

Draft NHP

Wadebridge Town Council Questions for the NHP Steering Group

1. Can you please provide the evidence for review which confirms the approach taken as to 'infill' for the NHP?
2. Supporting evidence for site allocations – can this be presented for review and understanding?
3. Public consultation – Regulation 14 doesn't offer the public any opportunity for comment. The consultation in February 2017 seemed to discount public opinion. Would a formal public consultation be a better option rather than moving on to Regulation 14?
4. Where is the evidence for development beyond the bypass now being part of the plan? This was not determined from the result of public consultation – who decided to implement the revised boundary and why?
5. What was the justification to contain building within the bypass?
6. When was the Boundary itself looked at as being fit for purpose? It seems that there is no capacity to provide the level of housing required if development is contained within the boundary as it is currently shown.
7. Site 10 and site 32 – why has one been included for development and the other has not?
8. Has the capacity of the sewage system in Wadebridge as being confirmed as fit for purpose – i.e. – can it support the proposed level of development?
9. Can we control the developments with regard to timing in the NHP?
10. Reference is made to 2 years and then allocations will be determined by Cornwall Council. Can you please explain this (S4.8)?
11. The NHP is trying to protect the Town Centre. The town now has empty shops and charity shops but the NHP does not want businesses to be returned to residential use. What about empty shops which remain empty for some time and become derelict – is there provision for this in the plan?
12. What land does Cornwall Council own in Wadebridge?
13. The Duchy – has the title of land been resolved at Bradford's Quay?

14. The Draft NHP seems outdated as it does not include Planning Appeals. The Objective Technical Review of Land Supply also seems out of date. Do both documents require updating to reflect the progress that has occurred regarding developments?
15. Does the Steering Group believe that the Plan today is what the Town wants?
16. The February Consultation – what changed in the plan as a result of this consultation?
17. Comments made in the February consultation referred to the Church Park development. These comments therefore related to Site 10 but were discounted as they were seen to be referring to a planning application. Comments made were however made in relation to a Site. What were the grounds for no change to the Draft Plan as a result of these comments made by the public?
18. Can we review the February consultation results?
19. Employment land review – what reviews have been carried out since 2010?
20. Designated green open spaces – when were these areas last reviewed and confirmed?
21. Should the 3 Councils be concerned in relation to the FOI recently received?
22. Does the Steering Group believe that the Draft NHP will pass the inspection stage?
23. Policy SD04 – is this Policy deliverable considering public comments made by Paul Stein (Cornwall Council) regarding a Pre-app for a development which was previously submitted for this site?
24. Why is the plan moving forward before the SEA is completed?

Comments

1. The reference to infrastructure in the plan is good as this is what the Public constantly refer to when they are discussing anything to do with building more houses. It is extremely important which must be recognised.
2. Many statements have been made thanking and congratulating the Steering Group on the work they have done for the draft NHP.