

## Presentation to Planning Committee by Cllr. John Bennett, 13/1/2009

### Introduction

When I stood for election for the first time on 7 April 2005, it was 'For Thoughtful Development of Hayle Harbour'. I am here tonight still standing for the same issue, but 'the devil is in the details.'

I represent the people in Hayle South ward and, since April 2008, when the OPA was submitted, I have received their comments, attended numerous meetings, read the planning application documents and had dozens, if not hundreds, of conversations on the subject.

So what do the people of Hayle want? This is obviously an unanswerable question but I can throw some light on the subject. Almost without exception, the Hayle resident thinks that 'something must be done'. By this they mean one or more of the following:

- The harbour infrastructure needs repair, specifically the 'craters' on South and East Quays and the quays need tidying up
- The harbour facilities should be improved to enable harbour-related jobs to continue and thrive. They want sluicing to improve access to the harbour, dredging to provide safe channels and fishermen's facilities, including such basics as fuel supplies, to be provided
- They want the historical and heritage facilities to be respected, enhanced and the WHS designation to be celebrated and protected
- They want community facilities such as new doctor's offices, classrooms, educational resources and a fire station
- They want landmark buildings such as a theatre or cinema or a museum or a water-sports centre
- They want high-quality local jobs
- They want interesting shops and cafes that complement and enrich the existing high street shops and restaurants.

Most people are surprised to hear that few of these things are delivered as part of this proposal. Net jobs created, by some calculations, are very few, no landmark buildings are included in the plan to be delivered by ING, the affordable housing element is constrained by financial viability, there is a danger that no community facilities will be delivered at all and repairs to South Quay could be delayed for many years – if delivered at all. No one has mentioned the need for a huge number of houses as high on their priority list.

My job is to *also* to determine if this scheme is viable – not for ING, but for the people of Hayle. I believe we can, by the addition of conditions, improve the balance. But first let us look at the cost to local residents:

- The applicant's own Transportation Plan shows that gridlock is bound to ensue with over 500 vehicles queuing at Foundry Square at peak times. County Highways has expressed grave concerns on this point and the offer of a 'hopper bus' is unlikely to solve the problem
- Loss of protected green-field land and encroachment on Phillack
- Loss of public views
- Overturning of a large number of local plan policies intended to protect local residents and the environment
- No repair of South Quay infrastructure until the end of the plan – and possibly never

The provision of 1,039 dwellings and major development of retail, commercial and industrial areas would probably be considered over-development of this site unless there were compensating benefits for the public good. The development on green-field land behind Clifton Terrace and at Hill Top would have great difficulty passing the County and Penwith policy tests unless the people of Hayle benefit substantially in other ways.

I draw your attention to the report prepared for the committee by Mr. Content, which I think is pretty balanced and addresses most of the major issues. Specifically,

- Page 12, first complete paragraph, in which the loss of agricultural land contrary to policy TV2 is described.
- The next paragraph in which any restorative work on South Quay, the most visible to visitors and residents, would not take place until Phase 4
- The fourth paragraph in which an affordable housing provision of only 17.5% is described contrary to policy
- Page 13 in which the serious transportation issues are raised
- Page 14 where it is recognised that there will be a 'significant impact on the characters of the World Heritage Site and the Conservation Area'
- And, most importantly, on Pages 18 and 19 where it is stated that, "Should the discussions with the applicant fail to resolve the provision of community facilities then the potential harm to current service provision is a material consideration which would warrant consideration of refusal of the application."

Mr. Content's summary on Page 20 states: "Given these fundamental issues, the answer to the question of whether the benefits to Hayle from the proposal outweigh the negative impacts is more finely balanced than is ideal at this stage." Surely this is not what our aspirations were for this project?

*Hayle Town Council met last Thursday and*

*Resolved to approve the application with the request that the following matters be addressed:*

***South Quay***

*The development of South Quay as proposed is essential to the balanced development of the harbour but if this is delayed it is necessary to include a condition to ensure that at least the major damage on South Quay be repaired before full occupancy of Riviere Fields and Hill Top is allowed.*

***Bridge Over Copperhouse Pool***

*Require evidence that the renovation and use of the existing Swing Bridge is not possible. [There is still no sign that all parties have sat around the table at the same time to resolve this important issue]*

***World Heritage Site***

*Require a statement from ICOMOS that none of the elements of the development will jeopardise the WHS inscription. [This should be simple, if the design complies]*

***Remaining ING Land between Riviere Fields and Phillack***

*Require a restrictive covenant be given to Hayle Town Council requiring a unanimous approval of the council at a properly constituted meeting prior to any development taking place on the land. [S106 agreements alone are insufficient to protect this land]*

***Station Approach***

*Require permanent protection of all of ING land between Hayle Railway Station and Hayle Terrace from development and ideally develop as a footpath and open space for residents.*

**Footpaths**

*Require the continuation or appropriate rerouting of the following footpaths, insofar as they are on ING land, with appropriate signage: 102/29/4, 102/37/1, 102/30/6, 102/30/1, 102/30/4, 102/33/1, 102/33/2, 102/33/3, 102/34/1, 102/1MUC/13, 102/22/2, 102/17/1, 102/16/1, 102/16/2, 102/43/2, 102/1MUC/10 & 102/32/1.*

**Community Service Facilities**

*Alternative provision must be made to ensure the promised community service facilities are provided. These elements are fundamental to a well balanced development and without them the existing services will be overburdened, contrary to the aim of PPS 1.*

**Financial Penalty**

*Require a financial penalty to be paid in the instance that ING, or any successor in title, fails to deliver the development of South Quay within seven years of outline permission being granted. [A bond would be required to ensure compliance]*

[You have heard Hayle Town Council’s resolutions which were arrived at after an excellent debate in the presence of a large number of town residents.] I believe we should incorporate all of **Hayle Town Council’s** conditions into any resolution passed tonight. In addition, I also believe that it is vital that Hayle councillors are involved in the ongoing negotiation process and consequently I propose:

“A Hayle Harbour sub-committee shall be formed comprising councillors for Hayle North and Hayle South and the Chair and Vice-Chair of Planning. This sub-committee shall be invited to every meeting involving officers of the Council in which negotiations are being conducted pertaining to the Hayle Harbour development.”

**In Conclusion**

So where are we? We appear to be rushing through an application that, if PDC itself were not hurtling towards its demise, would have been unlikely to be brought before the Planning Committee in such a state of unreadiness. Mr. Content’s report is full of warnings and doubts and, if we are ‘minded’ tonight to approve, you run a significant risk that a large number of people will lobby the Secretary of State to decline to relieve the policy violations and perhaps refer the issue to a Public Enquiry. Having waited so long for this development, let us not rush it through without being sure it is the best thing for Hayle. I am confident that, with a measured and thoughtful approach, we will produce a development that the people of Hayle can be proud of and that the applicant will find profitable.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I move deferral to a later Planning Committee meeting to allow time to negotiate satisfactory Section 106 agreements as indicated in the report with the conditions specified by Hayle Town Council and with the formation of a sub-committee as previously described.

-----