



**ST AGNES NDP DRAFT SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY CONSULTATION  
- ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**By James Evans BA (Hons) AssocRTPI**

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Background to the purpose of settlement boundaries .....	3
Brief.....	4
Consultation Responses.....	4
Analysis of Responses and Recommendations by Settlement .....	5
Blackwater .....	5
Chiverton .....	6
Mithian .....	7
Mount Hawke .....	7
Porthtowan.....	8
St Agnes .....	12
Towan Cross.....	13
Wheal Rose .....	14
Conclusions.....	16
Report Recommendations .....	16

## Introduction

This report has been prepared on behalf of the St Agnes Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group (the NDP Group) to assess the responses to the recent consultation on proposed settlement boundaries.

A number of the settlements within St Agnes Parish have proposed settlement boundaries which it is intended to include in the next consultation stage and the final NDP document.

The purpose of the report is to provide professional advice and recommendations to the NDP Group regarding the settlement boundaries and suggested amendments or other alterations in response to the comments made for subsequent consultation stages.

As the author of this document, I have over 17 years planning experience in Cornwall. During that time, I have worked in a broad range of roles in both the public and private sector, including planning policy, development management and more recently providing support to Neighbourhood Planning Groups. I am a qualified Town and Country Planner and an Associate of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI).

## Background to the Purpose of Settlement Boundaries

Delineated boundaries around settlements (settlement boundaries) in which new build market led housing is in terms of a sustainable location acceptable in principle, have been a staple feature of local development plan documents in Cornwall over the recent past (i.e., for example in the Carrick Local Plan).

The provision of a settlement boundary indicates which settlements, villages or hamlets are identified as suitable location for *market-led* housing development.

Principally the boundary is a housing policy marker delineating where one policy stops and another one starts. Inside the boundary is where the market-led housing policies apply, typically referred to as '*infill*' housing development, which also includes '*rounding off*' development as defined in the supporting text (paragraphs 1.52 to 1.72) to policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP).

The CLP is the strategic planning policy document that informs neighbourhood plans across Cornwall. The definitions in the supporting text identify the locations for market-led housing and thus establish the criteria for identifying a settlement boundary. Throughout this report reference is made back to this supporting text when assessing suggested changes to settlement boundaries.

It has to be stressed that housing development outside of these settlement boundaries is not entirely excluded, however these would be assessed under separate planning policies such as those relating to exception sites (where the majority is affordable housing) or housing in the countryside (such as replacement dwellings, barn conversions, agricultural workers dwellings etc).

## **Brief**

The brief for this commission is as follows:

- Review the consultation responses received; and
- Based upon these responses provide recommendations with regard to amendments or alterations to the draft settlement boundaries.

## **Consultation Responses**

Consultation took place over the summer of 2017 with an exhibition and information event in each of the five wards between 12<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

The settlement boundary consultation formed part of a wider consultation on the draft St Agnes Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan (the NDP).

Responses were submitted either in written form as part of a leaflet handed out or online via the Parish Council's website.

The majority of responses to the proposed settlement boundaries were positive. When specific comments were made either through survey monkey or at consultation events these were recorded. These are split into two references on the basis of the method in which they were submitted. A reference with the prefix F being submitted by the hand delivered form, whilst the reference SM refers to a submission via Survey monkey online, on the latter the submissions are by question, rather than an individual, therefore an individual may have more than one reference. A single submission was received via e-mail referring to a specific site and is referenced EM.

These are included at Appendix A.

Please note that the text is as submitted and spelling or grammatical errors have not been amended. Any reference to a named individual however has been removed.

## **Analysis of Responses and Recommendations by Settlement**

The majority of respondents supported the draft settlement boundaries.

However, a number of submissions identified amendments, expansions and in some cases the suggestion of further settlements that should in themselves have identified settlement boundaries.

Recommendations to the NDP Steering Group are provided below in response to specific points received as part of the consultation.

The detail of each consultation response is summarised and categorised by the nature of suggestion raised.

Where a specific site/area has been raised, the text titled by that site/area is delineated in ***italics and underlined***.

The responses are additionally categorised under the settlement they refer too for ease of reference.

### **Blackwater**

#### **Omega/ West End**

One submission refers to the inclusion of an area called Omega within the settlement boundary of Blackwater.

Omega relates to a collection of properties (sometimes called West End) situated to the south-west of the consulted upon draft settlement boundary. There is a large field between these properties and the edge of the draft boundary (please see the light blue highlighted section on plan at Appendix B).

Paragraph 1.66 of the CLP states that:

*'Many frontages however are not continuously built up and have large gaps, i.e. bigger than one or two dwellings between buildings or groups of buildings. These gaps can often provide the setting for the settlement, or add to the character of the area. Proposals should consider the significance or importance that larger gaps can make to settlements and ensure that this would not be significantly diminished.'*

Paragraph 1.67 continues:

*'Large gaps often exist between the urban edge of a settlement and other isolated dwellings beyond the edge of the settlement; they are not appropriate locations for infill development, and the development of these gaps would not therefore be considered as infill under the policies of this Local Plan.'*

My review of the above is that it distinguishes detached small clusters of development separated from a settlement by a large gap, as is the case here, from being part of the settlement. Thus does not represent an appropriate location for 'infill' or 'rounding off' development as permitted through the CLP. Please note that this is a different scenario to the situation at Porthtowan, where the settlement is broken in larger group of dwellings, rather the smaller cluster here.

However, there is an allowed Appeal decision (ref APP/D0840/W/16/3164950 and attached at Appendix C) for an 'infill' dwelling at one of the properties at West End, called Dewetha which was allowed on 07 April 2017, and post-dating the adoption of the CLP where 'infill' or 'rounding off' policies are attracting full weight.

Through Paragraph 9 of the Appeal decision the Inspector comments as follows:

*'In respect of the site's relationship with Blackwater, I consider that West End is perceived as being part of the outskirts of Blackwater, and the site is also seen within this context. I acknowledge there is an area of open land between the terrace within which Dewetha sits, and a bungalow known as Toronto which is almost contiguous with the main part of Blackwater. However I do not consider this open land distinguishes firmly between the edge of Blackwater and the start of a separate settlement at West End, particularly as Toronto sits in a fairly open plot and is itself surrounded by undeveloped land, and so contributes to the visual tapering of development from Blackwater into West End. The Council state the site is 250 metres from the edge of the settlement boundary of Blackwater, but I have no evidence before me to support this. As such the development would meet the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') by supporting the rural community of Blackwater.'*

### **Recommendation 1**

**I feel it is difficult to conclude contrary to the appeal decision, albeit the Inspector does make reference that he has no evidence to conclude that the settlement boundary ends where the draft boundary is now proposed. I do feel there is some inconsistency with the aforementioned text from the CLP and I do not necessarily agree with the Inspectors conclusions that West End is visually linked to the rest of the settlement. However, on balance my advice is that the properties at West End should be included within the settlement boundary due to conclusions reached at appeal.**

### **Chiverton**

Comment has been made to housing development at Chiverton. There is no proposed settlement boundary for this area in the draft NDP, it relates to a small cluster of properties, pub and various retail facilities associated with the close proximity to the A30.

Planning permission was granted in 2016 for the 'Proposed construction of

*roadside hotel and restaurant adjacent to A30 trunk road' through decision notice PA15/06100 opposite the pub, whereby the case officer in his supporting report acknowledging that 'the site is situated outside any settlement and is therefore considered to be in the open countryside.'* Planning permission in that case was granted *'in the context of the provision of services and facilities to cater for the needs of users of the trunk road and could potentially have safety benefits for users of the trunk road by providing accommodation for use by tired travellers.'* It was granted on a specific basis of addressing a need associated with the A30, rather than one of the sustainability of the location, this decision has not significant bearing on the suitability of Chiverton as a location for housing development.

Chiverton is not an area that has previously been considered suitable for residential development in recent development plan documents covering the area. Turning to the supporting text contained in the CLP, paragraph 1.68 refers to the lower size level of settlement or hamlet suitable for housing as; *'In smaller villages and hamlets in which 'infill' sites of one-two housing units are allowed, the settlement should have a form and shape and clearly definable boundaries, not just a low density straggle of dwellings. The settlement should be part of a network of settlements and / or be in reasonable proximity to a larger village or town with more significant community facilities, such as a primary school.'*

In my view Chiverton does not have *'a form and shape and clearly definable boundaries'*. It is more *'a low density straggle'* of buildings, not all of which are dwellings.

## **Recommendation 2**

**Chiverton is not a suitable settlement for new build housing in accordance with the policies in the CLP and does not therefore support a settlement boundary.**

## **Mithian**

No comments were received relating to the draft boundary for Mithian. As a result, there are no recommendations.

## **Mount Hawke**

### **Chychin/ Chy Glyn**

There was a single comment relating to the inclusion of a property referred to as 'Chychin'. Despite extensive searches and enquiries locally, no such property has been found, however it has been suggested that the comment may relate to the property 'Chy Glyn' which forms one of a collection of properties situated to the south-west of the main village and outside of the draft settlement boundary.

This area of properties is highlighted in light blue on the settlement boundary plan at Appendix D. Following a visit to the site it is acknowledged that the track leading westwards out of the settlement upon which these properties are located

is distinctively rural in character, representing a marked change from that of the settlement itself approximately 20 metres away to the east. This change begins at Anchor Cottage, a detached dwelling set in spacious grounds, and positioned within the south-western corner of the draft settlement boundary. It is at this property, where footpaths disappear and the gardens become dominated by trees that there is clear marker of visual and character separation from the rest of the settlement.

Anchor Cottage, and the undeveloped field to the north are included within the draft settlement boundary. Adjoining properties have a character relationship with Anchor Cottage. There is no apparent physical or character break between the two.

My conclusion is that if Anchor Cottage is within the settlement boundary then these adjoining properties, which cannot be distinguished from it in character or separation terms, must also be included.

### **Recommendation 3**

**It is therefore suggested that the settlement boundary should be extended to follow the area highlighted in blue. As it is considered all of the properties and land within this boundary fall within the definition of 'infill' or 'rounding off' as contained on the CLP.**

## **Porthtowan**

A number of locations have been suggested through submissions and are listed below.

### **Barn Elms**

The draft settlement boundary encompasses the existing property and immediate curtilage but excludes the wider land under associated ownership with this property to the north-east (see highlighted section in light blue on the plan at Appendix E.

This section of land was subject to a planning application (PA15/03067) for the 'erection of three dwellings' which was refused and was subsequently dismissed at Appeal on 7<sup>th</sup> September 2016 (Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/15/3137998). The Appeal decision is attached at Appendix F.

The Appeal pre-dated the adoption of the CLP and the application of 'infill' and 'rounding off' policies, thus the application was primarily assessed against the NPPF in terms of the suitability of the location for new residential development. In particular, Paragraph 55 upon which the Inspector concluded that the site was not isolated (being the Paragraph 55 test) despite the acknowledgement of the Inspector that that 'the appeal site lies outside of the village in a countryside position.'



In terms of this appraisal, unlike the Appeal the assessment is not against Paragraph 55 of the NPPF, but against the definitions of 'infill' and 'rounding off' contained in the CLP.

The Appeal decision is rather telling on this assessment, Paragraph 6 in particular stating '*the three additional dwellings would extend the pattern of housing into the undeveloped rural setting to the village.*'

From a visit to the site, I agree with this conclusion. As one of the criteria of the definition of 'rounding off' under Paragraph 1.68 of the CLP explains that development '*should not visually extend building into the open countryside*' the site clearly fails that test for the reasons under paragraph 6 of the Appeal decision.

Furthermore, as 'infill' development as explained through Paragraphs 1.65 to 1.67 of the CLP is defined as '*the filling of a small gap in an otherwise continuously built up frontage that does not physically extend the settlement into the open countryside*', again for the same reasons the site fails the test.

The site is therefore neither 'infill' or 'rounding off'.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**It is therefore recommended that the settlement boundary of Porthtowan is not extended to accommodate further land at Barn Elms.**

#### **Echo Corner**

Echo Corner is a reference to the collection of properties that sits to the eastern side of the main highway at the point where Rose Hill drops into the valley bottom and then starts to rise up as Coast Road. The section of land is highlighted in yellow on the plan at Appendix E.

There is a collection of four properties here that are neither sporadic nor broken up. It is small cluster of dwellings that are continuously built up and situated to the south-eastern edge of the built housing development that follows the valley running south from the beach. Echo Corner is only sub-divided from the remainder of this section of the village by the public highway.

#### **Recommendation 5**

**On this basis, it is suggested that Echo Corner is included within the settlement boundary of Porthtowan, it does not represent an extension into the open countryside.**

#### **Mile Hill**

Mile Hill concerns the highway running south by south-east of the most southerly

section of settlement boundary for the village at the crossroad break with the turning to the north-east towards Mount Pleasant Echo Park and to the south-west towards Nancekuke Common (highlighted in purple on the plan at Appendix E.

To the south of these crossroads residential development becomes sporadic and there are a number of gaps between properties. It is also worth acknowledging that only the eastern side of the road falls within the Parish and the boundary of the NDP. The adjoining Parish, Portreath has not progressed at this stage with an NDP.

Paragraph 1.67 of the CLP explains that:

*'Large gaps often exist between the urban edge of a settlement and other isolated dwellings beyond the edge of the settlement; they are not appropriate locations for infill development, and the development of these gaps would not therefore be considered as infill under the policies of this Local Plan.'*

In my mind, it is clear that the properties along Mile Hill fall into this excluding description, and therefore are not suitable as 'infill.' As development would extend built form into the open countryside it would not represent 'rounding off' either.

### **Recommendation 6**

**As a result, it is recommended that the settlement boundary is not extended to the south along Mile Hill, with one possible exception as described below.**

The property Trelyn (highlighted in green on the plan at Appendix E), located on the south-eastern corner of the cross roads referred to above, falls into a similar position to the dwellings at Echo Corner, it is directly adjacent to the settlement boundary and is only sub-divided by the road to the Eco park.

### **Recommendation 7**

**As there is no intervening gap other than the highway, it is suggested that this a dwelling is included in the settlement boundary, and thus it is extended round this single property.**

### **Rose Hill**

Reference has been made to the exclusion of the holiday use buildings on the southern side of Rose Hill (highlighted in red at Appendix E) and that these should be included within the settlement boundary as they represent built form.

However, the holiday use restriction is distinct from the unrestricted use of dwellings elsewhere. It is assumed when planning was granted for this site it

was not on the basis that the site was within the settlement and suitable for unrestricted use. It was more likely approved for holiday purposes only, based on tourism planning policies which are not as rigid as housing policies. On the basis of the economic benefits that arise in Cornwall, which is heavily reliant on the tourism industry.

Policy 5 of the CLP specifically refers to tourism and business, and 5.2. provides a number of criteria to '*proposals for the loss of business space*' including demonstrating '*no market demand*'. Whilst there are no appeals in the immediate locality for a proposal to remove holiday use conditions on an existing site to allow for residential uses, three associated Appeal decisions at Hendra Paul Cottages, Newquay dating from March 2015 (attached at Appendix G) for such a proposal, are considered relevant.

Paragraph 7 of the Appeal stating '*I consider that the proposed removal of the existing occupation restriction conditions would amount to the creation of new homes where the existing scenario is one of a holiday let enterprise.*'

Paragraph 8 continuing that '*I consider that it is reasonable in this case, where the buildings are in use for an existing holiday let business, and so not obviously redundant, to require proof of a lack of viability in order to, in effect, demonstrate redundancy.*'

On this basis alone, I feel it would not be comfortable policy fit to allow a holiday-use site to fall within the settlement boundary, as it would therefore in theory appear acceptable as a residential use.

**Recommendation 8**  
**My recommendation is to therefore exclude Rose Hill.**

However, I do acknowledge that there is a case to argue that Rose Hill is not less detached from the main core of Porthtowan than other areas. Thus a contrary view could be reached. Even if Rose Hill was within the settlement, it doesn't necessarily follow that re-development would be acceptable for the aforementioned reasons. I would stress that if the site, or any other site with holiday use restrictions, is included within a settlement, the NDP has a clear policy that does not allow for unrestricted residential development on the site unless the proposals demonstrate why the site is no longer suitable for holiday purposes on the basis of the contribution such site make to the tourism industry that Cornwall is so heavily reliant and dependent upon.

**Seaspray**

Seaspray (highlighted in orange on plan at Appendix E) is a similar situation to that of Rose Hill and my recommendation is the same, and for the same reasons.

The units are set to the eastern side of Porthtowan beach and are separated from the draft settlement boundaries to the east and to the south.

### **Recommendation 9**

**Exclude Seaspray from the settlement boundary.**

### **St Agnes**

#### **Quay Road**

A number of comments made a reference to the inclusion of Quay Road within the settlement boundary (see area highlighted in yellow on the plan at Appendix H).

This section of St Agnes, leading down to Trevaunance Cove clearly has a built-up nature. However, it was previously excluded from the Carrick District Local Plan settlement boundary for St Agnes.

Quay Road is covered by a number of designations and constraints. Whilst the majority of these, such as the AONB, have national or local status, they do not necessarily exclude development in principle.

There is an exception to this. Quay Road and the significant majority of properties along it fall within flood zone 3 as delineated in yellow on the plan at Appendix I. Where there are areas outside of the flood zone itself, these are bounded by steep climbing hillsides enabling the only realistic direction for access and egress to be into the flood zone.

The flood zone is a physical constraint that restricts new residential development as a matter of principle. The only realistic opportunities for residential use will be via replacing an existing dwelling where risk to life is not increased, such a scenario is permitted in principle through policies relating to the open countryside. Please refer to the *"Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework"* published in March 2012 for further information.

Therefore, on this basis, it is clearly of no benefit to include Quay Road within the settlement boundary as 'infill' or 'rounding off'. Development would be unacceptable in principle due to all potential development sites lying within, or reliant upon flood zone 3 for access.

### **Recommendation 10**

**It is therefore recommended to not delineate a settlement boundary around the cluster of dwellings and buildings on Quay Road.**

#### **Land to the north of Trevaunance Road along Wheal Friendly Lane**

The area of land sits to the south-east of the detached property Sea Breezes,

Which is situated to the north-eastern edge of the draft settlement boundary running to the north of Trevaunance Road (see area highlighted in blue on the plan at Appendix H).

The area of land is overgrown in appearance, has a dilapidated store to its north-western edge and is entirely enclosed to the south by residential properties, to the north by the vehicular access to Sea Breezes, to the west by Sea Breezes itself and to the east the land narrows to a point.

There can be no doubt that this section of land has a clear relationship with the built form of the settlement by virtue of its enclosed nature to the northern boundary by the vehicular access. It is not rural in character, nor does it represent open countryside. It accords with the definition of '*rounding off*' as contained in the CLP.

### **Recommendation 11**

**It is therefore recommended that this section of land, and the property Sea breezes itself are included in a revised draft of the settlement boundary.**

### **Towan Cross**

**Tresco Farm (Note: As the author of this report I declare a prejudicial interest in this submission due to existing/ previous work association with the enquirer)**

A specific request has been put forward with regard to a section of domestic curtilage associated with Tresco Farm as highlighted in light blue on the plan at Appendix J.

Tresco Farm is located within the hamlet of Towan Cross, which at present is not subject to a draft settlement boundary in the NDP.

Fundamentally the key consideration here is not specifically whether the site in question fits with the definition of '*infill*' or '*rounding off*', it does accord with the definition of the latter, but to whether Towan Cross itself is in principle a settlement that is suitable for new build housing and therefore is a location where '*infill*' or '*rounding off*' housing development would apply'

For the above reasons (see note) I provide no recommendation on this submission but would wish to draw attention to following matters which I consider relevant to this regard:

- The CLP through paragraph 1.68 refers to the lower size level of settlement or hamlet suitable for housing as '*In smaller villages and hamlets in which 'infill' sites of one-two housing units are allowed, the settlement should have a form and shape and clearly definable*

*boundaries, not just a low density straggle of dwellings. The settlement should be part of a network of settlements and / or be in reasonable proximity to a larger village or town with more significant community facilities, such as a primary school.'*

- An Appeal decision at Trevellas, a similar case hamlet in St Agnes Parish which was determined post the adoption of the CLP concluding that Trevellas was not a suitable location for new building housing development (see Appendix K), note the Inspectors comments at Paragraph 9 *'the development would not have acceptable access to goods and services and so would not be suitably located. It would therefore conflict with Policies 2, 3 and 7 of the CLP which all encourage development which is appropriate to its location, and Policy 27 of the CLP which advises that development should provide convenient and appropriate access for pedestrians and cyclists.'*;
- An approved Appeal at the Victory Inn for a dwelling to replace a static caravan (see Appendix L), pre the adoption of the CLP situated 60 metres distance to the south of the site which through paragraph 9 describes the context as follows *'Towan Cross as a whole encompasses a string of development along the primary road which passes the Victory Inn. A main cluster of dwellings lies a short distance to the east, but which is visually and physically separate from the smaller group of properties around the public house. Sporadic development continues to the west and to the north east, the latter being accessed from a lane which meets the main road opposite the appeal site. Aside from the presence of a public house, the small scale of the settlement and lack of facilities means that Towan Cross has the feel and presence of a small hamlet. The appeal site is clearly surrounded by open countryside, with the gap to the cluster of dwellings to the east meaning that the group of dwellings around the public house sit in this countryside context in their own right.'*;
- Planning permission was granted by Cornwall Council under decision notice PA16/09452 to replace a chicken shed with a dwelling. This decision was pre the adoption of the CLP.

## **Recommendation 12**

**For the NDP group to review referenced examples and to conclude on the appropriateness or not of including the site.**

## **Wheal Rose**

A number of submission have put forward Wheal Rose as a suitable location for housing growth. Wheal Rose at present is not subject to a draft settlement boundary in the NDP.

The first question is whether Wheal Rose is in principle a settlement suitable for new build housing and therefore is a location where *'infill'* or *'rounding off'*

housing development would apply.

As per Towan Cross, I refer to the paragraph 1.68 of the CLP *'In smaller villages and hamlets in which 'infill' sites of one-two housing units are allowed, the settlement should have a form and shape and clearly definable boundaries, not just a low density straggle of dwellings. The settlement should be part of a network of settlements and / or be in reasonable proximity to a larger village or town with more significant community facilities, such as a primary school.'*

Wheal Rose is I consider a settlement with *'a form and shape and clearly definable boundaries'* and it is *'part of a network of settlements and / or be in reasonable proximity to a larger village or town with more significant community facilities, such as a primary school.'*

Furthermore, the settlement has been subject to a number of positive planning approvals and allowed appeals for new build housing development. A clear example of which is the allowed Appeal at APP/D0840/W/16/3144526 (see Appendix M) which amongst other points stated (Paragraph 6):

*'The Framework acknowledges at paragraphs 29 and 34 that the need to travel needs to be minimised, however, this should take account of the specific context of rural areas. The appellant has argued that school bus and relatively frequent public bus services are available through the village, which is not disputed by the Council. Therefore, in the context of a rural village, Wheal Rose would afford opportunities to meet core basic needs locally or by sustainable means. Furthermore, I note the officer's conclusion in their report on the planning application at nearby Lansdowne Park1 that it was in a sustainable location, and that the appeal site is located similarly close to services.'*

### **Recommendation 13**

**It is therefore recommended that Wheal Rose is identified as a settlement where 'infill' or 'rounding off' housing development would apply and as a result a settlement boundary is drafted and is consulted upon following the criteria contained within the CLP from Paragraphs 1.65 to 1.68.**

A specific recommendation for a site to be included has been submitted with regard to Wheal Rose (**Note: As the author of this report I declare a prejudicial interest in this submission due to existing/ previous work association with the enquirer**).

As my recommendation is for the NDP group to identify a settlement boundary for consultation, I would suggest at this stage it is for the NDP Group to proceed on that basis, and as to whether the enquired site is included or not, will be one that will be subject to further consultation in the future and the matter can be

fully assessed at that stage if required.

## **Conclusions**

In general terms, the draft settlement boundaries have been supported by the community with limited requests for change.

Where this has been the case, these have been precise suggestions and are not contrary to the principle of the boundaries themselves. A number of suggested alterations as highlighted in this report are recommended.

However, it is for the NDP Steering Group themselves to make the final determination based upon my recommendations which are summarised below:

## **Report Recommendations**

### **BLACKWATER**

#### **Recommendation 1**

On balance my advice is that the properties at West End highlighted in light blue at Appendix B should be included within the settlement boundary due to conclusions reached at appeal.

### **CHIVERTON**

#### **Recommendation 2**

Chiverton is not a suitable settlement for new build housing in accordance with the policies in the CLP and does not therefore support a settlement boundary.

### **MOUNT HAWKE**

#### **Recommendation 3**

That the settlement boundary should be extended to follow the area highlighted in light blue at Appendix D.

### **PORTHTOWAN**

#### **Recommendation 4**

It is recommended that the settlement boundary of Porthtowan is not extended to accommodate further land at Barn Elms.

#### **Recommendation 5**

It is suggested that Echo Corner is included within the settlement boundary of Porthtowan, as highlighted in yellow at Appendix E.

#### **Recommendation 6**

It is recommended that the settlement boundary is not extended to the south along Mile Hill, with one possible exception as described below.



**Recommendation 7**

As there is no intervening gap other than the highway, it is suggested that Trelyn (as highlighted in green at Appendix E) is included in the settlement boundary, and thus it is extended round this single property.

**Recommendation 8**

My recommendation is to exclude Rose Hill.

**Recommendation 9**

Exclude Seaspray from the settlement boundary.

**ST AGNES****Recommendation 10**

It is recommended to not delineate a settlement boundary around the cluster of dwellings and buildings on Quay Road.

**Recommendation 11**

It is recommended that the property Sea breezes and adjacent section of land as highlighted in blue at Appendix H is included in a revised draft of the settlement boundary.

**TOWAN CROSS****Recommendation 12**

For the NDP group to review referenced examples and to conclude on the appropriateness or not of including the site.

**WHEAL ROSE****Recommendation 13**

It is recommended that Wheal Rose is identified as a settlement where '*infill*' or '*rounding off*' housing development would apply and as a result a settlement boundary is drafted and is consulted upon following the criteria contained within the CLP from Paragraphs 1.65 to 1.68.