create a small convenience store where appropriate on any new development will be supported.</b>	
<b>Policy TT06 Pedestrian and Cycle Priority in Town Centre</b>	
<b>Measures to provide dedicated routes for pedestrians and cyclists through Wadebridge town centre will be supported.</b>	
M Fraser (37)	Think that bikes should be directed away from the main street through the town. I don't think this would deter people from stopping in town if they have a good area to secure their bikes.
J Skinner (49)	Difficulties with Camel Trail cyclists through the town should be overcome by implementing the proposal of opening up the dis-used arch under the old bridge.
Helen Rawe (67)	Safe cycle links - the safety of cyclists at the junction by Barnecutts is an ongoing concern.
Emma Sanders (97)	Re-routing the Camel Trail cycle track from Lidl to the library must be a top priority. A traffic free track along the river will be safer and more attractive.
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	A traffic free / safe connection of the camel trail across Wadebridge should be a priority.
<b>Policy AC01 Art in the Public Realm</b>	
<b>Development proposals that introduce innovative design and art into the public realm and which facilitate greater community use of public spaces are supported.</b>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Provided they are appropriately in keeping with the area they are placed
Jane Indge (25)	There is a sculpture workshop in the Industrial Estate by the Council Offices perhaps they have some ideas.
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	Maybe some modern tasteful sculpture in the town or a fountain
Diana Smith (66)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use local materials and, where possible, artists to work on themes related to Wadebridge and even specific places in Wadebridge e.g. Granite from Bodmin Moor for a sculpture in Eddystone Road inspired by the Eddystone Lighthouse. (With explanatory plaque). All the better if it is robust enough for people to sit on and children to scramble over.</li> <li>2. Use local slate to create sculpture/signs to show the route through the sign for travellers on the Camel Trail.</li> <li>3. Could we have a replica of the statue of John Betjeman at St Pancras station outside the Betjeman Centre in Wadebridge?</li> <li>4. Connect 'BikeLights' more with artwork of a less ephemeral kind – if work is commissioned for Bikelights, e.g. a starting/finishing marker, make sure it is safe to be left in place for at least a few years.</li> </ol>

Abby Richardson (68)	A 'living' sculpture like the 'Willow Cathedral' in Taunton would be a great addition to somewhere like Jubilee Field. Also, art trails are a great way to encourage visitors to explore the town.
<b>Policy AC02 Centre for Arts and Cultural Activity</b> <b>The development of a centre for arts and cultural activity and other performance and exhibition spaces in Wadebridge town centre are supported.</b>	
Nicola Wills (5)	We are a busy commercial town. There's no room. We have a museum open 6 days a week for visitors to learn history of Wadebridge.
C E Buchanan (6)	No money can be spent more
Barbara Bell (17)	I agree there is a need to improve the provision of arts and cultural programmes in the town. Library is closed on some days and could be used as a cultural centre for art and craft workshops and seminars.
M Fraser (37)	We barely seem able to support a library.
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	Regularly exhibit our work travelling as far as St Ives but not in our own town.
Diana Smith (66)	Wadebridge has quite a number of venues; the difficulty would be to make sure the venues we have and any more proposed have enough regular income to be fully enough used. The Town Hall could be improved as a cultural venue; good sound system and better stage would encourage use.
Mr and Mrs Markham (92)	There are spaces for art/culture in our library and Betjeman centre also with our schools
Janet Munden (94)	Instead of building a new cultural centre and leisure facilities could we not improve on what we already have e.g. Town Hall and Betjeman Centre?
M J Menhinick (100)	The Town Hall should be up-graded especially in regard to the acoustics in the main hall.
Yvonne Cherry (101)	There is an embryonic cultural centre at the Betjeman centre. The Goods Shed is well used for cultural activities. Please don't lose the town hall, it is so beautifully positioned for everything that goes on.
<b>Policy SR01 Protecting Recreation Areas</b> <b>The following existing areas of recreation areas (see inset Map L) are very important to the local community and should be protected:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Jubilee Fields</b></li> <li><b>2. Egloshayle Playing Fields</b></li> <li><b>3. Burlawn Play Area</b></li> <li><b>4. Coronation Park</b></li> <li><b>5. Talmena Avenue Play Area</b></li> </ol> <b>Proposals to develop them in part or whole will be resisted unless:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows, to the satisfaction of Wadebridge Town Council, that the open space and any ancillary buildings within that space to be surplus to local and strategic need and demand; or</b></li> <li><b>ii. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality and community accessibility in a suitable location; or</b></li> <li><b>iii. the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss; or</b></li> <li><b>iv. the development is ancillary to the use of that land as recreational/open space; and</b></li> <li><b>v. the proposal is shown to have the support of the local community to the satisfaction of the Town Council.</b></li> </ol>	
William and Pauline Delacour (29)	Access to the water for sport and recreation is essential for a large number of local people. This must remain affordable. We are concerned to ensure that current facilities and access are not reduced.

J Skinner (49)	There is a small area of land at Trevilling Quay containing a slipway. This area has been used by the public for 20 years plus. Suddenly in 2015 it was blocked off. As there is a covenant on the land preventing the building of dwellings it would seem that Daftens and CC land would make an ideal site for waterfront activities.
Helen Rawe (67)	The protection of footpaths and recreational areas is important.
<b>Policy SR02 Promoting Tourism</b> <b>Proposals for tourism-related developments will be supported provided they comply with other policies of this Plan.</b> <b>Contributions for local facilities gained from the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 Agreements for new recreational and tourism developments will be directed towards facilities aimed at encouraging visitors to Wadebridge.</b>	
David Jowett (2)	Come tourist season would create chaos. There's parking problems now.
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	It would be nice to see local walks and footpaths advertised to enable tourists to explore our area further and enable them to access other trails and paths.
<b>Policy SR03 New Recreation Facilities</b> <b>Development proposals to provide the following recreation facilities are supported:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. a skate park on land off Goldsworthy Way (see inset Map M)</b></li> <li><b>ii. the creation of further exercise facilities for adults on Jubilee Park</b></li> <li><b>iii. the opening up of the Drovers' Trail between Burlorne Tregoose and Ruthernbridge (see inset Map N)</b></li> </ul>	
Ray Holgh (90)	The route of the Drover's Trail shown on the map is incorrect. I suggest someone talks to me.
Sally Green (98)	Provision needs to be created for youth and young people. We are still awaiting skate park. Any further development must include provision for children. A green gym in the park would be a fun and healthy attraction.
<b>Policy SR04 Sports Facilities</b> <b>Proposals to provide additional outdoor sports facilities and pitches are supported where they comply with other policies of this Plan.</b> <b>Proposals which result in a loss of existing outdoor sports facilities and pitches and/or their capacity and/or community accessibility (availability for community use) will be resisted unless:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows, to the satisfaction of the relevant Council that facilities are surplus to local and strategic need and demand; or</b></li> <li><b>ii. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity, quality and community accessibility in a suitable location; or</b></li> <li><b>iii. the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss; and</b></li> <li><b>iv. the proposal is shown to have the support of the local community to the satisfaction of the relevant Town or Parish Council.</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Policy SR05 Trevilling Quay</b> <b>Development proposals for a mixed-use development at Trevilling Quay that includes cultural and leisure facilities that meet local demands, will be supported provided:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. they display sensitivity to the character of the river frontage;</b></li> <li><b>ii. public access to the river for maritime activities, including the launching of small craft, is maintained;</b></li> </ul>	

<p>iii. it includes a shared use riverside route for pedestrians and cyclists;</p> <p>iv. any commercial development is compatible with other uses of the site and would not have a detrimental impact on the economic viability of the town centre;</p> <p>v. the height of buildings within 100 metres of the river will be limited so that they neither overpower the area between them and the river, nor obstruct the views of the river from Gonvena Hill;</p> <p>vi. an area at the northern end of the site is allocated for river-based activities and for a picnic area;</p> <p>vii. a contribution is being made towards the cost of a footbridge linking the site to the town centre;</p> <p>viii. the provision of dwellings includes a proportion of affordable housing in accordance with Cornwall Council policy.</p>	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Provided access is free of charge and available to all
Pamela Starling (7)	A high bridge will need a very long slope leading to it for bikes, prams etc. a low bridge would block a beautiful view down river and may need a mechanism to open it. Who will maintain this. Is it really necessary or just an expensive folly?
Paul Tofi (19)	I am in favour of limited residential development on Trevilling Quay. However I am not in favour of a footbridge being built across the river at this point.
Jane Indge (25)	I feel strongly that riverside walks should be retained and expanded and new developments not built down to the river.
William and Pauline Delacour (29)	We support the development of Trevilling Quay to provide greater access to the water for sports and leisure providing this includes ample storage for water-craft and parking.
M Fraser (37)	I am concerned that development of Trevilling Quay a further access to the river will deter our local swans and other river birds from coming up river.
Kirsten and Paul Becker (46)	It would be a real asset to many people to see this developed and brought up to modern standards. I agree a mixed development and a riverside leisure route would be very attractive and popular.
J Skinner (49)	A bridge over the river would be a useless expense and if built should be of a height no less above the water than by pass bridge.
Daften Die-Casting (57)	<p>We strongly support the re-development of Trevilling Quay provided a new industrial estate is created in a suitable location for existing businesses to relocate. It is essential that any new estate be designed large enough to accommodate further expansion and job creation also attracting other industrial businesses to the area.</p> <p>We do not believe that Trevilling Quay is suitable for Town type uses</p> <p>Possible parking and extra facilities could be provided by extending facilities and redevelopment to the north east of Trevilling Road into the greenfield land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Agree</li> <li>ii. Agree</li> <li>iii. agree</li> <li>iv. agree</li> <li>v. 100m is greater than the depth of development zone indicated on the map so this statement will restrict the height of all buildings along Trevilling Road</li> <li>vi. Agree</li> <li>vii. We would expect the cost of a footbridge to be considerable and its provision needs to be funded from other sources and not the redevelopment of Trevilling Road as it simply won't be viable</li> </ul> <p>The cost of providing affordable housing should be considered on viability and assessed against other community benefits being provided that are better suited for this location...</p>

Kevin Smith (63)	Trevillings Quay should so far as possible be retained for water sports and other recreational activities, with housing being discouraged, or at a minimum. Further development akin to adjacent Bradfords Quay, or on the side of the old bridge, would seal off the waterfront to the public.
Diana Smith (66)	<p>There is a once-only opportunity to develop the Gonvena side of the river to benefit the town. Water sports and all varieties of boating, alongside the boatyard, would allow for development of high quality restaurants and a lively social atmosphere. HOWEVER, I do not think this should be at the expense of packing all space back to the by-pass with residential property, though some will be needed for a good mixed use social 'feel'.</p> <p>If Trevillings Quay is well developed and attracts overflow boats from moorings in Rock, as the Harbour Commissioners report suggests, any housing close to it would be attractive not only to holiday-makers but also to second home owners. This in itself is not necessarily a bad thing – the town's prosperity can be increased by being seen as very much part of the coast – but will not ease the shortage of suitable relatively inexpensive homes for people living in the area.</p> <p>Also access to the ground behind Trevillings Quay will be hard to provide without roads leading from a B road, or through Bradford's Quay, where Gonvena Hill and Egloshayle Road both have heavy traffic calming measures in place, indicating their sensitivity to traffic.</p>
Abby Richardson (68)	I can see the reasoning behind the development of Trevilling Quay and I agree that access to the river in this area is very important. However, would it not be better to develop the area around Commissioners Quay as a cultural / leisure area in the first instance? There is still some light industrial use in the area (both by the river and the other side of Eddystone Road) that could be relocated to open up space as the Camel Trail comes into town from Padstow. This would be the ideal place for more leisure / cultural facilities that would enhance the town centre. Once this has been done then Trevilling could be 'Phase 2' – but in my opinion in order to be a success then this would be dependent on the new footbridge joining the area to the town centre. This is a very costly piece of infrastructure. I feel that the development of leisure at Trevilling Quay would need to be anchored to something such as an arts centre or work / hot desking space / innovation hub etc that would encourage people to be in the area. I'm not against mixed use on Trevilling Quay but think it needs to be further thought out.
Mark Innes (81)	<p>River edge north west of Bradford's Quay – no to simply residential this valuable open space should be for mixed use. Don't give away the precious river edge to housing demand some development there that provides diversity and gives the community something back – economic and social.</p> <p>All areas of open space should be designated and protected e.g. Tenant Vale. Policy must clearly require large developments to provide green open spaces and links.</p>
Paul and Angie Readfern (82)	We are concerned about the nature of development along Bradford's Quay. The river is a defining feature and should be developed sympathetically preserving views, affording access public facilities for boating and space for marine industry.
Peter Starling (91)	No footbridge required.
Situ Planning Consultancy (103)	Policy SR05 regarding Trevilling Quay is welcomed.
Mr Munden (93)	It does not fill me with confidence that you cannot get the name of an area correct. Trevilling Quay is the small hamlet at the end of Trevilling Road. That being said I am in favour of development along this road. However the artist's impression I have seen looks far too modern.
M J Menhinick (100)	Support for some development along Trevilling Quay but not so it becomes a rat-run.
<p><b>Policy SR06 Local Footpaths</b>  <b>Measures to improve and extend the existing network of local footpaths are supported where:</b>  <b>i. sensitive ecological areas are avoided</b></p>	

ii. the construction and appearance of new paths or tracks are appropriate to the location	
iii. opportunities are taken during construction to maintain biodiversity	
<b>Policy SR07 Recreation and Tourism Outside the Built-up Area Boundary</b>	
Development proposals for recreation and tourism facilities outside of the built-up area boundary will be supported where they:	
i. make provision for exercise-based and other recreational outdoor pursuits, or	
ii. provide educational opportunities to enhance knowledge of the natural environment, or	
iii. provide, either independently or in association with either of the above, holiday rental accommodation not exceeding nine units. The rental units shall be subject to a planning restriction that they should be available for at least ten months in a year for short term rents not exceeding one month and no one individual will be permitted to spend more than two months in the unit or complex in any one calendar year	
iv. Any such proposals must respect the character of the countryside and ensure that the form, massing and materials of the development cause minimal negative impact.	
<b>Policy CI01 Infrastructure Requirements</b>	
Financial contributions will be required, as appropriate, from each developer of major* residential developments to mitigate the impact of the development on essential infrastructure such as public utilities, libraries, policing, waste services and the highways network. Financial contributions will be required, as appropriate, to fund additional healthcare, education and leisure services within the Plan area.	
Community priorities in terms of additional local facilities to be provided, as a result of new development, are set out in the Wadebridge Neighbourhood Area Action Plan.	
Janet de la Cour (1)	Make sure infrastructure also developed to keep up with extra demands: schools, health facilities, car parks
David Jowett (2)	Doctors, dentists, schools, etc would not cope – not forgetting the post office.
P Cunliffe (9)	Influx of new houses require employment and the infrastructure which goes with it – namely schools (already in short supply). Schools require sporting facilities. Secondary schools also needed. Medical facilities barely cover the present requirements.
Ann Curtis-Clarke (10)	Provision of GP capacity and dental capacity in addition to more school capacity need to be in place before any more building.
Anthony Poole (12)	Very serious consideration must be given to the pressure on the 2 doctors' surgeries and secondary schools.
C J Phillips (13)	Any sites should address the issue of school places and medical infrastructure.
Barbara Bell (17)	Little in the document that addresses the need for improvements in the infrastructure of the area. Local primary schools are already over-subscribed. Provision of medical facilities is inadequate.
Paul Tofi (19)	I would like to see the NDP reflect people's concerns regarding hospital and social care facilities in Cornwall.
Malcolm and Diane Dingle (22)	Infrastructure of our town needs to be considered as this needs to improve as number of houses increases, NOT after they have been built. More schools are needed. Where are the doctors and dentists? Can the sewerage system cope?
Dominic Comonte (32)	A health centre is a must for a town our size
D Walters (38)	Our infrastructure cannot cope. Schools are overcrowded.
Daften Die-Casting (57)	We suggest the financial contributions for infrastructure development should only be applicable to residential development on greenfield sites and not brownfield sites and previously developed land.

Helen Rawe (67)	Whatever service you consider, the infrastructure is struggling already: parking, schools, medical provision, sewage works.
J P Renal (73)	We need to develop the town's infrastructure.
J Westlake (79)	The schools, doctors and dentists etc are over-subscribed. A school up Trevanion Road would cause large traffic problems all the way from the town. Increase the infant school up Gonvena while the land is still available.
Penelope McBreen (102)	Amongst the many important issues in the development proposals, basic infrastructure such as schooling and Health centres has to be addressed but there has to include adequate provision for vehicular use within the town, which I would suggest at present is already at full capacity, particularly during the summer months
Caroline Buchanan (96)	It is not only our schools that are full. Doctors, dentists and our one main hospital are already overwhelmed. We urgently need infrastructure to cope with all this. Another problem is the vexed question of sewage. There is only one old pipe going under the river from the Gonvena side and that pipe had to be floated on a raft as the river is virtually bottomless. How can that cope with all the extra sewage?
Sally Green (98)	Provision needs to be created for youth and young people. We are still awaiting skate park.
M J Menhinick (100)	General infrastructure should be improved before major developments take place.
R A Richards (109)	Problem of surface water at the Regal cinema. There have been lots of properties built since sewage works were built – is the treatment works big enough?
Julie Dunstan (122 – late)	The cumulative impact of all new development across the town needs to be taken into account to ensure appropriate new services; Drs, dentists, schools etc are provided. In addition, the cumulative impact of new development across the county needs to be considered regarding wider services like A&E, road network etc
Eimear Luxton (121 – late)	When planning applications are submitted I would like to see a proper assessment of facilities. I would like to see facts and figures to back up claims.
<p><b>Policy CI02 Community Facilities</b>  <b>Proposals that result in the loss of existing community facilities will only be supported where:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>i. there is no reasonable prospect of viable continued use of the existing building or facility which will benefit the local community and they demonstrate a need for their proposed change;</b></li> <li><b>ii. they have been subject to consultation with the local community; and</b></li> <li><b>iii. they will not result in the net loss of a community facility where need and demand for that facility and/or an alternative community use has been demonstrated.</b></li> </ul>	
1 1942 Squadron Air Cadets (58)	Although the squadron HQ at Wellington Place is a MOD owned property and there is no planned development, we would like to remind the Council that we are a resource for the teenage population in the town.