

Population and Housing.

November 2006

Population and Housing.

Introduction.

Liskeard currently has a population of around 8,750. Recent growth has been fairly steady and it is anticipated growth will continue. Accurate forecasts in this area are notoriously difficult but there are projections emerging from a variety of sources that provide some indication of likely growth in the wider region. However, different parts of the region have historically grown at different rates and it would be unwise to assume that future growth will be uniform. If the future of the town is to be planned, though, some prediction must be made together with an assessment of the desirability of this growth.

Growth of any settlement has both advantages and disadvantages and the balance between these is highly subjective and will vary depending on the viewpoint of the individual. Growth can be seen as bringing the opportunity of a greater range of employment; a greater range of facilities are likely to become available as a larger population renders these more economically viable and similarly, a larger catchment population is likely to make the town more attractive to a greater range of retail outlets, including some national names. Conversely, excessive growth can destroy the character and atmosphere of an historic market town and runs the danger of it becoming a dormitory for larger settlements in the area.

What is certain is that there will be growth. What is emerging is that the growth expected to be absorbed into the town will be substantial. Ultimately the town will not have total control over this but can only advance the arguments as to what is considered desirable and acceptable.

It is thus considered prudent to examine likely rates of growth and plan for a figure that is close to the maximum acceptable level. In this way a robust argument can be deployed against any higher figure and, should a lower figure prove necessary, then it is easier to scale back the development and infrastructure required than it would be to have to substantially increase it.

Population and Housing.

1. Population.

1.1 Regional Calculations.

- 1.1.1 Predictions of population change are difficult to carry out with a high degree of accuracy and will inevitably be at least partially dependent on historic figures and trends. The longer the period over which the prediction is made, the more liable any such forecast will be to changes in historic data and the less accurate the figures are likely to be.
- 1.1.2 In its Integrated Regional Strategy¹ it is stated that “the region is growing and we anticipate an extra half million people in the region by 2016”; based on a regional population of just over 5 million, this is a forecast rise of about 10% in 10 years.
- 1.1.3 The Draft Regional Spatial Strategy² (Draft RSS) is slightly more cautious in suggesting a growth of 750,000 (15%) to 5.85 million by 2026. It refers to a growth of over 400,000 since 1991 and a typical net annual growth rate of around 30,000 but also states that “growth has been accelerating since the early 1990s” and draws attention to the fact that “the South West had the highest regional rate of increase between censuses of all regions”.
- 1.1.4 Regional Planning Guidance Note 10³ which will be superseded when the Draft RSS is adopted, also draws attention to the fact that the South West has the fastest growing population amongst UK regions and quotes “an overall population increase of 460,000 (11%) over the period 1981 – 1996”.
- 1.1.5 Whilst there is variation in these figures, there is some consistency in a growth rate of between 15% and 20% over a period of 20 years.
- 1.1.6 Over the 25 years of this plan therefore, unless there are very significant changes, it is reasonable to expect a regional population growth of between 20% and 25%.

¹ An Integrated Regional Strategy (Just Connect), SWRA, November 2005.

² Draft Regional Spatial strategy for the South West, SWRA, June 2006.

³ Regional Planning Guidance for the South West (RPG 10), GOSW, September 2001

- 1.2. Caradon.
- 1.2.1 Looking closer to home, the Caradon District saw significant growth above the regional rate between 1981 and 1991 but, contrary to apparent regional trends, the rate of growth diminished somewhat in the following decade. Local variations such as the supply of housing land at any particular time will inevitably skew figures but the population growth from 67,700⁴ to 79,649⁵ show a growth of 17.6% over the period 1981 to 2001, in line with the regional figures. Current estimates by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) indicate a continuing growth of just under 1% per annum, also in line with the regional figures and giving a population of around 83,400 in 2006.
- 1.2.2 It can be postulated, therefore, that the district will continue to grow at a similar rate to the South West Region during the period of the plan with an increase of between 15% and 20% by 2026.
A growth of 15% would mean an additional 12,510 people by 2026
A growth of 20% would mean an additional 16,680 people by 2026.
- 1.2.3 The Draft RSS proposes an annual requirement of 290 dwellings for the district which, with an average household size for the region of 2.3 (2003) but continuing a slow downward trend, would indicate a population growth of some 13,500 over 20 years which accords closely with the previous calculations.
- 1.2.4 Despite their location in Cornwall, Saltash and Torpoint are considered as parts of the Plymouth Principal Urban Area (PUA) for housing calculations but are a part of Caradon and thus of Cornwall where population figures are concerned. But where people live depends upon any settlement's ability to house them and thus this becomes an issue in determining the absorption of growth within the district. The Draft RSS requires a growth figure of 50 households per annum in Torpoint and Saltash or 1000 households by 2026.
- 1.2.5 With the average household size, it can thus be assumed that these two towns will absorb around 2,300 from the 20 year forecast growth for the district total, some 20%. This equates to 3,000 over 25 years.
- 1.2.6 With the geographical constraints of Torpoint and the recent large expansion of Saltash as a consequence of the building of the Latchbrook and Pillmere estates, the future growth for these two settlements proposed in the Draft RSS of around 17% is probably not unreasonable despite the fact that they currently account for around 30% of the district's population.
- 1.2.7 The net upshot, however, is that over 80% of any growth, some 11,200 people by 2026, must be absorbed elsewhere in the district.
- 1.2.8 To the year 2031, if these figures are projected forwards, there will be another 5% increase in population a total growth of between 20% and 25%.

⁴ ONS Census statistics 1981.

⁵ ONS Census statistics 2001.

1.3 Development Distribution.

- 1.3.1 In proposing a functional approach to Spatial Strategy, the Draft RSS moves some distance from the stance taken in RPG 10. Whereas the emphasis in RPG 10 was very strongly in favour of maximising development in PUAs with little or no development encouraged outside these, the Draft RSS recognises that it needs to build in “more sensitivity to the diversity of the region”. In addition to the PUAs, it thus develops the context of other “Strategically Significant Cities and Towns” (SSTCs), ‘locally significant towns’ and ‘small towns and villages’ and proposes development policies for each. This is summarised at paragraph 2.5.10, which states:
- 1.3.2 The functional approach to Spatial Strategy means:
- The identification of settlements in the Draft RSS should avoid creating a hierarchy of cities and towns determined on population size, and should be based on selecting significant places because of their role and function. This is an important point to note, distinctly different from the approach of RPG 10.
 - The majority of major development needs to be focussed at the strategically significant settlements, in a way that encourages a better balance between homes and jobs.
 - Elsewhere, the policy approach for individual settlements, and the level of appropriate development, should reflect evidence relating to a given settlement’s role and function, its significance locally and the sub-regional context.
 - The nature of the region requires a “fine grain” approach if places are to develop as sustainable communities and, as such, a single region-wide approach to development would not be appropriate.
- 1.3.3 Turning then to guidance on the scale and location of development, the Draft RSS proposes Development Policies B and C to cover what it calls Market Towns (locally significant) and for which it lays down criteria and for Small Towns and Villages to cover all the others. In small towns and villages development is not totally ruled out but “small amounts of development (particularly economic development) may be appropriate”.
- 1.3.4 The approach taken by the Draft RSS in its shift away from RPG 10 is very similar to that in the report of a Parliamentary Select Committee⁶ which states “Government housing and planning policies must be flexible enough to allow new housing to take place in smaller settlements to support their regeneration and to enable them to support a wider range of services. We endorse the objectives of the report by the Government’s Rural Housing Commission and urge the Government to consider its recommendations seriously.”

⁶ Select Committee on Office of the Deputy Prime Minister: Housing, Planning, Local Government and the Regions, Third Report, Affordability and the Supply of Housing, paragraph 119, 20 June 2006.

1.4 Liskeard.

- 1.4.1 The issues discussed in the preceding paragraphs are pertinent in the consideration of the next step of the argument as to where the balance of the predicted population growth should be accommodated. Setting aside Saltash and Torpoint, calculations show that the rest of Caradon should absorb a growth of around 11,200 people in 4,800 households by 2026 but that some of this is already planned.
- 1.4.3 It is believed that, again discounting Saltash and Torpoint, the only settlement that falls into Draft RSS Development Policy B is Liskeard. Whilst development in Callington, Looe and the villages of the district is no longer precluded by the Draft RSS, any such development in these communities is likely to be restricted. It would therefore seem that a significant part of any future growth of the district will inevitably come to Liskeard.
- 1.4.3 If Liskeard were expected to absorb **half** of the proposed increase, this would amount to some 5,600 additional people on a current population of around 9,000, an increase of over 60% and would bring the town to approaching 15,000 inhabitants. This, it is considered would probably be the **absolute maximum** that could be absorbed without having a severely detrimental effect on the character of the town; indeed, there is a body of opinion that believes that even this would be too much. However, over 20 years this amounts to an average of under 300 people per annum and it is believed that this might just be accommodated provided that it was spread evenly across the time frame.
- 1.4.3. The 1st Alteration to the Caradon Local Plan⁷ proposes allocations for 475 new dwellings in Liskeard and assumes a further 312 windfall households⁸ in the period 2006 to 2016. This would absorb 1800 of the requirement which would leave a balance of around 3,800 people to be accommodated in new developments and further windfall sites. If windfalls proposed under the alteration are discounted, this balance rises to 4500 people.
- 1.4.4. Over the 25 years of the plan, assuming a continued growth at the same rate, this would mean the population increasing by a further 1400 people to a total of about 16,000, or nearly double its current size.
- 1.4.4. A more reasonable and sustainable rate of expansion might be for the town to take only, say, one third of the non-PUA district figures. This would amount to a population increase of approaching 4,000 people by 2026 and 5,000 by 2031 giving a population of 14,000 by the latter date.
- 1.4.5. Whilst eventual allocations will be made by the Local Planning Authority, it is considered that a ceiling should be set to the planned population over the period of the plan in order that the character of the town is protected and its infrastructure does not become overwhelmed.

Development of Liskeard should be constrained such that the planned population does not exceed 15,000 by the year 2031 (13750 by 2026). This is an average of 250 people per annum.

⁷ 1st Alteration to the Caradon Local Plan (Adopted 1999), Re-deposit version, May 2005

⁸ Housing Windfall Study, Entec Consultants, November 2004.

1.5 Surrounding Parishes.

- 1.5.1 Whilst development in towns and villages defined in the Draft RSS as being in Development Policy C will be limited, if Liskeard cannot accommodate the entire requirement of the Draft RSS, then some development of these settlements is inevitable.
- 1.5.2 Although the Liskeard Town Plan is not the right place to discuss or prescribe the detail of such development, nevertheless it will have an effect upon the town's infrastructure requirements if any relatively substantial development takes place in any of the settlements for which Liskeard is the natural "hub".
- 1.5.3 To this end, the town must be aware that after the towns of Looe and Callington have been considered, four of the seven most highly populated parishes in the district fall into this category. These are St Cleer (approx pop 3250), Dobwalls (2500), St Ive (Pensilva)(2000) and Menheniot (1750). Whilst some of these may have adopted policies within their parish plans to resist further development, it is likely that there will be pressure for expansion in view of the magnitude of the Draft RSS proposals.

2. Housing.

Note: To accord with the Draft RSS, calculations in this section are done for the 20 years to 2026 and projected ahead to 2031 in the final paragraph.

Quantity.

Working from a population increase of 5,000 over 20 years, there will be a need for around 2,100 additional households over the period. However, there are currently around 200 committed and remaining allocations, the 1st Alteration to the extant Local Plan proposes an additional allocation of 475 and predicts some 312 windfalls in the town. This accounts for about 1,000 of the requirement. There is thus a need to allocate a further 1,100 houses (but see windfall provision below).

Windfall provision.

A detailed study into potential windfall sites within the district was commissioned by Caradon District Council in 2004. This sought to produce a robust prediction for the five towns by identifying all potential windfall sites within their boundaries and including a market analysis of those likely to become available. With recent developments being of a higher density than many older ones, the potential for additional windfall opportunity in the town over and above that already identified is considered sufficiently small that it will not affect the new land provision required. As previously stated, however, current planning allows for a windfall provision of 312 dwellings over the next decade. Paragraph 14 of the Draft PPS 3 introduces a potential change to this; it states that “where it is not possible to allocate sufficient land, local planning authorities should make an allowance for Brownfield windfalls only where the particular circumstances justify it and where sustainability appraisal indicates that allocating sufficient land would have unacceptable impacts”. This sentence could be interpreted as instruction to the local planning authority not to plan for windfalls and would accord with the proposals of the Barker Review of Housing Supply. If this is the case, then a further number of dwellings will need to be planned in. It is presumed that windfalls already achieved could be deducted but this would still require provision for approximately a further 300 properties. In view of the uncertainty of this policy, this figure is not included in the current plan but provision is made below to add this quantity on if required.

A mixed and balanced community.

PPG 3, the draft PPS 3 and particularly RPG10 and the draft RSS place significant emphasis on creating mixed and balanced communities and the need for a balanced range of housing provision to support the economic needs of a settlement.

Recent provision of housing in Liskeard has been significantly biased towards the lower end of the market to the point where the community is becoming unbalanced with the attendant risk of engendering a downward economic spiral; indeed local growth has lagged significantly behind that of the rest of the district and county in the last decade which may, at least partially, be due to the skewed nature of the housing stock. The imbalance is well illustrated in the table below and it should be noted that the percentage figures have changed little in the last five years which is indicative that current developments remain unbalanced and thus, in absolute numbers, tend to make any required compensation more extreme.

The need for affordable housing is recognised and the target set by the district council of 40% of new build being affordable is endorsed. This however means that, for the period of this plan, the remaining 60% would all need to be at the upper end of the market if the current imbalance is to be rectified. Indeed, if 60% of the proposed

1100 houses were all to be above the Band D Council tax median, then the profile in Liskeard would be 75.6% below the median and 24.4% above, a figure similar to that for both district and county.

| Housing stock by Council Tax Band - April 2006 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Tax | National | | | Cornwall & IoS | | | Caradon | | | Liskeard | | |
| Band | Below Band D Median | Above Band D Median | Number | Below Band D Median | Above Band D Median | Number | Below Band D Median | Above Band D Median | Number | Below Band D Median | Above Band D Median | |
| A | | | 54866 | 22.87% | | 7115 | 18.57% | | 923 | 22.31% | | |
| B | | | 60597 | 25.26% | | 10836 | 28.28% | | 1526 | 36.89% | | |
| C | | | 50881 | 21.21% | | 8252 | 21.54% | | 808 | 19.53% | | |
| D/2 | 50.00% | | 19427 | 8.10% | | 3102 | 8.10% | | 264 | 6.38% | | |
| D/2 | | 50.00% | 19362 | | 8.07% | 3101 | | 8.09% | 264 | | 6.38% | |
| E | | | 22400 | | 9.34% | 4103 | | 10.71% | 259 | | 6.26% | |
| F | | | 8267 | | 3.45% | 1271 | | 3.32% | 74 | | 1.79% | |
| G | | | 3823 | | 1.59% | 501 | | 1.31% | 18 | | 0.44% | |
| H | | | 282 | | 0.12% | 31 | | 0.08% | 1 | | 0.02% | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 239905 | 77.44% | 22.56% | 38312 | 76.49% | 23.51% | 4137 | 85.11% | 14.89% | |

Figures supplied by the seven district councils of Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly of properties registered for the payment of Council Tax. Note, this does not include second homes registered for NNDR.

Density.

Draft PPS 3 gives proposed density ranges for different types of community. For a town such as Liskeard it proposes a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. In order to redress the balance of local housing stock, it will be necessary to build at an average close to the lower end of the recommended density range; indeed, there may be some areas where the density will need to be even lower. Also as there is no available brown-field land, provision will need to be made for “Greening the Residential Environment” as proposed in the draft PPS 3 and in PPS 9. This will also create pressure for lower density developments.

Location

National and regional guidance seeks to create coherent and cohesive communities that are, as far as possible, sustainable in their own right. It seeks to deter the use of private transport and to minimise the need for commuting from settlements outside the Principal Urban Areas and their defined TTWAs.

In adopting this guidance and seeking to create such a settlement that meets the criteria whilst providing a local service centre for the surrounding smaller communities, a simple starting point has been adopted. A circle has been drawn on the map with a radius of 1450m, centred on The Parade, and within which all currently proposed residential development is situated; indeed, all development with the exception of a part of the Moorswater Industrial Estate, a small portion of the proposed industrial land put forward in ALT 9 and the playing fields in ALT 15 fall within this circle. Areas currently undeveloped that fall within this “virtuous” circle were then examined with a view to their suitability for development including such issues as access to the town centre.

It became apparent that there is an area in the south-east quadrant that lies within this circle but is outside the parish of Liskeard; whilst this is not an obstacle in itself, it was noted that the parish of Menheniot has adopted a policy of “no further development” in its parish plan which has been endorsed by the district council. Residential development in an adjoining parish has, however, other disadvantages; the precept raised by the Town Council to pay for the facilities and infrastructure maintained by this body for the benefit of its residents can only be levied within the parish. Thus any parts of the “town” that fall outside the parish boundary will reap the benefits whilst not contributing to the cost. This has been noted particularly in Bridport, one of the pilots for the Market and Coastal Towns Initiative, where it understood to have caused significant problems.

Possible sites for residential development were proposed in the First Alteration Issues Report in 2000. The arguments advanced in the discussion of that report have not significantly changed and thus it is considered that the reasons for rejecting some sites put forward at that time remain equally valid today.

Island Shop / Bolitho is the area referred to above which is outside the parish of Liskeard but inside the virtuous circle. In addition the area is divorced from the town centre and town facilities with access realistically only by way of the Island Shop trunk road interchange. The site is not within or well integrated with the built up area of the town and the access to the town would almost certainly result in a development that was orientated towards car use and to commuting to Plymouth which is directly contrary to national and regional guidance.

Tencreek Farm is both in the parish of Dobwalls and outside the virtuous circle. It also remains divorced from the town centre and its facilities, again with access only via the trunk road interchange. Whilst further limited retail development has occurred in this area, this is not seen to affect the argument previously advanced. The site is not within or well integrated with the built up area of the town, is almost entirely outside the virtuous circle and would further extend the major axis of the current settlement, creating ribbon development along the A38. Its close proximity to this trunk road would almost certainly result in a development that was orientated towards car use and to commuting to Plymouth which is directly contrary to national and regional guidance. This site also is within the parish of Dobwalls

The area between Callington Road and St Cleer Road was previously seen as one that met the necessary criteria for development and it appeared in the 1st alteration proposals as ALT 11. This proposal has been reduced from 600 to 475 between first

deposit and redeposit due to a reduction in requirement as specified in the County Structure Plan. The land removed from this site could be reinstated. At the same time, the site for sports fields proposed under ALT 15 was adjusted such that there are just over 3 Ha of land between these two sites which might be utilised to provide further units.

Also between first deposit and redeposit of the 1st Alteration the site at Lamellion Cross, south of the railway station, (ALT 10) was delete due to lack of need. This could be reinstated to provide some 400 houses or possibly slightly enlarged to increase this to around 550. This site is adjacent to a current bus route and is close to the railway station; it thus meets the government requirement to promote development that is linked to public transport nodes. However current road access is poor and will need to be improved by means of direct access to the A 38 at Moorswater. Such a link would also connect the housing with a major employment site which might be developed to provide increased employment in reasonable proximity. The infrastructure improvements necessary to avoid exacerbating the already choked traffic conditions on Station Road will mean that a relatively large site will be required if the development is to be viable. 550 properties are thus proposed. Although the site has the potential to take slightly more than this, it is considered desirable to constrain its western boundary in order that it does not intrude into the Looe river valley.

In similar manner ALT 13 (45 units) could be reinstated; however, ALT 12 is considered unsuitable without access improvements and ALT 14 is unavailable. Reinstating and enlarging these sites would thus account for, say, 720 of the required provision. There is still a need to find 365.

Land to the west of Coldstyle Road was considered in the issues report and was said to be able to take 540 dwellings although the development was not favoured as it was seen to encroach upon the end of the “attractive valley that leads to Moorswater”. As this is well outside the boundary of the AGLV, the precise reasons that it was excluded are not understood. With the need for more housing, however, it must be re-examined; it is the closest site to the centre of town with sports and education facilities also within walking distance. The prior completion of the site between Callington Road and St Cleer Road would provide improved vehicle access from Charter Way and thus it would be less dependent on the congested area around Barras Cross than is currently the case. The total site bounded by Coldstyle Road, Venslooe Hill and Culvermoor Road would, in fact take considerably more the 540 dwellings previously proposed but considerable benefit is seen in retaining a “green finger” on the western flank of the site and thus it is not proposed to utilise the entire site. However, the site could be developed in phases with an initial allocation of around 400 in two phases and a potential third phase to incorporate some of the additional dwellings necessary if windfalls are deleted.

| | Location | Units | Possible Release date |
|---|--|--------------|------------------------------|
| 0 | Extant consents at adoption | 225 (say) | |
| 1 | Between Callington Road and St Cleer Road (1 st Alteration allocation)(1 & 2) | 475 (ALT 11) | 2006/8 |
| 2 | South of the Railway (1) | 275 | 2010 |
| 3 | South of the Railway !2) | 275 | 2013 |
| 4 | Between Callington Road and St Cleer Road (3) | 125 | 2016 |

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 5 | West of Coldstyle Road (1) | 200 | 2017 |
| 6 | West of Coldstyle Road (2) | 200 | 2019 |
| 7 | Western Avenue | 45 | 2021 |
| | | | |
| | 16 year Total | 1820 (=114 p.a.) | |
| | | | |
| 8 | West of Coldstyle Road (3) | 200 | 2022 |
| 9 | North Western area (to be determined) | 150 | 2024 - 2026 |
| | | 2170 (x 2.3 = 4990 people) | |

Projection to 2031.

Assuming the population continues to grow at the same rate and that household size continues to fall, there will be a need for around another 550 dwelling in the five years from 2026 to 2031. Some of this may be accommodated on the remaining parts of the Coldstyle/Venslooe wedge although it would be nice to keep a green finger here. Otherwise it is Old Park/Lady Park, Tencreek or Island Shop/Bolitho.

The latter is terribly badly placed for access (unless the Looe Valley Line closes) and it is also outside the parish boundary so the rates would go to Dobwalls!

Tencreek is still ribbon development along the A38, divorced from the town and in Menheniot so there's the same problem with the rates. Menheniot Parish Plan also has a policy of no further development in the parish.

So Old Park / Lady Park is a lovely area and it would be a shame to ruin it but it may be necessary and there may, in any event, be merit in improving the road effectively completing the ring road.

3. **Spatial, Planning, Design and Sustainability Issues.**

Current guidance and the increasing emphasis on creating sustainable communities points in the direction of compact settlements. These have the advantage of reducing the need or wish to use motor vehicles to access both work and services. As stated above, it is believed that the proposed development of Liskeard, whilst large, can be constrained within a circle of 3km diameter and to achieve this is seen as a significant factor in improving the sustainability of the town. This “virtuous circle” is thus seen as a cornerstone of planning the future of the town.

With little brown field land available and no opportunity for significant infill, the majority of the new residential areas will have to be built on green field sites and will be of a significant size. A “master plan” approach to these developments is therefore seen as essential in order to ensure that issues such as permeability, community safety and the provision of local infrastructure is addressed; it is also important the planning process does not allow sub-division of the sites in order to ensure that these issues are addressed holistically and that policies are not applied piecemeal. Where it is planned that sites will be released for development in phases, it is particularly important that the master plan takes account of the whole development and not merely the current phase.

The Draft RSS forecasts a significant rise in the percentage of the community who will be of pensionable age. The planning process will need to address this in considering the types of housing proposed and the services needed. For example, whilst the idea of gated retirement villages should never be supported, there may be a need for “extra-care” developments or for clusters of housing designed for the elderly and less mobile with level access to public transport and local facilities. Bungalows have been out of favour for some time, largely because of increased development cost and land usage but they are an option that should not be discounted without full investigation.

If the predictions are correct and the development of the town and its surrounding villages is on the scale envisaged, there will be a requirement for significant investment in the infrastructure of Liskeard in order to service the additional population. Investment on this scale will require fairly major intervention and it is seen as imperative that robust policies are in place to maximise the Community Benefit achieved from all development in the town and its catchment. An Audit Commission report⁹ demonstrates that many Local Planning Authorities do not have adequate policies to achieve this and gives guidance and exemplars from which such policies can be developed and improved. Proposals for this are outlined below.

With regard to the design of estates and individual properties, there is a lot of guidance and regulation emerging from government:

- a. The Manual for Streets, which will replace Design Bulletin 32, indicates a change in philosophy on estate layout to improve community safety, permeability and access as well as new thinking on issues such as parking and communal areas. With the overhaul of the planning system it would appear that much of the detail previously contained in Planning Policy Guidance but not included in the new Planning Policy Statements, has been transferred to this document; at the same time, there appears to have been a recognition that some of the previous guidance was open to misinterpretation and some did not reflect good current practice. Whilst Local Planning Authorities will be

⁹ Securing Community Benefits through the planning process, Audit Commission, August 2006.

determining their own detailed policies, it may be anticipated that the proposals espoused in this document will be included in local policies and should thus form a part of the master planning considerations.

- b. The proposals for introducing a Code for Sustainable Houses, visualises a code which contains six essential elements:
 - energy efficiency,
 - water efficiency,
 - surface water management,
 - site waste management,
 - household waste management and
 - use of materials.

At the same time, changes to the Building Regulations (particularly parts E and L and the introduction of a requirement for air leakage testing) give notice of government's intentions to pursue the issue of sustainability and to progressively raise standards. Whilst at first sight, these issues would appear to raise the cost (and thus reduce the affordability) of housing, it is considered that the emergence of new systems and practices, coupled with the use of modern materials can reduce this effect and ensure that these higher standards become a positive aspect of new housing in Liskeard.

Over the life of a building only 10% of its environmental impacts are embodied in building materials; 90% are caused by the lifestyle of the occupants.

Good building practice using modern methods of construction to high specifications may add a little to the cost and environmental impact but will be far outweighed, both in environmental and financial terms, by the through life savings that can be achieved.

In terms of energy efficiency, dwellings should be designed to exceed the current air leakage test limits such that they achieve a leakage of less than 5 cubic metres per hour per square metre. Target Emission Rates (TER) and Dwelling Emission Rates (DER) should be such that the Standard Assessment Procedure (SAP) rating is as high as achievable, exceeding the approved figure for the type of building in order to minimise the carbon footprint. To assist the achievement of a high SAP rating, the use of Ground Source energy should become the norm and other sustainable energy sources should be used where, as and when they are viable.

The dwindling resource of water should be conserved by the provision of grey water purification and recycling and, for example, the use of low or reduced flow taps, showers and cisterns.

Surface water management should be achieved by harvesting and utilising run-off and by the required provision of sustainable drainage.

Site waste management aims to reduce the significant waste generated by the construction industry whilst household waste management will involve the provision of facilities to encourage and promote recycling etc; this will require, for example, the provision of storage areas for recyclable waste.

In addition to the essential elements of the code, developers will also be required to address the internal adaptability of new dwellings in order to provide for "lifetime homes" and such things as the promotion of healthy living through higher daylighting standards.

Past practice in developing residential estates has often resulted in uniform mediocrity of design with many houses showing little if any variation compared with those

around them. New developments should demonstrate a variety of styles and individual designs in a mix of sizes and materials whilst maintaining an overall atmosphere in keeping with the local vernacular. This will require innovative thinking and design, the selection and employment of differing modern techniques and the use of a variety of materials that are appropriate to the setting of a Cornish market town. Uniform rows of mass-produced buildings are unlikely to be acceptable.

Community Benefit.

The Audit Commission report referred to above espouses strong policies to maximise the Community Benefit obtained from development. It indicates that, for residential properties, a contribution of up to 10% of the market value / increase in value of a property may be appropriate although the actual figure will depend on the local development context and other variables. For non-residential developments, the contribution will generally be less and will be determined by the effect of the development on the local community.

A robust policy and comprehensive guide has also been found to be welcomed by developers as this means that there is visibility and transparency of the likely contribution requirement from the outset of their plans.

Examples of the type of expectation are:

Note: In the first column of each table, the term ‘development’ is taken (unless otherwise stated) to include redevelopment, mixed use schemes, changes of use, and applications to extend the duration of a planning consent.

Table 1: Affordable Housing

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|---|--|--|
| <p>All applications for housing development including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • special needs and sheltered housing schemes • windfall sites not identified in the Local Plan. <p>Exceptions: Student accommodation</p> | <p>All Areas: Sites of 0.5 hectare or schemes proposing 15 or more dwellings (net additional).</p> <p>Other smaller proposals for piecemeal development, which clearly form part of a larger site.</p> | <p>As a starting-point, 40% of the total dwellings to be provided.</p> |

Table 2: Transport (Highways and Public Transport)

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|---|--|---|
| <p>All applications for Housing, Business, Retail, Leisure, Health and Education development.</p> | <p>Development that will involve a net increase in the number of dwellings or floorspace on the development site, or wherever an increase in vehicular or pedestrian or cyclist movement arising from the development is probable.</p> | <p>A contribution per additional dwelling or increase in floorspace towards meeting the cost of projects identified by the Council.</p> <p>Work must be to standards acceptable to the Council and be carried out as part of an agreement under s.278 of the Highways Act 1980.</p> |

Table 3: Transport (Workplace Travel Plans)

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|--|---|---|
| <p>All applications for Business, Retail, Leisure, Health and Education development.</p> | <p>A Travel Plan will always be required where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is a new commercial building • there is an increase in the number of vehicle trips generated to and from the site • the existing owner/developer or occupier seeks to increase or decrease car parking (a decrease may impact on on-street and public car park supply) • the existing owner/developer or occupier seeks expansion of business operation/change of use with the likelihood of increased vehicle trips to and from the site or locality • the locality/community will benefit from traffic reduction and an increase in sustainable transport measures • development results in a particular local problem that can be overcome by a Travel Plan • the development proposed, cumulatively with others in a locality, would be a major travel generator • a commercial building is replaced with another, regardless of whether there is a change in size or use. <p>A Travel Plan will not be required where there is already one in existence for the site that addresses all issues arising from the development proposals.</p> <p>New & expanded schools The Council's policy for the provision of School Travel Plans is set out in (the School Travel Plan Strategy).</p> | <p>Prior to first occupation, design and infrastructure measures to be implemented.</p> <p>Within three months of the development being occupied, a Travel Plan that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce single occupancy car usage for business travel • Encourage more environmentally friendly forms of travel • Deliver sustainable transport • Reduce the need to travel. <p>(para. 88 PPG13)</p> <p>A School Travel Plan (para. 89, PPG13)</p> |

Table 4: Education Provision

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|--|---|---|
| <p>All applications for housing development</p> <p>Exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-bedroom dwellings • Dwellings for the elderly or Sheltered housing schemes. • Student accommodation | <p>Development that will involve a net increase of 1 or more dwellings.</p> | <p>Contributions towards the cost of providing new accommodation and/or remodelling/ improving existing accommodation at educational facilities where additional pressure is likely to arise as a result of the development.</p> <p>In most instances this contribution will be calculated on a per dwelling basis.</p> <p>It may be appropriate in some cases for a developer to provide suitable land for a new school or for the significant expansion of an existing one and to construct it, to meet the demand from the proposed development.</p> |

Table 5: Community Facilities

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|--|---|--|
| <p>All applications for housing development.</p> | <p>Development that will involve a net increase of 1 or more dwellings.</p> | <p>A contribution per additional dwelling towards the cost of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing new community facilities in the area, or 2. enhancing or extending existing community facilities in the area. |

Table 6: Leisure Provision - Public Open Space

| Development | Proposal | Sought |
|-------------|----------|--------|
|-------------|----------|--------|

| Type | | |
|---|---|--|
| All applications for housing development. | Dwellings on site of 0.4 ha or greater. Net increase of 1 or more dwellings on site of less than 0.4 ha. | Open space in accordance with the Council's Local Plan Policy of 4.3 ha./1000 population. At least a minimum amount of on-site provision is required on-site (as per Local Plan policies). Any shortfall of provision requires contribution, as considered appropriate by the Council, towards the cost of: 1. providing new facilities in the area, or 2. enhancing or extending existing facilities in the area. |
| All applications for business developments, retail, leisure, health and education development | Development that will involve a net increase in floor space on the development site | A contribution per increase in floor space towards meeting the cost of projects identified by the council |

Table 7: Leisure Provision - Indoor Sports Facilities

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|--|---|---|
| All applications for Business, retail, health and education development. | Development that will involve a net increase in floorspace on the development site. | A contribution per increase in floorspace towards meeting the cost of projects identified by the Council. |
| All applications for residential development | All applications involving a net increase in bedrooms on the development site. | A contribution per increase in residents towards meeting the cost of projects identified by the Council |

Table 8: Town Centre Management, Regeneration and Improvement

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|------------------|--|---|
| All applications | Development within the Parish of Liskeard. Exceptionally contributions may be required from development in neighbouring parishes where such development directly affects the level of service and infrastructure provision required in Liskeard. | A contribution will be sought based upon average build prices for South West England (adjusted for local area and index linked). The contribution shall be calculated in relation to the mean cost £/m ² of gross internal floor area for the type and use of the new or extended floor space. |

Table 9: Economic Development

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|---|--|--|
| All applications for Business, Retail, Leisure, Health and Hotel Development. | Development within the Parish of Liskeard. Exceptionally contributions may be required | A contribution per increase in floorspace towards meeting the cost of projects identified by the |

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| Exceptions: • Development resulting in a net increase of less than 20m ² | from development in neighbouring parishes that have a direct impact upon the local economy and employment sources. | Council. |
|--|--|----------|

Table 10: Town and Parish Projects

| Development Type | Proposal | Sought |
|---|---|---|
| All applications for Housing, Business , Retail, Leisure, Health and Education development. | Within the context of development proposals, whenever a contribution is required to bring forward the need to implement a Parish Project, and this cannot be appropriately secured through planning conditions, a planning obligation will be sought. | A contribution per additional dwelling or increase in floorspace towards meeting the cost of measures identified by the Council. This may include commuted sums for maintenance over a specified period, to be agreed with the developer. |

Other areas in which contributions may be sought include:

Recycling

Community safety. Crime and Disorder prevention

Archaeology and conservation

Environmental improvements.