

Minor Village Development Boundaries

Supplementary Planning Guidance

November 2001



**NORTH CORNWALL
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

FOREWORD

The current Local Plan for North Cornwall was adopted in April 1999. As part of the process a Public Local Inquiry was held and the subsequent report by an independent inspector made a number of recommendations to the District Council. One of the more significant was the need to define development boundaries around 62 of the smaller villages throughout North Cornwall. The Council gave a commitment to address this issue which it did during 2000/2001.

During the summer of 2001 the Council produced a 'First Deposit Draft' version of the minor village development boundaries for consultation. A total of 125 representations were received from members of the public, statutory consultees and the Parish and Town Councils. The Council carefully considered all of these representations in November 2001, together with the future direction of the Local Plan.

Various changes were made in response to the representations and the Council proceeded to adopt the revised development boundaries around the minor villages as supplementary planning guidance.

As supplementary planning guidance the development boundaries will not form part of the Local Plan, but they will be taken into account in assessing planning applications as a material consideration. I fully endorse the adoption of these boundaries as supplementary planning guidance as they will provide the basis for consistent and fair decisions in relation to development proposals affecting minor villages, as well as providing greater certainty.

I would like to thank all individuals, Parish and Town Councils and organisations, for their valuable contribution in the preparation of this supplementary planning guidance.

Councillor Peter Davies
Chairman of the Planning and Development Committee

North Cornwall District Council

CONTENTS

	Inset Map	Page
Foreword		
Introduction		1
Background Information		1
Policy Context		2
Benefits & scope provided by development boundaries		4
Guiding principles for defining development boundaries		4
Sub-Area Map showing the distribution of Minor Villages		7
Bodmin Sub-Area:		
Cardinham	39	8
Helland	40	9
Longstone	41	10
Millpool	42	11
Withiel	43	12
Bude Sub-Area:		
Bangors	44	13
Grimscott	45	14
Higher Crackington	46	15
Jacobstow	47	16~17
North Tamerton	48	18
Shop	49	19
Stibb	50	20
Treskinnick Cross	51	21
Wainhouse Corner	52	22
Widemouth Bay	53	23
Woodford	54	24
Camelford Sub-Area:		
Hallworthy	55	25
Helstone	56	26
Marshgate	57	27~28
Otterham Station	58	29
Tregoodwell	59	30
Treknow	60	31
Tresparrrett	61	32
Treveighan	62	33
Trewarmett	63	34
Launceston Sub-Area:		
Bolventor	64	35
Boyton	65	36

		Inset Map	Page
Launceston Sub-Area:	Bray Shop	66	37
	Canworthy Water	67	38
	Daws House	68	39
	Downgate	69	40
	Lady Cross	70	41
	Laneast	71	42
	Langore	72	43
	Lawhitton	73	44
	Lezant	74	45
	Luckett	75	46
	Pipers Pool	76	47
	Polyphant	77	48
	Trebullett	78	49
	Treburley	79	50
	Trekenner	80	51
	Tresmeer	81	52
	Trewint	82	53
Yeolmbridge	83	54	
Padstow Sub-Area:	Constantine Bay	84	55~56
	Harlyn	85	57
	Little Petherick	86	58
	Penrose	87	59
	Porthcothan	88	60
	Rumford	89	61
	St. Eval M.Q.	90	62
	Treyarnon	91	63
Wadebridge Sub-Area:	Bodieve	92	64
	Burlawn	93	65
	Chapel Amble	94	66
	Pendoggett	95	67
	Port Gaverne	96	68
	St. Minver	97	69
	Sladesbridge	98	70
	Trelights	99	71
	Whitecross	100	72

Appendices:

Appendix 1 ~ Local Plan Policy HSG2

Appendix 2 ~ Structure Plan Policy H10

Appendix 3 ~ Consultation Statement

Introduction

1. This document sets out the development boundaries for the 62 minor villages distributed throughout North Cornwall as defined in the adopted North Cornwall District Local Plan (April 1999). The Council adopted the boundaries as supplementary planning guidance in November 2001 after extensive consultation. As supplementary planning guidance (SPG), the development boundaries do not form part of the Development Plan for the area. Local Plan Policy HSG2 (See Appendix 1) along with Policy H10 (See Appendix 2) in the Cornwall Structure Plan, will remain the main policy considerations when dealing with development proposals affecting minor villages. However the development boundaries will provide clarification on the interpretation and application of these policies and will be taken into account in assessing planning applications as a material consideration.

Background Information

2. A number of recommendations were made in the Local Plan Inspector's Report (September 1997), which although accepted by the Council, were not implemented at the Modifications stage because they represented significant changes that would inevitably lead to a delay in its adoption. The Council gave a commitment to address these issues, the most significant being the defining of development boundaries around the 62 minor villages, at the earliest opportunity after the Local Plan was adopted. The Inspector endorsed this approach.
3. The Local Plan was adopted in April 1999 and the Council agreed a timetable for addressing a number of issues in November 1999 as part of the First Alteration. However, following discussions with the Government Office for the South West, the Council decided to proceed with a streamlined review of the Local Plan which was limited to defining development boundaries around the minor villages. Survey work commenced during the early part of 2000 and discussions with relevant ward members took place during the summer of that year. During September and October 2000 extensive consultation was undertaken with the relevant parish and town councils, their comments were considered by the Council in February 2001.
4. The Council agreed the First Deposit Draft, which contained all the proposed development boundaries and was made available for comment (placed on deposit) for a six-week period from 3rd May to 15th June. In November 2001, the Council considered not only all the representations received (and agreed a small number of changes to the boundaries), but also the future direction of the First Alteration. Having taken into account a number of factors including the scale of objections received, the resource implications of undertaking an Inquiry and the need to progress a wider roll-forward review of the Local Plan, the Council concluded that the First Alteration programme should be abandoned. In addition it was agreed that

the development boundaries should be adopted as supplementary planning guidance pending further consideration in the full review of the Local Plan.

5. The full extent of the consultation undertaken throughout the preparation of the development boundaries is set out in Appendix 3.

Policy Context

6. Policy HSG2 in the adopted Local Plan, identifies 62 minor villages located throughout the District where limited housing development can take place *“in the form of infilling, conversion or redevelopment”*. A minor village has been defined for the purposes of the policy as a settlement usually consisting of at least 20 dwellings and having a compact built form. Most have at least one community facility such as a shop, post office, community hall or a pub. These villages do not have the services or status to support or warrant significant levels of development. However the Council felt that allowing a limited growth would help sustain and support rural community life and in particular aid the maintenance of existing services and facilities.
7. Minor villages included in Policy HSG2 generally conform with the County Structure Plan Policy H10. However the Council adopted a flexible approach in categorising settlements as minor villages due to the need to strike a balance between concentrating development in key settlements in the interests of sustainability and the need to support a large number of small rural communities across a large geographical area. Consequently some settlements on the margins of the criteria laid down in the County Structure Plan Policy H10 have been categorised as minor villages.
8. The Local Plan Inspector, although expressing support for the broad principles of the Local Plan settlement strategy in which minor villages formed an integral part, was concerned that Policy HSG2 as worded in the Deposit Draft (April 1995), provided *“undesirable scope for excessive and potentially inappropriate development”* within minor villages. He recommended therefore that development boundaries should be extended to all minor villages, which was accepted by the Council.
9. The Inspector was concerned that the application of development boundaries throughout the Deposit Draft (April 1995) was not consistent. The Council accepted this and made a number of modifications to the development boundaries around the towns and main villages to address the Inspector’s recommendations. The following extracts from the Inspector’s report served to provide guidance on the redrawing of development boundaries and is therefore relevant in defining new boundaries around minor villages.

Paragraph 3.4.7

“Development boundaries are recognised and generally accepted as an essential tool for the control of development, principally to prevent the unregulated encroachment of development into the open countryside. It is important therefore that the concept upon which they are based is clear, consistently applied, and capable of being easily understood by users of the DLP.”

Paragraph 3.4.10

“Development boundaries are generally used to define the demarcation between predominantly built-up areas of a particular town or village and the surrounding, predominantly open countryside; on one side of the boundary those policies relating to the built-up area apply, while on the other open countryside policies apply.”

Paragraph 3.4.15

Development boundaries should be drawn “where possible using clearly defined physical features, to encompass the true built-up area of each settlement, together with any peripheral allocations and commitments for built development, and built sites which contribute to its economic and social structure.”

10. As a result of the Inspector's comments, the Council modified two key paragraphs in the Local Plan which define the role and purpose of development boundaries. They now read as follows:

***3.24** Development boundaries are drawn around each town and main village in order to regulate and control their growth and prevent the encroachment of development into the countryside. Within these boundaries, development is generally acceptable provided proposals comply with other policies in the Plan. Outside these boundaries, development will only be acceptable for uses which are necessary in the interests of the rural economy, including tourism and genuine affordable housing schemes, or are the subject of specific policies or proposals in the Plan.*

***3.25** Development boundaries encompass the built-up areas of the six principle towns and all main villages, and all peripheral sites allocated or committed for built development. Only those parts of a settlement where development is likely to be acceptable in principle are included within the development boundary. However, the inclusion of land within a development boundary does not automatically mean that development will be permitted. All development proposals will be subject to other policies throughout the Plan, and integral features that contribute to the character or functioning of a settlement, such as recreational areas, allotments, car parks, school playing fields, and visually important open spaces will be protected.”*

Benefits & scope provided by development boundaries

11. There are some clear benefits to be gained from defining development boundaries around the minor villages. At a general level they will:

- Provide the basis for consistent and fair decisions
- Help to provide greater certainty; and
- Reduce the number of any misconceived planning applications and appeals.

12. Although the development boundaries will provide clarity in relation to the acceptable locations for most forms of development, especially housing, it is not a straight jacket to all forms of development. Policies in the Local Plan allow in principle, some forms of development on the edge of a minor village which could be outside but adjacent to the development boundary, subject to the usual site specific considerations such as access, visual impact etc. The main examples of development that may be acceptable are set out below:

Affordable Housing

Under Policy HSG10, small group affordable housing (exception sites) may be acceptable where there is a proven local need, which cannot be met in any other way. Any dwellings will be subject to secure arrangements to ensure that the initial and subsequent occupancy is restricted to members of the local community in housing need.

Small scale employment units

In order to assist appropriate scale employment generating developments in the rural areas, Policy ECN 4 provides scope for workshops to be located on suitable sites adjoining a development boundary.

Community facilities

Policy SAF11 seeks to encourage the provision of community facilities such as village halls and children's play areas, and in principle these can be provided on sites outside but adjoining the development boundary.

Guiding principles for defining development boundaries

13. In order to define the development boundaries around the different villages in a consistent way, the Council adopted the following guiding principles in

November 1999, many of which are based on the advice and comments contained in the Local Plan Inspector's Report (September 1997).

Guiding Principle 1: Given the role of minor villages in the settlement strategy, boundaries should be drawn fairly tightly around the built-up area and no new allocations for housing or other land uses will be incorporated.

Guiding Principle 2: In defining the overall limitation of each development boundary, account will be taken of the level of available facilities, public transport links, and location in relation to the road network, infrastructure and landscape constraints.

Guiding Principle 3: Development boundaries should include peripheral commitments for built development on the edge of a settlement e.g. unimplemented planning consents for dwellings.

Guiding Principle 4: Development boundaries should include peripheral built sites on the edge of a settlement which contribute to the economic and social life of the settlement e.g. community hall, church, chapel, workshops etc.

Guiding Principle 5: Isolated or sporadic development, which is clearly detached from the main built-up area of the settlement, should be excluded from the boundary.

Guiding Principle 6: Existing and proposed playing fields peripheral to a settlement should be excluded from the boundary.

Guiding Principle 7: Boundaries should generally follow the curtilage of properties except where there are large gardens or other open areas, which would be inappropriately drawn into the built-up area.

Guiding Principle 8: Where possible, boundaries should follow clearly defined features e.g field boundaries, roads, streams, walls, fences etc.

Guiding Principle 9: Development boundaries need not be continuous. It may be appropriate given the nature and form of a settlement to define two or more separate elements.

14. In applying these guiding principles, judgements have been made on whether land or buildings are considered to form a natural part of the built-up area of a village. Moreover, consideration has been given to whether development of a site on the periphery of a village would contribute to or detract from the character of the settlement. In some cases the judgements made are clear-cut whereas in others they are more finely balanced and subjective.

15. A particular issue, which has frequently occurred, is how to deal with agricultural buildings on the edge of a village. In addressing this issue the following factors have been taken into account:

- Type of agricultural building e.g. farmhouse, traditional stone built barn, modern storage shed etc
- Scale of the building
- Relationship with the rest of the village
- Redevelopment / conversion potential
- Availability of clear defensible boundaries

Although each case is different, the general approach adopted has been to include farmhouses and traditional stone buildings where they have a close relationship with the existing built-up area. These buildings tend to be of a scale which are in keeping with the rest of the village and any future proposals for residential conversion would be of a scale that is likely to be appropriate to a minor village. In the case of large modern agricultural buildings these have tended to be excluded where they are on the edge or detached from the built-up area. If these buildings were included they could provide significant scope for speculative residential redevelopment on a potential scale that would not comply with the role of minor villages in the Local Plan settlement strategy.



- | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 1 Bangers | 17 Hatherle | 33 Kernew | 48 Treligle |
| 2 Bodbice | 18 Higher Creakingfor | 34 Piper's Pool | 50 Tuckerton Cross |
| 3 Bokenka | 19 Jacobsons | 35 PilydPort | 51 Tuxemear |
| 4 Boyton | 20 Jadrross | 36 Surf Grove | 52 Treginnit |
| 5 Bray Shop | 21 Lavers | 37 Turlinfor | 53 Tre-eghys |
| 6 Burren | 22 Lelgus | 38 Turlinfor | 54 Trevenall |
| 7 Carnethy Wade | 23 Lenthon | 39 Tuxemear | 55 Tuxemear |
| 8 Carbis | 24 Lantz | 40 Wadebridge | 56 Tuxemear |
| 9 Chape Ambok | 25 Little Pethrick | 41 St Erva | 57 Washhouse Corner |
| 10 Constantine Bay | 26 Longstone | 42 St Martin | 58 Whitcross |
| 11 Ovals House | 27 Looe | 43 Tidd | 59 Widemouth Bay |
| 12 Downgate | 28 Mardogate | 44 Trebilly | 60 Wivel |
| 13 Osmocot | 29 Millpool | 45 Trebilly | 61 Wivel |
| 14 Nethworthy | 30 North Tamarzon | 46 Trebilly | 62 Wadebridge |
| 15 Nethy | 31 Owlham Stone | 47 Trebilly | |
| 16 Noland | 32 Padstow | 48 Trebilly | |



Minor Village Development Boundaries -
DISTRIBUTION OF MINOR VILLAGES BY SUB-AREA.

© Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
North Cornwall District Council
S.A. 07872
2007
Scale 1:300000 25/11/2001