

THE CORNISH VILLAGE

- 2.1. In their Outline Application, the developers propose a “Cornish Village” theme in the hope that such a phrase might have a better resonance with their audience. Beware those siren voices of the Applicant’s artistry... Cornish people everywhere will wonder upon which planet might be found a Cornish Village that has high-rise apartments blocking out the sunlight. Which Cornish Village has an underground car park for over 800 cars, and which Cornish Village has rules whereby the visiting public can be shut out upto 32 days per year, perhaps in high season ?
- 2.2. When challenged on this issue at a recent Parish meeting, it was averred on behalf of the developer that ***‘the general roof-profile of the design, with the tallest buildings at the back (most landward) areas of the site, would create a typically Cornish village appearance, with the overall roof-scape escalating from the sea-front backward toward the clifftop’.***
- 2.3. The only manner in which that appearance might possibly be perceived would be about half-a-mile out to sea. Certainly it could not be the perception either from ground-level (craning one’s neck upward past six storeys), or from the beach or south-west coastal path. Does the developer truly believe that a typical Cornish Village would have a dozen or more high-rise apartment blocks, or is this just a cynical attempt to kid the authorities that traditional local architectural values will be respected ? In any event, since we are offered only an ‘Outline’ decision as to what is intended, even if presently the design intent had been intrinsically Cornish, which it is not, then the designer has failed by any measure recognised by the indigenous Cornish people. It’s about as Cornish as tripe and onions.
- 2.4. Of the three leaflets given to those attending CEG presentations, No. 3, dated November 2010, shows an artist’s impression of the Crinnis Beach with a wide, flat beach, like that at Bude. In reality, it is very different, being steeper and narrower, and sometimes not there at all. Why is the Public being thus misinformed ? The October 2009 leaflet is an example of how the Developer has looked after its property. Falling apart, wind damage, bits blowing off. It is believed by many that the Developer’s objective is to make the site look so bad that the Planners and Public will accept almost anything as an improvement.

- 2.5. We all want something to happen, but it must be right for the Community in the long term. This is, or rather was, St Austell's main beach but, although the population has increased immensely and the Tourist trade in particular has developed, the public have been denied access for far too long.
- 2.6. The Developer is belatedly seeking 100% residential occupancy of the proposed 511 apartments whilst simultaneously claiming that only upto half will be occupied as fully residential. If that be the case, why then seek 100% ? We suggest this is not entertained. The community benefits, as described in their No 3 leaflet, claim that Tourism is a key generator of jobs. The Beach itself should continue to be a freely accessible tourist related attraction, for visiting members of the public and locals alike.
- 2.7. Residential Development can be undertaken in designated areas where Tourism is not an alternative option. The Developer, by seeking to have residential use here, clearly does not need all of the units for tourist use. In any event, there is a standard requirement that any such residential development must include a proportion of **affordable homes on site**, to create the necessary community-mix. Nothing on this site has been proposed for affordable homes.
- 2.8. The Carlyon Bay site includes three distinct beach bays, from west to east Crinnis, Shorthorn and Polgaver. **Crinnis** has been the only developed area in the past, and included a substantial car park at beach level for public use. Shorthorn and Polgaver were undeveloped, and had many footpaths for the public and a wide variety of natural vegetation, flora and fauna to enjoy.
- 2.9. **Polgaver**, over 30 years ago, following a County survey by the then County Council when undertaking its duties under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, was confirmed by the Secretary of State as 'Open Country' where the public were seen to have the right of access for open air recreation. Until the present owners fenced off the beaches, the public had unlimited access to Polgaver. No development whatever should be allowed on Polgaver.
- 2.10. **Shorthorn** should also not be allowed for development. It is a highly valuable natural asset which must not be denied to future generations. The building

proposals being developed would place many large buildings close to the cliff face. This cannot be proposed for any other reason than to make money at the expense of others. The cliff faces are not stable, due to continual erosion by wind, rain, frost etc. The coastal footpath in the St Austell area has fallen away in places, and will continue to do so in the future.

- 2.11. In some places (e.g. at the rail bridge at Par Docks) it has been stabilised by plugging and lining, and is most unattractive. This may be satisfactory for the bridge area, but not on an attractive beach location. Erosion is commonplace along this shoreline, and took place again only this November 2010, when heavy rainwater took a route across the top car park, cutting out a deep channel which carried tonnes of water over the cliff.
- 2.12. Future maintenance of the cliff would be very difficult with buildings so close and with little room for support services. The buildings, in some places, are planned to be faced with timber. This is a mad idea, as it will be continually bombarded by sea spray and salt, and so will rapidly downgrade in appearance. If in doubt, do look at the Travel Lodge in St Austell and the new holiday lodges at The Cornwall Hotel, Spa and Estate, Pentewan Road, St Austell. These are not subject to direct sea spray.
- 2.13. Unit occupants are to park their vehicles underground, and be ferried to and from their accommodation. Underground? Below sea level? Liable to flood? A distance from accommodation? The Developer needs convincing that occupants will use their vehicles during their stay. They believe, so they say, that occupants will stay on site for the duration, or will use public transport. We all know this is not the way tourists behave when in Cornwall, with so many other attractions to sample.
- 2.14. Parking on site, we are told, will only be underground for residents. There will be a few spaces for the disabled. We are also told that all staff (500 ?) will park off site, on a site yet to be purchased, and none will be allowed on site, as there will be no provision. The top car park, to accommodate 179, will only be for the public, at a charge. Leaflet 3 shows the South West Coastal Path going straight across the proposed car park.
- 2.15. At the 2006 Public Enquiry it was stated that over **4,000 day visitors** would be needed for financial viability. Where will they park ? Few families will go by public

transport because of their beach accoutrements. In the past, the large car park at beach level was well-used by the public visiting the beach and its attractions.

- 2.16. The site will need continual servicing, with stock deliveries and maintenance, to say nothing of beach management. This will require vehicles, some large. From the plans seen so far, provision appears inadequate. Looking after the planted areas mentioned, and the cliff face, will need regular deliveries and sizeable plant. Sewage management details have yet to be seen.
 - 2.17. Most importantly, from a safety point of view Emergency vehicles, Ambulances, Fire engines and support vehicles and Police must have adequate access. The site is, of course, fed by a single, narrow steep road and, if there are only narrow access-ways on site, the Fire Service, for example, will find it difficult to cope. How would the high-lift equipment get into position? Flood and storm damage will occur on the Carlyon Bay Beach site and adequate provision must be built in for those who have to deal with the damage and potential chaos.
 - 2.18. St Ives, Looe, Mevagissey and Padstow, for example, may be very attractive for holidaymakers to wander around, but are a nightmare for the Fire Service. To be serviced by only one narrow steep access route aggravates the situation. We are currently seeing the need for vehicles, plant and machinery in big numbers to clean up nearby recent flood damage.
 - 2.19. These reservations are also reflected as above-reported in the results of the survey by Cllr. Oxenham, in which only a minority of respondents supported the size of the current proposals whereas the majority wanted a smaller development, or nothing at all. We still await the essential details of the proposed Section 106 Agreement and will wish to comment more extensively when it is available.
-