

Edition 2.3
20th March 2009

Friends of Penzance Harbour

www.friendsofpzharbour.org

How to help

1. Object to the planning applications

Cornwall County Council has now put in its planning applications for the development at Battery Rocks. It is essential that these are rejected.

The plans, which have not changed since the January pre-planning exhibition, are available for inspection at the Sustainable Development and Improvement Reception at Penwith District Council. They can also be viewed on-line at:

www.penwith.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=29863

Any member of the public can object and this can be done either in writing to:

Mr. M Barton
Planning Department
Penwith District Council,
St. Clare, Penzance,
TR18 3QW

Or on-line at;

www.penwith.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=9628

The on-line form asks you for an address: just put "Penzance Harbour".

The reference numbers for the planning applications, which must be quoted when objecting, are:

Penzance 09-0213-P	(this is the major part of the scheme)
Penzance 09-0214-LBC	(alterations to quayside and sea wall)
Penzance 09-0216-CAC	(demolition of a section of wall)

If you object on-line these references should go in the "Application Reference Number" box of the on-line form; ignore the reference to the "weekly list". **If you use the on-line form be sure to change the "I wish to" tick box from the default "raise concerns" to "object".**

The date by which objections must be received at the Penwith District Council offices is:

26th March 2009.

The development is in conflict with a number of policies and objectives contained in the *Local Plan* and *County Structure Plan*. More specifically:

- The development will damage the listed South Pier and have a serious adverse effect on the setting and character of the historic harbour and of Penzance as a whole.

- The development will obliterate Battery Rocks beach and seriously harm the landscape, amenity and natural values of the area.
- The development ignores traffic congestion problems in the harbour area and does nothing to reduce the adverse effects of this on health, the natural and built environment and public safety.
- The development's form, bulk and general design is not in keeping with the character of its surroundings.
- By damaging the natural environment and undermining the town's most important heritage assets, the development harms features that are essential to the long-term wellbeing of the tourism industry and local economy.
- Alternatives, and in particular the out-of-town freight depot proposal, would meet all the developer's objectives, make efficient use of existing sites and buildings, and remove over 250 cars, vans and lorries from the congested harbour area for each freight sailing.

For a more detailed consideration of the planning application and how it conflicts with the *Local Plan* and *County Structure Plan* **see the ANNEX below.**

A draft letter for you to customise and send to planning can be downloaded from our web site (see under "Materials" on the home page). If you have time a letter of your own will probably have more impact.

As well as objecting in the manner described above you can also make your feelings known directly to the Councillors that will sit on the planning committee. Do not expect them to express an opinion (that is called "pre-determination" and would debar them from subsequently voting on the application) but they can talk to you about it and should listen to your concerns.

At the moment it is not clear when the planning application will be considered or which planning committee will consider it. The last Penwith District Council (PDC) planning committee meeting (before PDC is replaced by the new Unitary Authority) is on March 10th, too soon for this application to be considered by it. The application may go before a special Unitary Authority transitional planning sub-committee for the "West Area" sub-region (it's first meeting is in early April), but if there is any significant delay in processing the application it could end up being considered by the new Unitary Authority's planning committee (after the June elections). **Watch our web site for news in this regard.**

The make up of the Unitary Authority's new planning committee will only be known after the elections, but the members of the transitional sub-committee (six councillors from Penwith District Council and six from Kerrier District Council) can be found below.

The members of the transitional planning sub-committee from Penwith are:

Jan Ruhmund (Lib Dem)
27 Leskinnick Terrace
Penzance, Cornwall
TR18 2HB
jan.ruhmund@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 360153

Peter Mates (Lib Dem)
Trenowyn, Ludgvan
Penzance, Cornwall
TR20 8BL
peter.mates@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 740560

Jack Dixon (Lib Dem)
26 Lannoweth Road
Penzance, Cornwall
TR18 3AB
jack.dixon@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 364350

Adrian Semmens (Cons)
Brew Farm, St Levan
Penzance, Cornwall
TR19 6NA
adrian.semmens@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 871281

William Maddern (Cons)
10 Bodinnar Close
Newbridge, Penzance,
Cornwall, TR20 8NN
william.maddern@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 364954

Miss Irene Bailey (Ind)
4 Higher Eglos
Ludgvan, Penzance
Cornwall, TR20 8HQ
irene.bailey@penwith.gov.uk
Tel: 01736 710278

The members of the transitional planning sub-committee from Kerrier are:

Mr J Thomas (Ind)
Gwel-an-Eglos, Church Row,
Lanner, Redruth
Cornwall, TR16 6ET
john.thomas@kerrier.gov.uk
Tel: 01209 215162

Miss Pat Aston (Lib Dem)
Rose Cottage,
West Tolgus, Redruth,
Cornwall, TR15 3TN
aston@clara.net
Tel: 01209 211648

Mr J. H. M. Keay (Lib Dem)
32 Coronation Place
Helston,
Cornwall,
TR13 8JE
Tel: 01326 561294

Ms A K Pascoe (Lib Dem)
35 Church Road
Penponds, Camborne
Cornwall, TR14 0QE
mutantbonsai@hotmail.co.uk
Tel: 01209 714845

Mr M. J. Moyle (Lab)
33 Moorfield Road, Pool, Redruth
Cornwall, TR15 3QB
malcolm.moyle@kerrier.gov.uk
Tel: 01209 214381

Mrs P. A. Lyne (Ind)
Chywartha, Kestle, Manaccan,
Helston, Cornwall, TR12 6HU
plyne@cornwall.gov.uk
Tel: 01326 231307

2. Write to your County Councillors

This is important because the Liberal Democrat controlled County Council is the senior partner in the Route Partnership and the ones who are pushing the scheme against the wishes of local people.

You can find the names and addresses of your county councillors at:

http://mapping.cornwall.gov.uk/website/government/gov_search.asp

In addition to contacting your own councillor you should also write to the two "portfolio holders" (local "ministers") at County Hall that are responsible for the Route Partnership. Their contacts details are:

Transport Portfolio Holder
Matt McTaggart (Lib Dem)
Ward: Menheniot & St Germans
3 Heskyn View, Tideford, Saltash,
Cornwall, PL12 5JP
Office Tel: 01872 322570
Home Tel: 01752 851306
Fax: 01872 322580
mmctaggart@cornwall.gov.uk

Economics Portfolio Holder
Andrew Mitchell (Lib Dem)
Ward: St Ives
36 Parc-an-Creet, St Ives,
Cornwall, TR26 2ES
Office Tel: 01872 322570
Home Tel: 01736 797538
Fax: 01872 322580
andmitchell@cornwall.gov.uk

They attended the exhibition in January and saw the public opposition, but have chosen to push ahead with the Route Partnership's scheme.

Any correspondence to councillors could also usefully be copied to the Chairman and Leader of the County Council and the Council's Chief Executive. Their contact details are:

Mrs Doris Ansari
Chair of Cornwall County Council
County Hall, Treyew Road
Truro, TR1 3AY
Tel: 01872 274846
dansari@cornwall.gov.uk

David Whalley
Leader of Cornwall County Council
County Hall, Treyew Road
Truro, TR1 3AY
Tel: 01288 354329
dwhalley@cornwall.gov.uk

Kevin Lavery
Chief Executive of Cornwall County Council
County Hall, Treyew Road
Truro, TR1 3AY
Tel: 01872 322000
klavery@cornwall.goc.uk

3. Write to your MP

If you are in the St Ives constituency then you should write to Andrew George at:

Andrew George MP
18 Mennaye Road
Penzance, Cornwall
TR18 4NG
Tel: 01736 360020
Fax: 01736 332866

Andrew George has been instrumental in securing the funding for the harbour improvements but has had his request for a public meeting and for more time for the consideration of alternatives rejected by the Route Partnership. It is important that he continues to feel the strength of public opposition to the scheme.

If you are in Cornwall but outside Andrew George's constituency write to your own MP (they are all Liberal Democrats). You could include in your letter that you are disappointed that the Liberal Democrats at County Hall seem to have forgotten that Liberal Democrats are supposed to be the party of local democracy.

4. Write to the Department of Transport and South West RDA

It is the Department for Transport (DfT) that is providing the funding for the harbour works and they have stated that they are not bothered which scheme is chosen so long as it meets the objectives and is supported by the public locally. The DfT funding is being channelled through the South West Regional Development Agency (RDA). They can be contacted at:

Mrs Fozia Chughtai
Department for Transport
Regional & Local Major Projects Division
Zone 3/18
Great Minster House
76 Marsham Street
London, SW1P 4DR
Fozia.chughtai@dft.gsi.gov.uk

Theo Leijser
South West RDA
Area Director for Cornwall & the IoS
Castle House, Pydar Street
Truro, Cornwall TR1 2UJ
Tel: 01872 243750
Fax: 01872 243799
theo.leijser@southwestrda.org.uk

You should tell them that the Route Partnership's scheme is not supported locally and that there are better, cheaper, less destructive alternatives that should be considered. Please refer to our "Lost Forever?" brochure for details.

5. Write to the Cornishman

To help keep the issue in the public eye think about writing a letter expressing your concerns to the *Cornishman* or other local media. Letters to the Cornishman should be sent to:

The Letters Page
The Cornishman
Harmsworth House
City Wharf, Malpas Road
Truro TR1 1QH
letters@cornishman.co.uk
fax: 01872 247435

6. Put a poster in your window

You can download and print off a poster from our web site. Just go to:

www.friendsofpzharbour.org/pdfs/A4_Poster.pdf

Or contact us via the web site and we will send you one.

7. Sign the petition

This can be done on-line by going to:

www.thepetitionsite.com/2/save-the-holy-headland-penzance

8. Tell your friends

Word of mouth is vitally important to ensure that as many people as possible know about what is happening. The more that know the more that will object and the more difficult it is for Cornwall County Council, the Route Partnership and others to ignore us.

ANNEX

Key Planning Objections

References are to the Local Plan 2004 (as revised Sept 2007), the Cornwall Structure Plan 2004, and national policy planning guidance (PPG15); the latter relates to listed buildings and conservation areas, which are not covered in either of the other two documents.

These documents can be viewed by going to:

Penwith Local Plan

www.penwith.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=5602

Cornwall Structure Plan

www.cornwall.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=9111

PPG15

www.planningportal.gov.uk/england/professionals/en/1020432881271.html

Other national policy planning guidance (PPGs) and policy planning statements (PPS) may be relevant but have not been reviewed.

Analysis and objections are divided into six sections: heritage, environment/ amenity, transport/traffic, economy, design, and alternatives/location. For each section a summary of the main objections is followed by a more detailed view of how the scheme conflicts with specific planning objectives and policies.

1. Heritage

The development will have a serious adverse effect on the setting and character of the historic harbour and of Penzance as a whole and undermine the local distinctiveness of the town and wider area. The loss and concealment of substantial parts of the listed harbour walls will have a large adverse effect on this heritage asset. The development is “modern industrial” and does not respect the traditional patterns of development and style, form and detailing found in the historic harbour area.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
<i>Objectives</i>	
1	The development has an “adverse effect on... historic [and] archaeological... values”.
2	The development does not “preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the built environment”.
5	The development is not of a “scale and design that is in keeping with the special character and qualities of the District and its specific location”.
18	By undermining the “cultural heritage of the District” the development discourages tourism development.
<i>Policies</i>	
GD-1	The development is not “integrated with its surroundings in terms of scale, siting and design” and is not “in keeping with the character of the district” and certainly not the character of the specific location.
GD-2(i)	The development is modern industrial and does not “respect [the] traditional patterns of development and style, form and detailing” found in the historic harbour area.
GD-2(ii)	The development makes extensive use of modern materials when the rest of the harbour and locality is built in granite of one quality or another.
CC-1	By substantially compromising the listed harbour structures and associated

	listed buildings the development significantly harms the historic values of the coast.
CC-14	The development "would have a significant adverse effect on the shoreline... [and] adjacent coastal waters in terms of... historic values".
CC-15	The development, and in particular the modifications to the South Pier will "damage... important archaeological remains... [and] their setting".; To quote the developer's own Environmental Statement: "while the visible part of the structure is Victorian the core of the walls is possibly Medieval and of regional and possibly national importance." The development involves knocking holes in these structures and encasing large parts of it in concrete.
CC-16	The development will affect "archaeological remains of county [and possible national] importance" (see comment under CC-15 above) and it will certainly "harm... the historic character of the [harbour] landscape" and the "value, character... [and] setting of the remains".
TV-1	The development will "have a significant adverse effect on the setting... [and] character" of Penzance. To quote the developer's own Environmental Statement: "The stonework of the North Arm and South Pier is a distinctive part of the harbour and creates the setting for the entire area. The loss or concealment of part or all of the harbour walls as part of the scheme may be considered to have a large adverse effect on the heritage asset as a whole".
TV-6 (PPG15)	By introducing a modern industrial estate style installation into the middle of a conservation area the development will have an adverse effect on the character, appearance and architectural and historic importance of the harbour and adjacent waterfront and is in conflict with the objective to preserve and enhance the character of the area.
TV-10 (PPG15)	The proposed development directly affects the listed South Pier but does not respect the intrinsic or heritage asset value of the Pier or its setting.
TV-11 (PPG15)	The development requires the partial demolition of the South Pier wall but alternatives have not been fully explored, nor the case made that the development brings any substantial benefits to the community.
TV-B(ii)	The development will have a significant "adverse impact on the visual setting of the harbour". English Heritage have said: "it is regrettable that more weight was not given to the historic environment; with the South Pier being almost entirely obscured when viewed from along the coast to the south and from the seaward side". English Heritage also point out that the Route Partnership's plans "seem to be driven more by technical and engineering requirements, rather than a wider consideration of their visual impact and the resultant harm to the area's local distinctiveness". To view the English Heritage comments in full go to: www.friendsofpzharbour.org/blog_more.php?b=16
TP-4(ii)	The development's "form, bulk and general design" is not "in keeping with the character of their surroundings". The surroundings are characterised by high natural and heritage values with many listed buildings and structures; the development is of a form, bulk and general design more akin to a modern industrial estate. See also comments above.
County Structure Plan	
<i>Policies</i>	
2	There is nothing more typical and distinctive in the built environment of Cornwall that its old harbours and quays, and this development seriously damages these structures and spoils their setting.

2. Environment/amenity

The development will obliterate Battery Rocks beach, an important open area and educational and leisure resource in the middle of town, and will seriously harm the landscape character, amenity and natural values of the area.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
<i>Objectives</i>	
1	The development has an "adverse effect on landscape, [and] nature

	conservation... values”.
18	By undermining the “natural attractions... of the District” the development discourages tourism development.
21	The development will entirely destroy Battery Rocks beach, an important “recreational... facility” used by many local residents.
Policies	
CC-1	By entirely destroying Battery Rocks beach, a valued local leisure and educational resource, the development will “significantly harm the landscape character, amenity [and] nature conservation... values of the coast”.
CC-4	A development that concrete’s over a local beach and places an industrial estate-style installation in the middle of the town’s historic seafront cannot be consistent with a policy to “conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the heritage coast”.
CC-8	The Battery Rocks area including the beach adjacent to the South Pier is used extensively as a scientific and educational resource by various local schools, diving and marine conservation organisations, guided tour operators focussing on the natural environment, and others. It is very much a <i>de facto</i> Nature Reserve and the development will entirely obliterate the beach and pose a significant threat to the rest of the area.
CC-9	The Purple Sandpiper (<i>Calidris maritima</i>) is protected under both national and EU legislation and the development will more than “significantly harm” its habitat, it will entirely obliterate it.
CC-14	The development “would have a significant adverse effect on the shoreline... [and] adjacent coastal waters in terms of its landscape character, amenity [and] nature conservation ... values”.
TV-3	Battery Rocks beach is an important “open area” within Penzance that is used for educational and leisure purposes; the development will obliterate it.
TV-23	This policy relates to the protection of views from the “harbour car park” but is relevant in that the proposed development very seriously restricts views of the Bay from the area of St Anthony’s Gardens.
TV-C	The development encroaches on this area which is “reserved for leisure facilities”.
R-3	The development will result in the loss of Battery Rocks beach, an valued local recreational resource and the development contains no alternative provision.
County Structure Plan	
Policies	
2	The Battery Rocks beach area is home to a number of animals most noteworthy of which is the Purple Sandpiper; the development will obliterate its semi-natural habitat.

3. Transport/traffic

The development ignores serious traffic congestion problems in the harbour area and does nothing to reduce the adverse effects of this on health, the natural and built environment and public safety. No attempt has been made to integrate the development with the public transport system.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
Objectives	
7	By choosing a site for the passenger terminal that is distant from the main bus and train stations the scheme neither “allows for the use of alternative means of transport to the private car” nor “is well related to existing [public] transport networks”.
10	Again the site of the passenger terminal does nothing to improve “the provision of facilities for public transport users”.
Policies	
GD-2(viii)	By placing the passenger terminal so far from the bus and train stations the

	"design and layout of the development" does nothing to "maximise public transport opportunities".
GD-5	The scheme includes "alterations to the proposed access" and as such is in conflict with this policy. Perhaps more importantly though, even with the proposed revised access the "safe movement of traffic" is unlikely. The entrance/exit for the freight handling facility is on a corner adjacent to another turning and next to the main route on/off the Lighthouse Pier. A recent County Council traffic survey shows this road is heavily used with an average of 850 vehicles per hour recorded between 0700 and 1900 on Tuesday 20 th May 2008 (i.e., outside the main holiday season). Another County Council traffic survey (10-11 th June 2008) tells us that in excess of 250 cars, vans and lorries will be visiting the site to drop off freight for every sailing of the vessel. For more information about the traffic surveys go to: www.friendsofpzharbour.org/blog_more.php?b=12
TP-1(i)	By placing the passenger terminal at a distance from the main bus and train terminals the scheme does nothing to "facilitate alternatives to the private car".
TP-1(ii)	The scheme is not necessary "for public safety" and will not "achieve a traffic improvement". In respect of the latter, the developers are claiming that the new facility will take queuing traffic off Wharf Road; given the number of vehicles using the site (see traffic data above) and the size of the area created this seems unlikely.
TP-1(iii)	The scheme achieves no obvious "other environmental benefits"; the same number of vehicles will be visiting a congested town centre location (see comment under "alternatives/location" below), missing an opportunity to reduce "pollution... [and] congestion".
TP-4(i)	With the passenger terminal at a distance from the main bus and train terminals the development will not "integrate with transport networks".
County Structure Plan	
<i>Policies</i>	
2	The development does nothing to "create safe" places to live and work; instead by locating the freight handling facility in the middle of the harbour area the scheme has missed an opportunity to reduce traffic and congestion and make the harbour area a safer place to live and work (see "alternatives/location" below).
15	The development is not "located... to ensure that it can be adequately supported by necessary transport provision". More specifically: 1) the passenger terminal is too far from the main bus and train terminals, 2) the freight handling depot is located in an area that suffers from heavy traffic, and 3) the scale of the development is insufficient to stop freight delivery traffic from queuing on Wharf Road.
21	The development does not "capitalise on the varied transport terminals" (bus and train in particular) and does nothing to improve "pedestrian accessibility".
27	By locating the passenger terminal at a distance from other public transport nodes, and by choosing to site the freight handling depot in the middle of the heavily congested (see comment above about traffic volumes) and historically sensitive (see under "heritage" above) harbour area the development does nothing to "reduce the adverse effects of transport upon health and the natural and built environment". By failing to site the passenger terminal within safe walking distance of the bus and train stations the development does not support an important transport "link" to the rest of the country and abroad, nor does it enhance the role of public transport or help create an "integrated public transport system".
28	See comment above in respect of "increased choice of travel by... public transport."

4. Economy

By impacting on the natural environment and undermining the town's most important heritage assets the development harms features that are essential to the long-term wellbeing of the tourism and recreation industries.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
<i>Objectives</i>	
18	The siting of the development will have impacts on the "natural attractions" of Battery Rocks, Mounts Bay and the adjacent coast, and the "cultural heritage" of the historic harbour, promenade, Barbican area, and Jubilee Pool. The development is in large part to satisfy the travel demands of tourists and tourist-related business yet it is seriously undermining the natural and cultural heritage assets of the District that underpin the tourist industry.
<i>Policies</i>	
TM-1	The development is in large part to satisfy the travel demands of tourists and tourist-related business yet by utilising a location which heavily impacts on the coast it is seriously undermining the "primary environmental resource of the industry".
County Structure Plan	
<i>Policies</i>	
13	By impacting on the natural environment and undermining the town's most important heritage assets the development clearly harms "features that contribute to Cornwall's attraction for tourism and recreation."
21	The development is of a "maritime" nature but by impacting on those natural and heritage values that underpin "tourism" it will have a significant negative impact on the economy of Penzance. It must also be born in mind that the objectives of the scheme can be met by alternative development approaches that have none of the negative environmental and heritage impacts (see under "alternatives" below).

5. Design

The development's form, bulk and general design is not in keeping with the character of their surroundings. The surroundings are characterised by high natural and heritage values with many listed buildings and structures; the development is of a form, bulk and general design more akin to a modern industrial estate.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
<i>Objectives</i>	
5	The development is not "of a scale and design that is in keeping with the special character and qualities of... its specific location".
<i>Policies</i>	
GD-1	The development is not "integrated with its surroundings in terms of scale, siting and design" and is not "in keeping with the character of the district" and certainly not the character of the specific location.
GD-2(i)	The development is modern industrial and does not "respect [the] traditional patterns of development and style, form and detailing" found in the historic harbour area.
GD2-(ii)	The development makes extensive use of modern materials when the rest of the harbour and locality is built in granite of one quality or another.
TV-6 (PPG15)	By introducing a modern industrial estate style installation into the middle of a conservation area the development will have an adverse effect on the

	character, appearance and architectural and historic importance of the harbour and adjacent waterfront and is in conflict with the objective to preserve and enhance the character of the area.
TV-B(ii)	The development will have a significant "adverse impact on the visual setting of the harbour". English Heritage have said: "it is regrettable that more weight was not given to the historic environment; with the South Pier being almost entirely obscured when viewed from along the coast to the south and from the seaward side". English heritage also point out that the Route Partnership's plans "seem to be driven more by technical and engineering requirements, rather than a wider consideration of their visual impact and the resultant harm to the area's local distinctiveness". For the source of these comments from English Heritage go to: http://www.friendsofpzharbour.org/blog_more.php?b=16
TP-4(ii)	The developments "form, bulk and general design" is not "in keeping with the character of their surroundings". The surroundings are characterised by high natural and heritage values with many listed buildings and structures; the development is of a form, bulk and general design more akin to an industrial estate.
County Structure Plan	
<i>Policies</i>	
2	The development in no-way "positively relates to townscape and landscape character through siting, design, [or] use of local materials".

6. Alternatives/location

Alternatives, and in particular the out-of-town freight forwarding depot proposal with goods brought to the quay once per sailing for immediate loading, would meet all the developer's objectives, make efficient use of existing sites and buildings, and remove over 250 cars, vans and lorries from the congested harbour area for each freight sailing. This approach would be substantially cheaper to set-up (no expensive infrastructure required) and would have comparable running costs.

The failure of the developers to properly demonstrate need and the existence of alternatives means there can be no "overriding public interest" in allowing the development to go ahead despite conflicts with planning policy.

More specifically, the development conflicts with the following objectives/policies contained in the Local and County Structure Plans:

Local Plan	
<i>Objectives</i>	
11	Far from "making the most efficient use of land and existing buildings" this development turns its back on the existing harbour area and industrial and commercial facilities on the outskirts of town and creates new space and buildings on a "blue field" site at enormous cost to the local environment (see also under "heritage" and "environment/amenity" above). Specifically the freight shed and freight handling side of the scheme could be housed on an existing site outside of town and zoned for such use. The passenger terminal could be housed on/in an existing harbour side site/building; a number of candidates exist depending on where the passenger vessel sails from.
12	See comment above and note that vacant units at Long Rock industrial estate (one of which (unit 18) is particularly well suited for use as a freight forwarding facility) suggest that this area has a number of "unused and under-used sites" that would benefit from "regeneration".
<i>Policies</i>	
CC-1	The development's conflict with this policy is covered elsewhere in this analysis but here it is worth pointing out that an alternative out-of-town approach would ensure that development takes place in an appropriately zoned area and be entirely consistent with the policy.
TV-1	The scheme ignores the possibility of developing the freight handling

	<p>facilities at an out-of-town site and as such does not make "maximum use of previously developed land".</p> <p>The scheme clearly also has "a significant adverse effect on the setting [and] character" of Penzance (see comment on TV-1 under "heritage" above).</p>
TP-1(ii)&(iii)	<p>The scheme will not "achieve a traffic improvement" or "other environmental benefits in terms of a reduction in pollution, [and] congestion... ". The same number of vehicles will be visiting a congested town centre location. An out-of-town freight handling facility would remove more than 250 cars, vans and lorries from the congested harbour area for every sailing of the freight vessel (County Council traffic survey, 10-11th June 2008. See: http://www.friendsofpzharbour.org/blog_more.php?b=12).</p>
County Structure Plan	
<i>Policies</i>	
3	<p>The development does not "give priority to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings" (see comments above).</p>
15	<p>By failing to make use of existing sites (out-of-town for the freight handling and within the existing harbour boundaries for the passenger terminal) and instead creating an entirely new infrastructure the development does not "make best use of existing infrastructure".</p> <p>By placing the passenger terminal at a location distant from the main train and bus stations the scheme has not ensured that the development is "adequately supported by necessary transport provision". If the larger scheme were to use two vessels instead of one and the Albert Pier for the passenger service this requirement of the structure plan would be met.</p>
28	<p>Again by not choosing a site for the passenger terminal that is convenient for the train and bus stations the scheme has failed to give consideration to the "overall impact on travel patterns and the availability of alternative locations for development in order to... increase choice of travel by... public transport".</p>