

# Pre-Submission Consultation Responses Analysis and Actions

(numbers in brackets show the number, if more than 1, of responses received)

**Table 1: Comments concerning the proposed development Boundary.**

Note: comments that agree with the proposed Development Boundary as shown in Newsletter 7 have not been included here as the responses to the second question showed a high level of support for the Boundary as depicted then.

Cell number	Comments	Action
Cell 4	Should be outside the Development Boundary (16) Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 5	Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 6	Should not be further developed (5)	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 8	South and East portions should be included within the Development Boundary.  Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 9	Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 10	Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 11	Exclude from Development Boundary.	
Cell 15	Should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell17	Should be included within the Development Boundary which should be further extended to include the development in the former Pill Farm yard	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 23	Part should be included within the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 26	Should be outside the Development Boundary (3)	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.

Cell 27	Should be outside the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 28	Should be outside the Development Boundary	Excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.
Cell 29	<p>Development Boundary should be rounded off to include the garden of Meanders St Nicholas Park.</p> <p>The non-wooded lower parts would be suitable for affordable housing (2)</p> <p>School field should be included within the Development Boundary</p> <p>The field outlined in red on the map: (Cell 28 and the SE portion of Cell 29 as at February 28 2018) is suitable for affordable housing.</p> <p>Garden in SE corner should be included.</p>	All of this cell excluded as does not fit criteria; see Development Boundary Rationale.

**Table 2: Comments on other matters.**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Action</b>
Affordable housing	Price should be set in accordance with the average wage. More needed	None possible
Climate change mitigation	Support for what is said in the Plan	Already included in the Plan
Cott Rd North of A390	No further development as traffic already causes problems. New development should be in this area.	All land along Cott Rd North is now excluded from the Development Boundary
Green spaces	The green open space in Grenville Meadows should be protected. Green open space in Brambles should be protected.	Protected in the Plan
Housing	Policy HH1 supported Policy HH4 is too onerous Policy HH5; add 'where	

	<p>practical’.</p> <p>Support for development near the town centre.</p> <p>Support for small developments.</p> <p>No more market-value housing needed.</p> <p>No more development along Tanhouse Rd.</p>	<p>Development Boundary changes support this.</p> <p>Land along Tanhouse Road excluded from Development Boundary.</p>
Infrastructure	More commitment needed to improve infrastructure	
Lanwithan Rd	No further development as traffic already causes problems (2)	Land along Lanwithan Rd excluded from Development Boundary.
Parade Square	Instead if it being used for parking, develop it for the benefit of the town.	Majority of responses emphasise the need for parking, so no action on this
Parking	More free public parking needed (2) More parking needed (2).	See policies in Plan.
Playing Fields	Policy needed to protect these	Included in Plan
Policy BE2	Needs correcting Too restrictive; open to legal challenge.	Majority of responses support the current policy BE2. Kept in the Plan.
Railway Sidings	<p>Policy TT2 The area designated to be used for parking should not include the two railway lines next to former Platform 3.</p> <p>Network Rail should be able to decide what use the railway sidings are put to, for example they could be used for housing.</p>	<p>No action:housing target already met.</p> <p>Railway sidings within the Flood Zone 2. More parking needed</p>
Railway	<p>Too costly to re-open Fowey line.</p> <p>Footbridge needed over railway by station (2).</p>	<p>Retained as an aspiration.</p> <p>Land protected for footbridge.</p>
Solar electricity generation	Roof-top panels conflated with solar farms in the Plan	No action needed as the Plan’s intention is clear.
Traffic	<p>Extend 30mph limit further up Castle Hill.</p> <p>Speeding traffic along A390 needs addressing.</p>	Separate traffic management plan being developed.