

CALSTOCK NDP RESPONSE TO EXAMINER – LOCAL GREEN SPACES

EXAMINERS REQUIREMENT:

1. Having read the representations and examined the Calstock Parish NDP Green Space Assessment Report I require clarification on how the boundaries for the proposed LGS designations were determined. I would like clarification for all of the proposed LGS designations, addressing the following issues:

- a. How was the boundary for each area decided? It is not clear why some areas have been chosen above others with apparently similar characteristics and what rationale was used to draw the precise boundaries.
- b. A number of the areas do include sites with extant planning permissions, why?
- c. A number of the sites include what appear to be domestic curtilages or subdivide domestic curtilages, why?
- d. A number of the areas proposed already have significant policy protection, what additional local benefit will the designation bring?

QB INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTS:

2. Some 90% of respondents supported 'keeping green spaces between our villages in an attempt to preserve a settlement's identity'. There was also strong support for limiting development to small areas and brownfield land development. These results strongly influenced the NDP vision, particularly those elements relating the achievement of necessary growth 'in settlements that retain their rural character...respecting and protecting the distinctive landscape, environment and heritage of the area....' and led to the strategy involving SDBs, rural gaps and LGS [local green space].

3. On the issue of the inclusion of domestic curtilages and sites with PPs, neither of the relevant NPPF paragraphs require or infer that a local green site should be publicly accessible, nor do they refer to the nature of ownership of the site. National Planning Policy Guidance says that '*A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership....*'. It seems reasonable therefore to take the view that the fact that a green space may be not be publicly accessible nor in private ownership does not preclude it being identified as a Local Green Space to be protected if it is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance. Also of course LGS designation does not rule out development but seeks to ensure that development should not harm the openness or special character of a Local Green Space or its significance and value to the local community.

4. National Planning Policy Guidance says that '*Different types of designations are intended to achieve different purposes. If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space*'. In areas where there are existing 'policy protections' the QB were concerned that reliance on national and CC level designations and polices, which are very broad and involve general criteria, could be less sensitive to local circumstances and over time through varying policy interpretation lead to harmful cumulative change to the local significance of the area. The valley along the River Tamar is demonstrably special to the local community and holds a particular local significance because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity and the richness of its wildlife. It is also particularly prone to planning decisions which whilst judged by the LPA to be in accordance with national and Cornwall policy are considered locally to have the effect of eroding this local significance. This occurs because the LPA has no local policy which can be taken into account in its planning decisions. The NDP affords the opportunity to provide such a policy.

5. However it is accepted that proposed LGS areas within the Conservation Area, AONB and WHS do have some form of protection which will go some way to securing the outcome that that the LGS designation and policy seeks to achieve.

6. More detailed maps showing the LGS can be accessed by the following hyperlink. When opened, the web page will show a map which can be zoomed into using the '+' and '-' tabs located at the top left of the page, or by double-clicking on the map. Zooming in causes the map base to move through the OS Mastermap stack through to the most detailed level. Below these tabs is a drop-down menu called 'Layers'. This menu will allow some helpful map layers to be toggled on and off. Hyperlink: <https://shared.xmap.cloud?map=377078c3-0ff5-4f58-9f47-d1eadf1760d6>

7. In the following table, the case for inclusion of the area concerned is set in the Assessment Report so is not repeated.

LGS REFERENCE	RESPONSE
a) Calstock Riverside	<p>A. After much debate the precise boundary was agreed to be essentially the area of the woodlands to the west of the village. This was because of their significant contribution to the setting of Calstock within the AONB and WHS, and the Calstock CA. They are a major contributor to the distinctive character of the Tamar Valley in this area, especially as seen from Cotehele NT property.</p> <p>B. The QB is concerned that notwithstanding the various protections applicable to the site, the LPA is allowing a gradual erosion of the woodlands by development which will ultimately lead to significant harm. The boundary was drawn therefore to include the garden portions of more recent PPs so as to help avoid proliferation of domestic buildings and additional woodland clearance.</p> <p>C. As per B above.</p> <p>D. See B and Paras 4 and 5 above. The special character of the site is very much cherished locally and protection of this green space from the perceived erosion of its local significance is considered by the QB of the highest importance.</p>
b) Calstock land south of Station Lane	<p>A. The precise boundaries are formed by the extent of the residential properties involved.</p> <p>B. At the time of survey there were no current PPs. However, there is concern that being within the built-up area of the village, the site could attract proposals for further outbuildings or intensification that could radically change its appearance and harm the CA and AONB.</p> <p>C. Although this is private land related to residential property, it has landscape and heritage value and makes a critical contribution to the character of the Conservation Area, the AONB and the WHS.</p>

	D. See Paras 4 and 5 above.
c) West of Rosemary Cottage, Gunnislake (Newbridge Hill)	<p>A. The extent is drawn to the natural boundaries of the parcels of land identified, apart from residential properties, where the houses themselves are excluded but the gardens, where they visually link with the green space, have been included.</p> <p>B. At the time of survey there were no current PPs.</p> <p>C. Residential properties are excluded but the gardens, where they visually link with the green space, have been included.</p> <p>D. See Paras 4 and 5 above.</p>
d) Gunnislake Riverside	<p>A. The boundary was drawn largely to follow those of the sites of Newbridge Wharf and the quarry, and the site of former mineworkers' smallholdings, although two residential properties with large grounds were also included as they were visually part of the green space.</p> <p>B. At the time of the refreshed survey the site south of Mizpah (AKA the Southfields site discussed in the QB response on SDBs) was identified as having to be excluded because of a residential PP. However, it is understood that this PP has now expired.</p> <p>C. See A above.</p> <p>D. See Paras 4 and 5 above.</p>
e) Edgecombe Way	<p>A. The site defines itself, being surrounded by estate road.</p> <p>B. Not applicable.</p> <p>C. Not applicable.</p> <p>D. Not applicable.</p>
f) Drakewalls Mine (East)	<p>A. The boundaries follow the remaining outline of the mine sett where they remain, now mostly delineated by surrounding development.</p> <p>B. No PPs on site, but there is permission for a development adjacent, alongside the curtilage, as referred to in the Assessment Report</p> <p>C. Not applicable.</p> <p>D. Not in the AONB but is in WHS. Green Space designation supports the WHS designation as well as its role as a 'green finger' within the built-up area.</p>
g) Kingswood House, Gunnislake	<p>A. The boundary is drawn to exclude the main building but to include the garden woodlands which link visually to the more extensive woodlands to the west. Arguably the other large curtilages adjacent could have been</p>

	<p>identified as LGS but they are not wooded and do not make the same contribution to the landscape and heritage setting of the village, WHS and AONB.</p> <p>B. No PPs on site.</p> <p>C. See A above.</p> <p>D. See Paras 4 and 5 above.</p>
h) Drakewalls Mine (West)	<p>A. Site defines itself as a small paddock enclosed by development and the rest of the mine sett to the north.</p> <p>B. History of failed PPs due to inadequate access, the most recent being in November 2020 (PA20/03516)</p> <p>C. Not applicable.</p> <p>D. Not in the AONB but is in WHS. Landlocked and unusable for development, could form a useful add on to the Recreation space located to north, and make the former Drakewalls Mine site complete in terms of heritage access and appreciation.</p>
i) St Dominic Park	<p>A. Site is bounded and defined by estate road and river.</p> <p>B. Not applicable.</p> <p>C. Not applicable.</p> <p>D. Not in AONB, WHS or Cons Area.</p>
j) Okeltor Woods and Wildlife Reserve	<p>A. The site is defined mostly be the sett of Okeltor Mine.</p> <p>B. No PPs were identified affecting the site.</p> <p>C. Three residential properties are located within the site. Due to their visual linkage to and depth within the site the LGS designation has been washed over them.</p> <p>D. In AONB, WHS, is a SAM and also Cornwall Wildlife Site adjoins the Tamar-Tavy Estuary SSSI and Plymouth Sound and Estuaries SAC. See Paras 4 and 5 above.</p>