

**Rame NDP Consultation w/c 23.02.15 – Comments on policies**

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Millbrook</b>	<b>Antony</b>	<b>St John</b>	<b>Maker-with-Rame</b>	<b>Sheviock</b>
<b>1: New Housing – Primary Residency</b>	Concerned that current wording will prohibit holiday units (which would not be supported).  Difficult to see how enforced.	No Comment	Concerned that current wording will prohibit holiday units (which would not be supported).	Difficult to see how enforced.	No Comment
<b>2: CIL (Local Element)</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	What amount of money available for new infrastructure?
<b>3: Renewable Energy</b>	No Comment	How will money be split between parishes?	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment
<b>4: General Development</b>	Explanation of what large scale renewable energy schemes are	Para 2 of policy text queried - In supporting text, include an explanation of para 2 of policy wording (i.e. why would development displace or harm in first place?)	No Comment	Para 2 of policy text queried - In supporting text, include an explanation of para 2 of policy wording (i.e. why would development displace or harm in first place?)	No Comment
<b>5: Flood Risk Management</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	What are flood zones 2 & 3?	No Comment
<b>6: Conservation Areas</b>	Could this be applied to other areas?	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment
<b>7: Development throughout the Rame NDP area</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment
<b>8: Forts of the Rame Peninsula</b>	What does high priority mean? More emphasis on Forts. Mention should be	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment

	made of mixed use development.				
<b>9: Mount Edgcumbe Country Park</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment
<b>10: Maker Heights</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	Policy needs rewording to ensure it applies to existing buildings and cannot be interpreted to allow additional builds.  Concern over allowing residential development here.	No Comment
<b>11. Commercial Growth area for Millbrook</b>	No Comment	No Comment	Concern that this policy will be encouraging more large employment sites which will generate more traffic and issues on already constrained network.  Change wording from 'in close proximity to Gallows Park Industrial Units' to 'to the west of Hounster Hill'.	No Comment	Concern that this policy and encouraging more large employment sites which will generate more traffic and issues on already constrained network.
<b>12. Millbrook Lake and Green Space</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment
<b>13. Southdown &amp; Foss Quay Boatyards</b>	What are B1 and B2 uses? Better definition of materially adverse impacts	What are B1 and B2 uses?	No Comment	No Comment	Amend policy wording on (b) to rural (NOT on the village and rural environment) environment and of the whole peninsula

<b>14. Rame Peninsula Gateway</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	Policy should include maps for three settlements  Crafthole policy lacking in the same principles as Millbrook and St John
<b>15. Development in St John Village</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	Why aren't similar policies applied to Crafthole
<b>16. Antony Village Bypass – Safeguarding of Land</b>	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	No Comment	Route a bit close to the Fort
<b>Other Comments:</b>	Additional policy request to encourage Swifts back to Millbrook area – this can be done through a design type policy (or addition to policy).		Add in a generic road policy	Why hasn't parking around Kingsand & Cawsand been addressed (major issue)?  Lack of development framework for Kingsand and Cawsand	General comments around road capacity