

## **Penzance Neighbourhood Plan – Reg 14 Consultation Response**

**Name:** Gerry Penrose

**Title/Organisation:** Penzance Civic Society

### **Q1. Introduction & Context Summary – your comments**

-

### **Q2. The Plan's Overall Vision and Community Vision Statements – your comments**

PzCS support the Plans overall vision and Penzance Community Vision Statements

### **Q3. Development, Design and Heritage – your comments**

Reference Respecting Heritage and Character – 'Objectives' and 'Achieved by'  
Pages 29 and 30.

- While the Penzance Civic Society (PzCS) fully support the objectives detailed on page 29 the items laid out to achieve them in section 5.1.3, page 30, are considered inadequate.

This section seems to focus on major developments but appears weak as regards protection and enhancement of our areas character, identity and 'sense of place'.

The second bullet of 5.1.3 refers to creating a register of key heritage buildings. However, all the listed buildings are already registered by Historic England.

The Penzance Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) from March 2010 appears to be the go to document on the County Council Conservation and Environment Protection website.: <https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment/conservation-and-environmentprotection/strategic-historic-environment-service/appraisals-and-surveys/>

Would it be appropriate to add more photographic detail/evidence to the CAA on a site that can be accessed by planning applicants, planning authorities as well as being kept up to date?

- Over time, with pressures on Council operating costs, there appears to be very limited control over compliance with conservation applications or approvals.

Could compliance with conservation principles be delegated to the Town to help ensure planning applications are made and where given, are adhered to?

- The fifth bullet of 5.1.3 refers to engagement with Highways England to trial and implement schemes to reduce impact of traffic. We see this as key to the development of the Harbour and Coinage Hall area as well as improving access between the 3 destination points identified in the plan.

However, for the foreseeable future there will be a residual requirement for traffic from and to Newlyn/Mousehole to the east side of Penzance. This will include heavy commercial, delivery and trader's vans as well as private cars where public transport is not viable.

Without addressing the dangerous junction between The Coombe and the A30, it is unlikely that wide support will be gained for further restrictions of traffic along the Promenade by Penzance harbour or over Ross Bridge.

Could the NP include an objective and action to address, together with Highways England the dangerous and inadequate access from Newlyn onto the A30?

#### **Q4. Economy – your comments**

-

#### **Q5. Housing – your comments**

Policy H2 Page 71

The limited scope of the NP in addressing the identified housing issues is understood. It is hoped that the Penzance Council will continue to press for the required changes in housing policies.

In addition to gaining control of the use for new and existing housing stock, should there be a plan for holiday/second home accommodation which may, in itself, reduce pressure on local communities and prices of primary homes?

#### **Q6. Natural Environment and Green Infrastructure – your comments**

-

#### **Q7. Coastal Vulnerability – your comments**

-

#### **Q8. Penzance Town Centre and Waterfront – your comments**

6.4.1 Map 16 Page 126

PzCS fear that development in these areas will be very much top-down, driven by the County Council DPD plan, with limited consultation or alternatives put forward.

The “Investment Vision” for the Coinagehall and Wetdock Headland Destination seem to be catch-all statements. In addition, the recent announcement of the compulsory purchase of the Meadery is also indicative of a top-down approach.

PzCS see two key priorities for this area.

- To enhance the operation of the harbour, especially the passenger and freight facilities for the Scilly Island ferries.
- Secondly, with the objective of making this a destination area, there should be a focus on creating valuable community and visitor amenities – a phrase used in relation to The Prom on page 124.

Recognising that this is a DPD allocated site, is Penzance Council in a position to challenge or influence how this key area is developed prior to plans being laid before it?

As a destination area the Coinagehall St and Wetdock area will require much improved access. Pavements to the other two ‘Legs of the Stool’ along Chapel Street and the Wharf are very narrow with significant amounts of traffic passing very close to pedestrians.

Reducing the amount and speed of traffic seems key to transforming the area to make the most of its waterside location, as a leisure destination. (Map 16 Wetdock transformation)

As has been identified in Section 7 Development, Design and Heritage, there needs to be a safe alternative route for essential traffic traveling east from the Newlyn area to the west side of Penzance. Addressing the junction of The Combe and A30 is thought to be an essential element in reducing traffic between the ‘Arrival Zone’ and the ‘Headland Destination’.

Could traffic volumes along the Wharf be further reduced by directing west bound traffic to the Albert Pier entrance to the Harbour carpark? Could the current west entrance to the harbour carpark then only be used for traffic to and from the west side only.

PEN7 Page 136

Recognising the constraint that the NP has in defining the redevelopment objectives of the Harbour and Headland, is the Penzance Council in a position to challenge or modify DPD policies? Points 2 and 3 of PEN7 seem contradictory.

The headland area would seem an ideal location for a hotel due to its proximity to the ferry terminal and being walking distance from the ‘Arrival Zone’. A hotel in this area would also reduce ‘drop-off’ traffic at ferry arrival and departure times. This would seem in line with point 3 of PEN7