



# Cornwall Councillor's Report to Saltash Town Council

**Submitted by:** Cllr Keith Johnson

**Division:** Saltash Tamar

**Reporting period:** August 2026

## 1. New Road Zebra Crossing

Following concerns raised about the condition and visibility of the zebra crossing on New Road, the necessary renewal work has now been completed.

The refreshed road markings have significantly improved the visibility of the crossing and should make it clearer to approaching motorists. This is particularly important for children, older residents, people with disabilities and others who rely upon this crossing.

Cllr Keith Johnson would like to thank every resident, councillor and council officer who remained involved throughout what became a lengthy campaign to secure this essential work. Their persistence ensured that the concerns of the community could not be overlooked.

The completion of this work represents a true victory for road safety in Saltash. It also demonstrates what can be achieved when residents and their elected representatives work together and refuse to give up on an important local safety issue.

## Recommendations

It is recommended that Saltash Town Council:

1. Notes that the renewal work at the New Road zebra crossing has been completed.
2. Welcomes the improved visibility and safety of the crossing.
3. Formally recognises and thanks everybody who contributed to the lengthy campaign to secure the work.
4. Requests that Cornwall Council continues to monitor the crossing and its associated signs, markings, Belisha beacons and lighting through its routine highway-inspection programme.
5. Asks that any future deterioration affecting the visibility or safety of the crossing is addressed promptly.

6. Encourages residents and councillors to report faded pedestrian-crossing markings and other highway-safety defects at the earliest opportunity.

## 2. B3271 New Road Traffic-Speed Survey

Following concerns raised by residents regarding vehicle speeds, traffic noise and road safety on New Road, an automated traffic-speed survey was undertaken on the B3271 between **23 and 30 July 2026**.

Monitoring equipment was installed at two survey locations. Across the full survey period, more than **110,000 vehicle movements** were recorded, providing a substantial evidence base from which to assess traffic speeds.

### Summary of results

| Measure                            | Survey outcome                                                 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Survey period                      | 23–30 July 2026                                                |
| Number of monitoring locations     | 2                                                              |
| Total vehicle observations         | More than 110,000                                              |
| Recorded average speeds            | Approximately 25.9–28.2mph                                     |
| Recorded 85th-percentile speeds    | Approximately 30–32mph                                         |
| Compliance with the 30mph limit    | Approximately 76%–92%, depending on site, direction and period |
| Vehicles exceeding 40mph at Site 1 | Up to approximately 0.9%                                       |
| Vehicles exceeding 40mph at Site 2 | Approximately 0.4%                                             |

### Average vehicle speeds

The average speeds recorded across the different locations and directions were between approximately **25.9mph and 28.2mph**.

These averages were below the posted 30mph speed limit. On the evidence collected during the survey period, the majority of motorists were therefore travelling at or below the limit.

However, an average speed does not reveal every instance of speeding. A relatively small number of vehicles travelling at excessive speed can still create a serious danger, particularly near junctions, residential accesses and pedestrian crossing points.

### The 85th-percentile measurement

The 85th-percentile speed is the speed at or below which 85% of surveyed vehicles were travelling. It is commonly used by highway professionals to understand prevailing traffic speeds and driver behaviour.

The survey recorded 85th-percentile speeds of approximately **30–32mph**. This indicates that at some locations or in some directions, a meaningful minority of motorists were travelling above the 30mph limit, although generally not by a substantial margin.

The results do not demonstrate widespread, extreme speeding by the majority of motorists. They do, however, show that compliance is not universal and that vehicle speeds remain sufficiently high to justify continued attention, particularly where residents have reported concerns about pedestrian safety, traffic noise and isolated instances of aggressive driving.

### **Compliance with the speed limit**

Depending upon the location, direction of travel and survey period, recorded compliance with the 30mph limit ranged from approximately **76% to 92%**.

At the strongest-performing measurements, more than nine out of every ten drivers complied with the limit. At the weakest-performing measurements, approximately one vehicle in four was recorded above 30mph.

This variation is important. It suggests that driver behaviour may be influenced by the direction of travel, road layout, traffic conditions or the time of day. The headline average should therefore not be used to dismiss residents' experiences at particular locations or times.

### **Vehicles travelling above 40mph**

At Site 1, up to approximately **0.9%** of vehicles were recorded travelling above 40mph. At Site 2, the corresponding figure was approximately **0.4%**.

Although these percentages appear small, they should be considered alongside the very high volume of traffic using New Road. A small percentage of more than 110,000 vehicle movements can still represent a significant number of individual speeding incidents.

Vehicles travelling above 40mph in a 30mph residential area present a materially greater risk to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users. These higher-speed incidents are therefore a legitimate concern even though they do not represent the behaviour of most motorists.

### **Overall assessment**

The survey provides a balanced but important picture:

- Most motorists travelled within or close to the 30mph limit.
- Average recorded speeds were below 30mph.
- The 85th-percentile figures reached approximately 32mph in some measurements.
- Compliance varied considerably, falling to approximately 76% in the weakest-performing measurements.
- A small but persistent minority of vehicles travelled above 40mph.
- The volume of traffic means that even a relatively low percentage of speeding vehicles can translate into a noticeable number of incidents.

The evidence does not support a conclusion that the majority of drivers are travelling at extreme speeds. Equally, it would be wrong to conclude that there is no problem. The survey confirms that speeding does occur, including some vehicles travelling more than 10mph above the limit.

Residents' concerns also extend beyond average speed. Traffic volume, vehicle noise, acceleration, braking, the behaviour of individual motorists and the suitability of crossing and junction arrangements all affect the experience and safety of people living along New Road.

### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that Saltash Town Council:

1. Notes the results of the B3271 New Road traffic-speed survey undertaken between 23 and 30 July 2026.
2. Recognises that the majority of motorists were travelling within or close to the 30mph limit, but that a minority exceeded it, including some vehicles travelling above 40mph.
3. Requests that Cornwall Council provides the complete survey dataset, including hourly and directional breakdowns, so that peak periods and the weaker-performing location can be examined more closely.
4. Asks Cornwall Council's highway and road-safety officers to assess whether the variation between the two sites and directions identifies any particular location requiring further action.
5. Requests targeted speed-enforcement activity at the times and locations where the survey recorded the poorest compliance or highest speeds.
6. Supports the use of temporary vehicle-activated signs or speed-indicator devices at suitable locations to remind drivers of the 30mph limit.
7. Requests continued monitoring, particularly following any significant increase in traffic caused by development, road diversions or disruption affecting the Tamar Bridge and Saltash Tunnel.
8. Asks that any future assessment considers traffic volume, pedestrian movements, noise, acceleration and collision history alongside average vehicle speeds.
9. Encourages residents to continue reporting dangerous driving to the police, providing registration numbers, dates, times and video evidence where it is safe and lawful to do so.
10. Requests that the findings are retained as baseline evidence against which future traffic conditions on New Road can be compared.

### **3. Cornwall Council Budget and Debt Position**

Cornwall Council has begun preparing for another extremely challenging financial period. The latest reported position indicates that the authority is carrying approximately **£1.5 billion of debt**, with annual financing costs of approximately **£62.7 million**.

This means that around **£1.2 million every week** is being committed to financing the Council's borrowing. That is money which cannot simultaneously be spent on highways, social care, children's services, public transport, libraries or other frontline priorities.

It is important to explain that this is gross borrowing accumulated over many years, principally to finance capital investment. It is not the same as an annual revenue overspend, and some borrowing

is associated with assets or projects intended to generate income. Nevertheless, the scale of the debt and the cost of servicing it materially reduces the Council's financial flexibility.

### Latest headline figures

| Financial measure                                                                    | Latest reported position    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cornwall Council gross annual budget                                                 | Approximately £1.6 billion  |
| Council debt                                                                         | Approximately £1.5 billion  |
| Annual debt-financing cost                                                           | Approximately £62.7 million |
| Equivalent weekly financing cost                                                     | Approximately £1.2 million  |
| 2025/26 savings programme                                                            | Approximately £60 million   |
| Potential additional budget gap                                                      | Approximately £22 million   |
| Additional service savings being examined Up to approximately 5% of relevant budgets |                             |

### The 2025/26 savings position

The 2025/26 budget required a savings programme of approximately **£60 million**, following years of previous reductions and efficiency measures.

Although substantial savings and spending reductions were implemented, not all planned savings were delivered in full or within the timescales originally assumed. Where a saving is delayed or not achieved, the financial pressure does not disappear. It is carried forward and added to new inflationary, demand and service pressures.

This is particularly concerning because some previous budgets have depended upon proposed efficiencies, transformation programmes, additional income or reductions in spending that take time to implement. When those assumptions are not achieved, the Council must either:

- identify replacement savings;
- reduce other expenditure;
- generate additional income;
- use reserves, where lawful and sustainable;
- delay planned activity; or
- accept an overspend which must subsequently be recovered.

Reserves may provide temporary assistance, but they can only be spent once. They cannot permanently support recurring annual expenditure.

### Potential £22 million budget gap

The latest budget planning indicates a potential further shortfall of approximately **£22 million**.

This comes after the Council was already required to make approximately **£60 million of savings and reductions during 2025/26**. The £22 million figure should therefore not be viewed in isolation. It represents an additional challenge on top of substantial savings already demanded from services.

Council departments have reportedly been asked to examine options equivalent to approximately **5% of their relevant budgets**. These are options rather than automatic across-the-board cuts, but the exercise illustrates the seriousness of the position.

The eventual gap could change as assumptions concerning government funding, inflation, pay, interest rates, fees, council-tax income and service demand are updated. However, it is clear that difficult decisions will have to be made if a legally balanced budget is to be agreed.

### **Pressures on essential services**

The financial problem is not caused by one service or one decision. Cornwall Council continues to face significant and increasing pressures from:

- adult social-care demand and placement costs;
- children's social care;
- support for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities;
- home-to-school and SEND transport;
- homelessness and temporary accommodation;
- staff pay and contractual inflation;
- highways and infrastructure maintenance;
- waste and environmental services; and
- the cost of financing existing borrowing.

Many of these are statutory services which the Council is legally required to provide. That limits the areas in which spending can be reduced quickly and increases the risk that discretionary and preventative services face disproportionate pressure.

### **Debt and financial resilience**

A debt figure of **£1.5 billion** must be treated seriously, but it should also be described accurately. Local authorities commonly borrow to finance long-term capital projects and infrastructure, and borrowing cannot simply be equated with day-to-day financial loss.

The central questions are:

- whether each borrowing decision was affordable and justified;
- whether the resulting asset or project is delivering the expected public or financial benefit;
- whether income forecasts were realistic;
- whether refinancing and interest-rate risks are being managed;
- whether projects remain within their approved budgets; and
- whether annual debt costs leave sufficient resources for essential services.

At approximately **£62.7 million a year**, the financing cost alone is equivalent to around **£172,000 every day**. This underlines why borrowing, investment and capital projects must be subjected to continuing scrutiny rather than judged only when initially approved.

### **Impact on residents and town councils**

Further reductions could have a direct impact upon services experienced locally in Saltash, including:

- highway maintenance and road markings;
- public transport support;
- community and preventative services;
- environmental maintenance;
- youth and family support;
- libraries and cultural services; and
- the availability of Cornwall Council funding for local projects.

There is also a risk that financial pressure at Cornwall Council results in further expectations being placed upon town and parish councils. Any request for Saltash Town Council to assume additional responsibilities must be accompanied by transparent information about costs, liabilities, staffing and long-term funding.

Services should not be transferred simply to remove expenditure from Cornwall Council's accounts while leaving local council taxpayers to meet the same cost through a higher town precept.

### Overall assessment

The position can be summarised as follows:

- Cornwall Council is carrying approximately **£1.5 billion of debt**.
- Financing that debt is costing approximately **£62.7 million annually**.
- The 2025/26 budget depended upon approximately **£60 million of savings and reductions**.
- Not all planned savings were achieved in full or within their original timetable.
- A potential additional budget gap of approximately **£22 million** has been identified.
- Services are being asked to examine savings options equivalent to approximately **5% of relevant budgets**.
- Increasing demand for statutory care and support services continues to restrict the Council's ability to reduce spending without consequences.

These figures demonstrate that the Council cannot continue relying upon optimistic savings assumptions or postponing difficult decisions. Future budgets must be based upon realistic, deliverable and independently scrutinised plans.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that Saltash Town Council:

1. Notes Cornwall Council's reported debt position of approximately **£1.5 billion** and annual financing costs of approximately **£62.7 million**.
2. Notes the potential additional budget gap of approximately **£22 million**, following a 2025/26 savings programme of around **£60 million**.
3. Expresses concern that not all savings assumed within the 2025/26 budget were delivered in full or within their planned timescales.
4. Requests that Cornwall Council publishes a clear service-by-service schedule showing:
  - each saving approved for 2025/26;
  - the amount actually delivered;
  - savings delayed or not achieved;
  - the reason for each variance;
  - the replacement action proposed; and

- any effect upon the 2026/27 and later budgets.
- 5. Requests a clear breakdown of the Council's approximately **£1.5 billion debt**, identifying:
  - the principal projects or purposes for which borrowing was undertaken;
  - the outstanding balance;
  - the applicable interest or financing cost;
  - the repayment period;
  - the assets held against the borrowing; and
  - the income or public benefit being delivered.
- 6. Calls for enhanced scrutiny of major capital projects, commercial investments and council-owned companies to ensure that expected returns and public benefits are being achieved.
- 7. Requests that frontline and statutory services are protected as far as reasonably possible, with priority given to eliminating waste, duplication, avoidable consultancy expenditure and ineffective projects.
- 8. Asks Cornwall Council to consult town and parish councils at an early stage about proposals that could affect local services.
- 9. States that no service or asset should be transferred to Saltash Town Council without a full assessment of staffing, maintenance, legal liability, future capital costs and sustainable funding.
- 10. Requests regular public updates throughout the budget-setting process so residents can understand the choices being considered before final decisions are made.
- 11. Calls for future budgets to distinguish clearly between confirmed savings, savings still under development and proposals that remain dependent upon untested assumptions.
- 12. Requests that the final budget includes an equality and community-impact assessment explaining how proposed reductions could affect vulnerable residents and communities such as Saltash.

#### **4. Section 106 Affordable Housing at Treledan and Plymouth Community Homes**

Cllr Keith Johnson has raised a series of questions about the acquisition, allocation and long-term management of Section 106 affordable housing at the Treledan development in Saltash by Plymouth Community Homes.

The purpose of these questions is not to make allegations against individual tenants or to suggest, without evidence, that Plymouth Community Homes has acted unlawfully. It is to establish clearly whether the affordable homes are being allocated in accordance with the relevant Section 106 agreements, Cornwall Council's housing-allocation policies and the local-connection criteria intended to benefit Saltash and the surrounding area.

##### **Number and tenure of homes**

Published information indicates that Plymouth Community Homes has secured two significant packages of affordable housing at Treledan:

##### **Treledan affordable-housing provision    Number of homes**

|                                     |     |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| First-phase Section 106 acquisition | 107 |
| First-phase affordable-rent homes   | 65  |
| First-phase shared-ownership homes  | 42  |

|                                        |            |
|----------------------------------------|------------|
| Second-phase acquisition               | 54         |
| Second-phase affordable-rent homes     | 34         |
| Second-phase shared-ownership homes    | 20         |
| <b>Combined total secured by PCH</b>   | <b>161</b> |
| <b>Combined affordable-rent total</b>  | <b>99</b>  |
| <b>Combined shared-ownership total</b> | <b>62</b>  |

Plymouth Community Homes originally agreed to acquire **107 affordable homes** in the first phase of Treledan. Published PCH information identifies these as **65 affordable-rent properties and 42 shared-ownership homes**.

In December 2025, PCH announced that it had secured a further **54 homes** in the second phase being developed by Bloor Homes. Of these, **34 are intended for affordable rent and 20 for shared ownership**.

Taken together, the published figures indicate that Plymouth Community Homes has secured **161 affordable homes at Treledan**, comprising **99 affordable-rent properties and 62 shared-ownership homes**.

This represents a very substantial proportion of the affordable housing being provided within this major Saltash development.

### **Local housing need**

Cornwall Council has stated that more than **500 households with a local connection to Saltash** are registered as needing social housing.

This level of recorded demand makes it essential that the Section 106 homes intended to meet local need are allocated transparently and in the correct priority order.

The published Treledan eligibility information indicates that the primary local-connection area includes:

- Saltash;
- Antony;
- Botus Fleming;
- Landrake;
- Landulph; and
- Sheviock.

A secondary connection may extend more widely across Cornwall, depending upon the exact wording of the applicable Section 106 agreement and the relevant cascade arrangements.

The precise provisions may differ between development phases or individual agreements. Cornwall Council must therefore publish or provide the actual criteria applying to each group of affordable homes rather than relying upon general assurances.

## Role of Plymouth Community Homes

Plymouth Community Homes is a registered provider of social housing whose principal housing stock has historically been in Plymouth. A registered provider is not automatically prevented from acquiring and managing affordable housing in Cornwall.

The central issue is therefore not simply that the provider is based outside Cornwall. The important questions are:

- which authority controls nominations;
- which housing register is used;
- what local-connection criteria apply;
- how the Section 106 cascade operates;
- whether the correct cascade stages are exhausted before eligibility is widened; and
- how compliance is monitored and enforced.

PCH has stated publicly that the Treledan homes will be prioritised for people with a local connection and that Cornwall Council has supported the arrangement. Cornwall Council's Homechoice system also lists PCH as a partner landlord.

However, residents are entitled to see how those commitments operate in practice, particularly where all the affordable units within significant phases appear to have been acquired by one provider.

## Questions raised by Cllr Keith Johnson

Cllr Johnson is seeking clear written answers from Plymouth Community Homes and Cornwall Council to the following questions.

### Acquisition and funding

1. Has Plymouth Community Homes acquired, contracted to acquire or secured nomination or management rights over a total of **161 affordable homes at Treledan**?
2. How many of these properties have been completed, transferred, occupied, advertised or remain under construction?
3. What is the tenure of every property, broken down between affordable rent, social rent, shared ownership and any other category?
4. Were all 161 homes secured through Section 106 obligations, or was any part of the acquisition supported through Homes England grant, Cornwall Council funding or another public subsidy?
5. What purchase price or valuation methodology was used for the affordable units?
6. Did PCH receive any bulk-purchase discount or other commercial incentive from either developer?
7. What involvement did Cornwall Council have in approving or facilitating the transactions?
8. Was other-registered housing providers invited or given an opportunity to acquire any of the affordable homes?

## **Section 106 agreements**

9. Which Section 106 agreement, deed of variation or supplemental agreement applies to each phase and group of properties?
10. What exact definition of “local connection” applies?
11. What is the geographical order of priority within the allocation cascade?
12. How long must each cascade stage operate before eligibility can be widened?
13. Does the agreement require an applicant to be on Cornwall Homechoice, or can PCH nominate applicants through another route?
14. Does Cornwall Council retain full nomination rights over the affordable-rent properties?
15. If nomination rights are shared, what proportion is controlled by Cornwall Council and what proportion by PCH?
16. Were any amendments made to the original local-connection criteria or nomination arrangements to enable PCH to acquire or let the homes?
17. Can the Section 106 restrictions be varied, waived or discharged in the future, and which body would have authority to approve such a change?

## **Allocation of affordable-rent homes**

18. How many affordable-rent homes have been allocated to households with a primary connection to Saltash?
19. How many have been allocated through connections with Antony, Botus Fleming, Landrake, Landulph or Sheviock?
20. How many allocations have proceeded to the secondary Cornwall-wide stage?
21. Have any homes been allocated to households without a qualifying connection to the defined primary or secondary areas?
22. Has any applicant been nominated through Plymouth City Council, another local authority or an allocation list other than Cornwall Home choice?
23. Has any household been placed at Treledan to discharge another council’s homelessness duty?
24. Can another council refer or place a household in a Treledan Section 106 property without Cornwall Council confirming that the applicant satisfies the applicable local-connection criteria?
25. What evidence must applicants provide to demonstrate residence, employment, family association or another qualifying connection?
26. Who verifies that evidence—PCH or Cornwall Council?
27. What audit process is used to ensure the cascade has been followed correctly for every allocation?

## **Temporary accommodation and local connection**

28. Can time spent in temporary accommodation—including a hotel, Travelodge or other nightly-paid accommodation—count towards the required period of residence?
29. If temporary accommodation was arranged by a different council, would that period establish a local connection with Saltash or Cornwall?
30. Does physical residence alone qualify, or must it be accompanied by an established voluntary connection with the area?
31. Are periods of residence disregarded where a person was placed in the area by another local authority?

32. How are competing local connections assessed where an applicant has links with both Cornwall and another authority?

These questions are important because a person can physically reside in an area without necessarily acquiring every form of statutory or Section 106 local connection. The result depends upon the precise agreement and allocation policy.

No assumption should therefore be made that two or three years in temporary accommodation either automatically qualifies or automatically disqualifies an applicant. Cornwall Council should provide a definitive written interpretation of the relevant Treledan agreement.

### **Shared-ownership homes**

33. How are the **62 shared-ownership homes** advertised?
34. What local-connection and affordability tests apply to purchasers?
35. For how long must the homes be marketed to applicants from the primary local area before the geographical search is widened?
36. How many shared-ownership properties have been sold to purchasers with a Saltash connection?
37. What minimum and maximum initial shares are available?
38. What rent, service charge and other monthly costs apply to the unsold equity?
39. Can owner's staircase to 100% ownership and, if so, what mechanism ensures that an equivalent affordable-housing benefit is retained?
40. What restrictions apply when a shared owner wishes to sell the property?

### **Future management and accountability**

41. Will PCH retain ownership and management of these properties permanently?
42. Could the homes or management responsibilities subsequently be transferred to another provider?
43. How will tenants access repairs, complaints and housing-management services locally?
44. Does PCH maintain a permanent housing-management presence in Cornwall?
45. Which organisation is responsible for dealing with estate-management concerns affecting both PCH tenants and neighbouring residents?
46. How frequently does Cornwall Council audit compliance with the Section 106 agreement?
47. What enforcement action would be available if a property were allocated outside the permitted cascade?
48. Will Cornwall Council and PCH publish annual anonymised figures showing the local-connection category under which each Treledan home was allocated?

### **Transparency and data protection**

Cllr Johnson is not requesting the names, personal histories or confidential circumstances of individual tenants. Those details must remain private.

However, data protection should not prevent the publication of anonymised totals showing:

- the number of properties allocated;
- the applicable cascade stage;
- the broad local-connection area;

- whether the nomination came through Cornwall Homechoice;
- the number of unsuccessful local applicants; and
- the number of properties progressing beyond the primary local area.

This information would allow the community to assess whether the system is delivering its intended purpose without identifying individual households.

### Overall position

The delivery of **161 affordable homes** is potentially a significant benefit for Saltash, particularly when more than **500 locally connected households** are reported to be waiting for social housing.

The concern is not about the personal background of tenants, nor should residents moving into affordable housing be treated with suspicion. The legitimate issue is whether a scarce public benefit created through the planning system is being distributed according to the legally agreed rules.

Cllr Johnson supports the provision of genuinely affordable homes but believes that Cornwall Council and PCH must demonstrate:

- openness over the acquisition arrangements;
- strict adherence to the Section 106 agreements;
- priority for qualifying local households;
- transparent operation of every cascade stage;
- proper monitoring and enforcement; and
- accountability for the use of public subsidy and planning obligations.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that Saltash Town Council:

1. Notes that published information indicates Plymouth Community Homes has secured **161 affordable homes at Treledan**, consisting of **99 affordable-rent homes and 62 shared-ownership properties**.
2. Welcomes the provision of additional affordable housing while recognising the substantial unmet need among households with a connection to Saltash.
3. Supports Cllr Keith Johnson's request for detailed written answers from Cornwall Council and Plymouth Community Homes.
4. Requests copies of the relevant Section 106 agreements, deeds of variation and nomination agreements applying to every phase of Treledan.
5. Requests a definitive written explanation of the local-connection cascade, including how residence in temporary accommodation is treated.
6. Asks Cornwall Council to confirm whether any Treledan affordable-rent property can be allocated through Plymouth City Council or another local authority.
7. Requests anonymised allocation figures showing how many homes were allocated at each stage of the local-connection cascade.
8. Requests equivalent information for shared-ownership sales, including the number purchased by applicants with a primary Saltash-area connection.
9. Calls upon Cornwall Council to audit the allocations already completed and confirm that each complied with the applicable Section 106 agreement.

10. Requests that future allocations and shared-ownership sales are reported annually in an anonymised and publicly accessible format.
11. Asks that Saltash Town Council is consulted before any material variation to the local-connection, tenure or nomination provisions is approved.
12. Reaffirms that scrutiny must focus upon the decisions of the responsible organisations and not upon individual tenants, whose privacy and dignity must be respected.
13. Calls for all future major housing developments in Saltash to include clear, enforceable and publicly available local-connection arrangements from the outset.
14. Requests that Cornwall Council considers whether concentrating all affordable homes from a major development in the ownership of a single provider creates any governance, competition, resilience or accountability risks.

Cornwall Councillor Keith Johnson – End of report.