

John & Jill Scarrott - Resident

Having read through the section on housing policy it appears to us that there is very little comment on social housing. Question 7 of the original survey was about this subject and received a lot of attention but this is not reflected in the draft plan. We as a community need to provide a percentage of affordable housing in order to retain the younger people in our community who are trying to get on the housing ladder and do not have the luxury of highly paid jobs. Perhaps this might be addressed in any revision of the draft plan. Regards John and Jill Scarrott

Suzette Gale - Resident

hello,
i would like to respond to the neighbourhood plan and development of the parish going forward, i am not in favour of the placement of wind turbines and solar farms, although i would favour individual property's the chance to have renewable systems in or on their own homes, i do not see any gain for the community in allowing wind turbines and solar farms having seen the way the bray shop solar farm has ruined that area and its natural beauty ,cornwall and south hill is as the plan states limited when it comes to infrastructure and therefore industry ,we do however live in an area of what is uninterrupted open countryside with small villages and hamlets ,most people live in this area because of what it is now, not plastered in new homes and solar farms and turbines , i am in agreement with your suggested business policy and that you offer the chance of small rural start ups, change of use of disused farm buildings etc, i think that as south hill is a largely farming region more support or diversification will be a necessity and should be supported where possible with such things as campsites , or the current trend of glamping which can offer a great financial return and which is the sort of tourism which links easily into a working farm and could bring many spin offs and local employment ,overall i think having looked at many other plans, south hills is concise without being over written in detail, which i think allows it to be flexible going forward and fully support it

suzette gale

John & Marilyn Tasker - Residents

Dear Mrs Hoskin

We would like to make the following comments re the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan: -

It is stated within 5. View of the Community: -

"The majority favoured affordable family homes for sale in any appropriate individual site within the parish"

In light of the comments made, could a further point be added that the majority do not favour any more social rented housing in Golberdon. This is in view of the existing and disproportionate amount of this type of "affordable housing" in Golberdon which can only really be described as a hamlet. There were various comments which highlighted the fact that affordable houses are not really "affordable" and are unsustainable in rural locations. Tenants of social rented housing are low income households and are better located in an area where there are full amenities, schools etc. rather than in rural locations. Could it be emphasised in the Neighbourhood Plan that Golberdon already has a disproportionate amount of social rented housing and the general view is that no further social housing is needed. A planning pre-application in 2014 for 8 further social rented houses in Moorland View was not proceeded with when it was established that there were 11 applicants on the Home Choice waiting list, opting to be housed in Golberdon, none of whom were from South Hill Parish and all were already adequately housed in Category E, Home Choice's lowest band of housing need.

In 4. Description of the Parish

It is stated that part of the Parish is within an Area of Great Landscape Value. Consideration should be given to allowing this to remain untouched and mention of this made in the NDP? Many of the comments mention the appeal of the rural location of South Hill Parish. Could this be emphasised more strongly within the document with particular respect to the AGLV. With regard to development – If housing development continues to increase, even at a low level, (10% ?) and the next NDP increases it again, this is development creep and slide into conurbation and the really rural character of South Hill Parish will disappear.

Many thanks

John and Marilyn Tasker

Ivan Callanan - Residents

Dear Parish Councillors,

We have lived in South Hill Parish for 12+ years. During this time we have established three new businesses here. First a Farm Holiday Cottage business which is in its 10th year. This was followed by a food business which has now been sold and a website design business. In the community I was part of the team that produced the Parish Plan and former parish councillor.

I struggled through the proposed plan and came out the other end none the wiser as to what is being proposed. What is clear is that we took part in a survey a couple of years ago and the wishes of the parish do not appear to be covered by this plan. I would go as far to say the previous Parish Plan which you may remember had its title for the open day "Your Plan, Your Day" had far more relevance to what is wanted in our parish than this proposal. The results of the survey should be reflected in the plan, otherwise what was the point of the survey in the first place. It is presented in a way that most of the general public would show no interest in its content and just ignore it. When I was a councillor, I had serious doubts at what was being suggested and I'm afraid as far as I'm concerned this proposal doesn't do much to get me enthused.

Best regards

Juan Callanan

John Packer – NDP Team Member

I wish to comment on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan as follows:

My main comment is that a lot of the Plan is not supported by evidence, and would not therefore stand up to scrutiny or challenge.

The Planning Advisory Service of the Local Government Association is quite clear that in order to comply with the basic conditions in the Localism Act and the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning regulations, the need for evidence to underpin a neighbourhood plan is important.

I am not aware of any public consultation within the Parish which supports Business Policies B1 and B2. They may be excellent policies, but the original Residents Survey sought no local opinion on B1 (a) i or B2 (a) i & ii.

Interestingly, these two policies have a striking similarity to those set out in the Quethiock Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Policy H1 (a) iv sets out a sensible policy for housing for rural workers, but where is the local evidence to support it?

Even where the Residents Survey asked for local views, the draft policy does not always reflect the answers.

For example, 50% of respondents felt that new affordable housing to purchase within the parish should have a local occupancy condition. Policy H1 (a) makes no reference to a local occupancy condition.

Finally, I don't understand why the strong feelings expressed in the survey on solar panels on the ground, and wind turbines do not been given strength in policies within the Plan, as they are major planning issues which have the potential to affect the lives of many people in the Parish

In conclusion, although I think that a challenge is fairly unlikely, I repeat that in my opinion, the Draft Neighbourhood Plan would not stand up to scrutiny, which is very sad given the high level of local enthusiasm at the beginning of the process.

John Packer

Ali Humphreys – NDP Team Member

I voted against this Draft Plan going to the Parish Council as I felt it was not a true reflection of the views of the parish as presented in the Residents Survey.

We asked the people of South Hill to fill out the residents surveys and had a 81% return rate, they expect the steering committee and the Parish council to produce a plan based on the evidence collated.

At first glance of the Policies, there is ONE Housing policy TWO Business policies and THREE Community policies. This just isn't consistent with the Resident's Survey results.

The idea was to use Quethiocks Plan as a template then amend the Draft Plan to reflect the views of our parish, how can we just copy The Vision and Objectives and Policies from another parish.

To date 14/09/2016 not all details have been uploaded to the PC web site so people don't have all the information.

Where is the supporting evidence going to come from? Maybe we need to ask more questions.

The Steering Committee proved they do not have the knowledge or time to write our plan. We should have a professional to develop our plan, I believe there is money for this.

There are omissions and errors I feel still need addressing. Here are some as I go through the plan.

2.2 **Inviting them to make comments and observations on a number of different topics.** The survey was divided into sections. Housing and Building, The Environment we live in, Renewable Energy, The Local Economy and About your household. I feel this should be added.

2.3 also present were representatives from The Ramblers, Tamar Grow Local & SHARE ... should be added and have these been contacted for comment.

The results of this survey will be further discussed in Section 5 with the survey results being published as part of the Evidence Base Document (EBD). Published where?

Caradon Community Network Area (CNA) The Caradon C.N.A should be explained as being made up of St. Ive, Linkinhorne, Callington, Stoke Climsland, Calstock, St Dominick, Pillaton, St. Mellion parishes and all these should be asked for comment.

4.2 Description is misleading, sounds like the football pitch and children's play area are a separate area from the rec field, should say the Recreation Field in Golberdon contains the parish hall (the map should show this on Pg 15), football pitch and a fenced children's play park, there is also an allotment field adjacent with 14 good sized plots.

4.5 States 203 dwellings on page 5 and 214 on page 8 ?

4.7 To say **a number of listed buildings** doesn't reflect the heritage important held by residents, we have a record of listed buildings and structures.

Page 6

5.2 **full results are published separately** ... where.... ?

In general.... Housing in line.. why not say **residents supported up to 20 new homes within the parish, over the next 20 years...**

Affordable family homes ... affordable housing to purchase with local occupancy restriction was important to the residents what does **in any appropriate individual site** mean? Non descriptive waffle.

Any benefits provided by a developer..... where was this discussed.... Comments suggested they didn't want developers building.

The Parish Hall, Rec Ground (should be Field), St Sampson's, where does it say should be protected from development.?

The Pump at Egypt and the Medieval and Post-Medieval Bridges and heritage assets such as the war memorial, troughs, stones & wells, were all important to residents.
List the Heritage sites named in the survey.

Page 7 not our **vision and objectives**

The residents survey showed people want to protect the overall rural character of the parish, protect our heritage and named structures, improve our footpaths, were supportive of new homes, renewable energy, wanted better infrastructure, and when asked what do you see as the major challenges facing the parish in the next 20 years responded: support ageing population, lack of public transport, over development, renewable energy, rural identity, lack of amenities, poverty, increased traffic, loss of young families, decline in farming.

The youth of the parish were asked what do we need to make this a better place in the future, 3 suggestions were given with evenly divided replies, more clubs & activities for young people and encourage new small businesses here, a few more want better public transport facilities. Comments suggested they would like a shop, post office, sweetshop, more activities and a wood.

Questions in the survey that attracted the most comments were **Which buildings are important because of their historical connection** and overwhelmingly the Church was the most common answer, the 2nd highest question that attracted the most comments was a follow up to **Do you experience problems with speeding vehicles in the parish and where**, many have encountered speeding and listed areas of concern around the parish. I feel a mention should be included to show we took this onboard.

People stated in the survey they'd like an appraisal to identify specific conservation sites within the parish and a heritage audit of the parish to secure heritage sites. Neither have come to fruition but could be in the future.

Page 8

7.2 confusing **The supporting text below each policy...** yet it's before the policy

Target of 520 new dwellings... page 4 says 510... not sure how the rest is supposed to add up... if you take 510 minus 480 allocated to Callington leaves 30 between Caradon C N A SO are the 150 completions and 304 with planning permission or under construction in Callington or the whole area ?

The rest is just all copied from Quethiock's plan.

Page 9

Infill development of one or two dwellings in the village, hamlets and small settlements.... This wasn't in the survey comments , which said Single homes rather than grouped

Housing for a rural worker..... Why include this when it's caused so much anguish in the parish already.

The rest is so wishy washy... **to preserve and enhance the green infrastructures which helps give the area it's unique character...** what does it mean?..... if we're going to have policies they should contain words like must, demand they are followed and not leave room for misinterpretation. New builds must plant and maintain additional trees, keep hedges and rebuild any hedges damaged.

d. probably the best example of a non policy. Bats and owls (selected wildlife) need more than boxes to survive.

Business & Community Policies ALL direct copy from Quethiock's Plan, there were no details in the survey, so no supporting evidence, the wording is weak (ie **would not give rise to an "unacceptable" increase of road traffic**) and doesn't translate to our parish. We should be encouraging not restricting business and employment opportunities. **Applications which enhance the children's play area will be supported**, this wording is so ambiguous.

What else is missing ...

There was a whole section on **Renewable Energy** yet no policies have been developed to reflect the parish support . We should aim to promote energy efficiency and to reduce energy costs and create our own sources of renewable energies to provide a secure energy supply for the future of the Parish.

I cant write policy but someone will be able to word all this correctly.

R E Projects should be owned by our residents and community groups that will ensure all benefits stay within the parish ANY proposals from a developer or persons outside the parish will not be entertained.

Footpaths had much support, a policy should demonstrate they are an asset to preserve, maintain and promote.

Well written planning policies will help protect our environment and safeguard wildlife habitats and encourage growth of businesses to support local employment. We need expert help to do this.

The survey also raised more questions that have not been addressed, many answered don't know because they didn't have enough information, maybe another survey (by email) would help clarify some areas and help to resolve some issues that have arisen. Maybe an expert should help compile this.

We're planning ahead to 2030. Here are further topics people in the parish have talked about. Lets get people thinking.

Future plans could explore ways to reduce the dependency on car use, by car sharing, for work, shopping, recreation, use of community transport & electric vehicles.

Promote better recycling, through policies, tradesmen shouldn't be penalized at recycling centres which just adds to costs and fly tipping. Energy efficient building materials and new techniques must be used.

Encourage composting, water conservation, recycle garden waste, eliminate one use plastics.

Infrastructure needs addressing

Promote dark skies policies to reduce light pollution.

Broadband for all. & Improve Mobile phone coverage

Ageing in place, provision of health services.

A survey could ask what people think is important now and in the future.

As part of the NP Steering Group at the Horticultural Show, I was tasked with asking people if they had read the plan and made comments, here are the results.....

I've read the Draft and sent comments	I've read and will send comments	I've read and will not comment	I have not read but will do	I'll read and Probably comment	I'll read but not likely to comment	I'm not really That interested
0	5	5	9	8	0	2
10 said they'd read it			17 said they will read			2 not interested

I hope we can salvage this and with expert help produce a Plan that all can agree with, right now I feel the Draft Plan is very disappointing and doesn't represent our parish views.

Ali Humphreys

David Skelton – NDP Team Member

I was born in South Hill parish and have lived and worked here nearly all of my life. I own property and a farm in the parish. As well as the farm business, I am also an electrical contractor, based in the parish.

I have been a parish councillor for 12 years, taking a particular interest in planning and attended numerous planning training events. I chaired the steering group which developed the South Hill Parish Plan. I have always supported the concept of an NP and went to a few training sessions before the Parish Council decided to produce a neighbourhood plan. Although not initially part of the NDP steering group, I was fully involved with all aspects of the survey and the results presentation.

Residents and Consultees have been asked to comment on the draft NDP and I will do so later but I do not believe that a neighbourhood plan which is fit for purpose can be developed with the process that has been followed since the survey results presentation (effectively during 2016).

Public engagement is a fundamental part of the process of developing a Neighbourhood Plan and our residents have shown their willingness to be involved;

- The response rate to the survey was 82%
- Many people took the time to write detailed comments on the survey
- Good turnout at results presentation event

Had the guidance available from Cornwall Council and Locality been followed, there is a wealth of material that could have been developed into a Vision for South Hill Parish for the next 14 years. From what we know about our parish and the issues raised, I suggest that the vision should include:

Demographics, aging population, few children staying to live and work in the parish. Few families with children moving in.

- Climate change
- Housing needs
- Sustainability –transport, energy, recycling
- Local economy
- Landscape. Farming and the needs of the wider community
- Infrastructure
- Access to services

We should be reaching out to those who have an interest in the future of this parish and finding out what their concerns and needs are. This could include those running businesses, those with health problems, our youth, etc. These groups have no formal structure and wouldn't normally get involved in local politics, but they should be involved now.

If you have read thus far and can see merit in my comments you need to read no further. If this consultation is only to consider comments made on the draft neighbourhood plan then I am afraid you will need to read on.

THE DRAFT PLAN

Two different versions of the draft NDP have been published on the Parish Council website during the consultation period. I wrote the following comments in August when version (319-1853864736.pdf) was on the website. The late document was (318.227.pdf)

2. The NDP Process.

2.3 It was stated at the final public consultation event, when the survey results were presented (March 15th 2015), that the summary of survey results would be published. There was no publicity until they were put on the South Hill Connection website in August 2016.

It was stated in the survey summary that although there was not room to print all the comments made, they would be available on line. This was not done. Some of the comments were put on the Parish Council's website part way through the pre-submission consultation period. The page states that all of the comments made in the survey are attached. They are not. The comments made in response to the Local Economy and Your Household sections and the back page comments are all missing.

2.4 No. The NP team did not follow the guidance available from Cornwall Council and Locality. Rather than using the EBD to develop our own vision and objectives, policies were simply copied from the Quethiock NP.

4. Description of the parish.

4.2 The play area and football pitch are not separate entities. The recreation field contains the Parish Hall, play area and football pitch.

4.3 South Hill Parish Council owns farmland in Maders, the former allotment fields behind the bus shelter and the recreation field referred to in 4.2

Cornwall Council owns 8(?) houses and the field between Moorland View and Trewoodloe Lane.

4.7 A reference to Landscape Character Areas 25 and 26 would help.

There is a churchyard surrounding St Sampsons and a Methodist cemetery in Golberdon.

This is living, working parish not some bucolic, rural idyll. This section should include:- Most of the parish is farmland which is farmed, moderately intensively by 19 family farming businesses. Most farm buildings are clustered near the farmhouses located throughout the parish. Most of the land is suitable for growing crops or grazing.

Fields in the Lyhner valley and tributaries tend to be smaller, steeper and only suitable for grazing. Crops grown include potatoes, wheat, barley, oats, maize and grass for silage, hay and grazing. Economic pressure and bTB has caused the number of dairy farms to decline from a peak of 45 to just 3. A typical farm now has a mixture of sheep, beef and arable. These businesses are responsible for maintaining much of the landscape so valued by many residents and commented on in the survey. There are numerous examples of habitat creation, hedgerow reconstruction, tree planting etc. Other businesses include an agricultural contractor with a large grain storage and processing facility, and agricultural machinery sales and hire business, a cabinet works, five building contractors, a plant hire business, a small food manufacturer, a cold store/butchery, a vehicle body repair and paint spraying business and a car sales business. There are numerous small businesses either operating from or in people's homes (16% according to the survey). Additionally there are holiday businesses including at least 11 holiday lets, several B and B businesses and a caravan and camping site.

There is a 5MW solar farm in the parish, numerous small areas of woodland and a significant area used for grazing horses.

The main roads serving the parish are two lane for most of their length and nearly all parts of the parish can be accessed by large commercial vehicles. Golberdon, Egypt and Trewoodloe are connected to a mains sewer. Elsewhere, properties use septic tanks which are well suited to the topography and geology. The capacity of the electricity, telephone and water services infrastructure is unlikely to limit development. There is no mains gas. Superfast fibre broadband is available in half the parish and there are proposals to make it available elsewhere.

5. View of the Community.

5.1 No. There has been no discussion of how infrastructure would limit development in the parish.

There has been no discussion with any of the community groups that operate in the parish. These groups are important because they are the usual way that our residents meet together. They have the Parish Hall booked for months ahead!

5.2 Summary

4th bullet. There was support for redevelopment of disused farm sites and redundant buildings, not just "disused farm buildings"

5th bullet. This was copied from Quethiock. There has been no consultation on how benefits from a developer should be used. However, there were comments made that “developers” should not be building new houses in South Hill.

6th bullet. Most residents are in favour of all forms of roof mounted solar PV. The word “domestic” was not used in the survey and there were no comments to support this limitation. There was not support for “large scale ground based solar panels” but opinion on wind turbines was mixed.

7th Recreation field is the term that everyone I know uses.

8th As this is a summary, the wording should be general, as wells and other structures were mentioned.

6. Vision and Objectives.

6.1 Vision. In the Survey introduction it says, “We hope to publish our “vision” early in the new year (2015) and will hold a public meeting where everyone can comment on it”

There has been no discussion within the NP team or community consultation to develop a Vision. This has been copied word for word.

The Parish of Quethiock has established appropriate new housing to meet the Parish’s needs for new, and especially affordable homes, by utilising any suitable sites within the Parish.

The Parish of South Hill has established appropriate new housing to meet the Parish’s needs for new and affordable homes by utilising any suitable sites within the Parish.

6.2 Objectives. There has been no discussion within the NP team or community consultation to develop a Vision. This has been copied.

To meet the vision a number of objectives have been identified and are outlined within the policies:

To meet the vision a number of objectives have been identified and are outlined within the policies: (policies C1 & C2)

7. Policies.

Without a genuine Vision and Objectives for South Hill parish, it is hard to see what basis there is for any resultant policies.

Housing Policies. (there is only one)

Supporting text.

1) The number of dwellings is not consistent with paragraph 4.5.

The statement “is amongst the least developed parishes in Cornwall; with an infrastructure largely unchanged since the mid-twentieth century.” is not one I recognise but this might be a clue “Quethiock is amongst the least developed parishes in Cornwall with road infrastructure largely unchanged since the mid-twentieth century”.

Our infrastructure is fairly typical of most rural Cornish parishes.

Most readers will not be aware of the other parishes contained within the Caradon Community Network Area.

Policy H1. Housing development.

a.i There was support for single properties rather than groups. The proposed text could be interpreted to mean a cap of one or two dwellings per village/hamlet/ settlement for which there is no evidence.

a.iii.and farm sites.

a.iv. This policy is already local and nation policy. Abuse of this policy has caused some local resentment but there has been no consultation on this to develop a NP policy.

c. What is “green infrastructure” ? This area does not have a unique character. Refer to LCA 25 and 26. A requirement to plant trees without also a requirement to keep them is of little value.

d. Why not make this a must rather than “encouraged and supported”? It is not a particularly onerous requirement. I’m no expert on bats but I do know that they prefer a cool stable temperature so a bat box built into the structure of a new house generally will have better thermal properties.

Business Policies.

Supporting text. There has been no discussion of this text, it does not describe the parish that I know and again is largely copied from the Quethiock NP.

There were few questions on business in the survey and there has been no public consultation since, so there is little evidence to support the proposed policies other than 30% of the young people wanted to work in this area and wanted new small businesses to be encouraged here. There has been no discussion of the need to balance the need for economic development against the impact that new commercial buildings or conversions might have. In the absence of any discussion, there is a proposed policy which supports new build business premises of a scale and design in keeping with the local area. A cheaper design, well screened may be just as acceptable? The test that “there is no existing building suitable for conversion” is

unreasonable if such a building is not available at an economic price. The list of business uses in policy B2 are irrelevant to this parish, do not include those uses listed in the supporting text and do not include any of the uses to which buildings in the parish are currently being put without any problems at all. Had there been any consultation with the farmers, it is likely that the need for some farmers to diversify in order to supplement their agricultural income to a sustainable level, would have been recognised. This could have been supported with a business policy.

Community policies.

There were no questions about the Parish Hall, play area or recreation field in the survey so there is no evidence for these three policies, however well meaning.

The Parish Hall was mentioned by some respondents in response to the question about which building they would like to be "Preserved". This implies no development which is at odds with recent developments such as the tarmacked area outside, the canopy and solar PV panels, all of which have been welcomed by Hall users. There is a clear need for the Parish Hall committee to be consulted and further community engagement to develop a useful policy.

Policy C2 Children's play area. Figure 3 is wrong and clause b) needs to explain what "applications" this refers to. This could be interpreted as any planning application which was accompanied by an offer to enhance the play area would be supported. There is no evidence for this.

WHAT'S MISSING?

Our community welcomed the opportunity to express their views in the public survey. The data collected could have been used to develop a wide range of objectives but this did not happen. Comments made by individuals could have been used to initiate further debate and, if there was support, developed into a policy. A simple example would be that regarding house building, comments were made saying "No developers" This could have been developed into a policy with a provision for self-builders, but the opportunity was missed.

Demographics.

There should be some analysis of the data we have.

How many 65+ residents will we have in 14 years from now?

Should we be doing more to encourage families with children to move here?

Should we be doing more to enable those young people who want to live and work here, to do so?

Should we be encouraging more local businesses to provide an income for those young people/families?

Should we be encouraging more local businesses to provide a local service?

Housing

There is no policy on energy efficient homes which are affordable to run. (there is no mains gas in the parish so fuel bills are above average) There has been no development of the comments made on energy efficiency in the Housing section and the comments made in the Renewable Energy section.

There has been no development of the theme linking the needs of our aging population to housing. There is no policy on Sheltered housing even though 22% of our population is 65+ and 51% thought there was a need for Sheltered accommodation.

The Environment

St Sampsons Church at South Hill engendered a massive number of comments but it just gets mentioned once in 5.2, bullet 7. The Parochial Church Council have been carrying out their own opinion survey on the future use of the Church so this could have been developed into an objective supported by the NP if there had been a willingness for public engagement.

The question was asked "What features in our more distant landscape views should we be asking our neighbouring parishes to preserve?" but there has been no contact with our neighbouring parishes.

Footpaths. There was plenty of evidence to support an objective of improving our footpaths. This could include making them dog friendly, better signage, permissive paths, maps and easier access to those with limited mobility. For a parish with an aging population, this would promote health and well-being.

Dark Skies. This was not considered at the time of the survey but would have been discussed if the lapse in community engagement had not occurred, particularly with neighbouring parishes.

Heritage. Our troughs and wells, the War memorial, even the phone box are valued by many. Why was the question about a heritage audit not followed up?

Renewable Energy

There were comments made and answers given to this section of the survey that should have been developed into objectives. A community energy group representing a quarter of households in the parish wants to engage in this process. I should declare at this point that I am Chairman of South Hill Association for Renewable Energy (SHARE). This community benefit society seeks to help the same community that the Neighbourhood Plan is supposed to represent.

There should have been consideration of electric car charging points, a local electricity tariff, district heating, rain water harvesting, doing our bit to combat climate

change, which is the biggest threat to the environment which is so valued by so many.

Infrastructure

Proper maintenance of road markings and road and footpath signage but restrictions on unnecessary signs.

Broadband and mobile phone coverage including 3G.

Community transport. Mobile services, shopping.

Technology

There are numerous emerging technologies that will develop during the course of this plan but no thought has been given to how this will affect our lives. It should be easier to work remotely. Technology in assisted living should help our aging population live in their own homes for longer. Driverless cars will provide access to services and facilities for both the young and those unable to drive. There will be all sorts of ways that we can live smarter, more sustainable lives and we should embrace them.

Geoffrey Hardman - Resident

Comments from Geoffrey Hardman, "Hemma", Maders, Callington. PL17 7LL

1. On reading the plan, there seems to be a very limited interpretation of the word Development. The NPPF statement on page 3.1 begins '*Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they need.*

2. But this seems to have been interpreted purely in the "bricks and mortar" sense. Following the breadth of topics in the survey, the question that I expected the Plan to address was in regard to the development OF the neighbourhood, meaning its social, economic, domestic and educational existence, not just specific constructional development WITHIN the neighbourhood.

3. As is pointed out in section 4, there is a very small proportion of the population under the age of 18 (as of the last Census). It is essential that the NP explores and makes recommendations towards maintaining a healthily balanced society, or else the Neighbourhood will evolve into a retirement community.

4. This is reflected in a very limited and introspective set of Visions in para 6.1 for the neighbourhood for 2030. There is a vision statement for buildings, but not for the community. The third objective, "*To protect and enhance community facilities and social cohesion*" seems to have been ignored completely as they are not addressed in Policies C1 or C2.

5. As a long term resident, (moving here in the late Eighties), my vision is of a thriving and prosperous rural community, sensitive to its heritage and environment, being a place and society that encourages families to remain and build roots. It is extremely disappointing that the team that drafted the Plan do not have the same aspirations. The development plan must address the needs of such a society, not just in terms of housing, but also its social needs, its community, employment, infrastructure, transport, well-being. In short, what does the Neighbourhood need to ensure it thrives as a good place to live? Without doing so, we risk reducing the Parish to a dormitory for commuters, a departure lounge for families and an unmanageable retirement home for its seniors.

6. The survey included a section on landscape and the environment, (such as footpaths) but there is no Vision in the NP for them, nor any other mention. Shouldn't the Plan state the vision for these amenities too? For example, should we aspire by 2030 to having a stated percentage of local journeys made by non motorised transport, which would necessitate maintenance and upgrade of the footpath network? Not just for the recreational rambles, but actually to get around? After all, over 70% of respondents felt that preservation and maintenance was "very important".

7. Ours is of course a small community. There are some services that we clearly cannot provide or justify for the neighbourhood on its own. For example, the notion of a Golberdon school or a Mornick hospital is absurd. The flip side is that the plan must at least address access to these services, be they transportational, remotely accessed or otherwise accessed.

8. Policy H1 sets out a vision for housing that blends in, and makes provision for Bats, Owls and Trees. What I don't see here is provision for families, especially with children, other than being affordable "*where there is a demonstrated local need*". This policy makes it very clear that the planned vision for the Parish is timewarp stagnation rather than community cohesion. After all, if no such "local need" is "demonstrated", it infers that such limited building as would be permitted should be unaffordable. Surely that cannot be the intent?

9. Incidentally, the subject of bat and owl boxes is in response to a closed question of whether insistence should be made to provide nesting. Whilst laudable, this is utterly pointless unless the habitat that supports the creatures is also protected. Put simply – why would an owl want to live in your box if you don't provide it with vole or mouse hunting grounds? For example, a Barn Owl needs at least 17 hectares of rough grass dependent on the landscape *source: BarnOwlTrust.org.uk* (note – rough grassland, NOT rough grazing) within a 2km radius in order to sustain a brood. So insisting on owl boxes at a higher density is pointless.. the environment won't sustain them. Therefore, to be meaningful, it is necessary to plan the local environment with the same care as its housing stock.

10. Policy B1 (Small businesses) is framed in terms of what mustn't be adversely affected, (amenity, noise, visuals, traffic) and again explicitly requires Bat and Owl boxes. Where is the policy that recognises that rural employment patterns are changing, and that sensitive local employment schemes should be ENCOURAGED rather than be permitted, so as not to drive away our youngsters? The very reason that traffic is on the increase is that it is necessary to travel away from the Neighbourhood in order to gain employment. Appropriate encouraged infrastructure within the Parish boundary could equally provide a traffic reduction, or at least a reduced rate of increase of traffic.

11. Both small business policies (B1 and B2) are very limited in the scope of industries or employment that would be permitted. As the opportunity for remote working or telecommuting, (a major benefit from a traffic and infrastructure standpoint, especially with access to fibre communications in much of the Parish) increases, are premises used for IT based commercial activities to be barred, unless they fall in the category of finance or one of the "professions"? Web designers, media artists, advertising agencies, employment agencies, quality auditing, design services, accreditation services...all of these can be accommodated traffic free in a sensitive rural environment, but not under the terms of these policies. In the survey section on local economy, the neighbourhood responded with a fairly equal split between working in, outside or not working. Match that with concerns over traffic, it reinforces the need to consider local employment that doesn't require the use of transport for commuting, especially when matched with the next response – 87% of respondents use their own vehicle, and 51% stated that the infrastructure doesn't meet their needs. So the Development Plan must state a vision for what the response would be to the same question asked in 2030, and what we need to do to get it.

12. Policy C1 – Parish Hall. Currently the Parish Hall is well used as a community resource, with a very high evening occupancy rate. So much so that making a booking, even for community events, is becoming increasingly difficult. There is nothing in the plan about what facilities the neighbourhood would wish to develop by 2030. Policy C1a is a non policy. It states nothing at all about what the facility should grow in to, only some side reference to an "application", which again is presumed to be the limited interpretation of a separate planning application for construction not including the hall. The other Parish resource is the Church: What is the vision for the building (as opposed to the organisation)? I recognise that that is the subject of a separate survey, but the secular needs as well as the spiritual needs should be addressed in the Plan.

13. Policy C2a is key. Children need open space. A supplementary policy regarding the aspirations for children's facilities within the community should be generated. The current

C2b could be cynically paraphrased as “To get your building passed, all you need to do is support the playground”. Surely the NPC aren’t so naïve as to actually publish that in a policy document?

14. Other Visions are also missing from the Plan. Renewable energy made up an entire section of the survey, but other than a constraint on wind turbines or ground based PV, there is nothing in the plan at all. The response regarding wind turbines did find in favour of restricting them – but not by an overwhelming majority (53% against vs 40% for) so the Neighbourhood is not as polarised as the plan suggests. Refer back to the survey for confirmation.

15. In conclusion: The Parish Survey identified many facets of the community; its employment, housing, recreation, infrastructure and economics. What is sadly lacking from the NDP at present are proactive visions for the sustainable, sensitive development of these facets. I sincerely hope these omissions will be addressed before the plan is published. Not to do so would be to waste an opportunity.

Susan Skelton – Resident

South Hill Neighbourhood Development Plan Mrs Susan Skelton

Comment 16th Sept 2016

As a Parish resident of some 33 years, I have raised two children to adulthood and been engaged in Agriculture in the Parish all my married life, besides being employed in the wider community. I was a founder member of the South Hill Connection website and newsletter in 2004 and continue to be actively involved in this. Recently I have been an active member of the community energy group SHARE, which was started in 2015.

I am aware that a great deal of work has been put into this draft plan by Parish Councillors and other members of the steering group. I am also aware that the whole project faltered in 2015, and that when it was re-started there was understandably a certain sense of weariness among some of the members, which has made it difficult to progress to a final plan. To keep my comment short, I concentrate on my suggestions and criticisms, but acknowledge that there is much that is good in the draft.

The consultation day held in the Parish Hall to present the results of the Questionnaire was a big success. I very much hope that there will be further consultation along those lines before the Plan is finalised.

I have re-read the 2014 Questionnaire and responses and tried to form my own opinion as to the views expressed. I haven’t seen a list of all the Comments made by respondents, although the survey report says that they will be made available online.

Taking as my starting point the Challenges identified by Parish residents at the end of the Questionnaire:

What do you see as the major challenges facing this parish in the next 20 years?

54 comments - summarised at the end of the report as:

Support aging population; lack of public transport; Over development; renewable energy; rural identity; Lack of amenities; Poverty; increased traffic ; Loss of young families; decline in farming
Looking at the draft development plan, it seems to me that you have plenty of emphasis on people’s concern about over-development and rural identity, but not very much attention to anything else on this list.

Below are my comments on the “Vision” section of the draft plan:

Vision

The vision for South Hill Parish in 2031 is:

- The Parish of South Hill has established appropriate new housing to meet the Parish's needs for new and affordable homes by utilising any suitable sites within the Parish.
- The Parish Hall has continued to be the hub of the parish, having developed even further into a community centre with social and recreational facilities for all parish residents. [I have no objection to this, but there was nothing about the development of a community centre in the Questionnaire]
- The introduction of advanced communications has contributed towards the establishment of a number of small businesses including a number based in homes. [Again I have no objection to this statement, but there was nothing in the Questionnaire about the establishment of businesses]

To address some of the concerns expressed, I would add something like:

- South Hill has developed infrastructure and amenities to make it a more attractive place for young families, and for young adults to live and work in the Parish.
- South Hill continues to support its existing businesses and encourages innovation within the Parish
- South Hill has made a contribution to the general sustainability of the local economy and the well-being of its residents through the support of community projects.

Comments on the “Objectives” section:

- To encourage suitable business development. (Policies B1 & B2)

There is no evidence in the Questionnaire results to show what the community thinks about this. The questions on “Local Economy” were restricted to modes of travel, infrastructure and traffic concerns.

I would also add something along these lines, in accordance with the Questionnaire results:

- To encourage efficiency and self-sufficiency in the Parish.

My comments on the Housing section:

1) You say there are “very limited public and social facilities currently available”

So how are we going to improve this?

3) “It must clearly relate to part of an established settlement and not isolated dwellings.”

The questionnaire responses show support for single homes rather than grouped, and also the use of brown field sites or conversion of redundant buildings. Why specify that these need to be part of an established settlement? Barns and brown field sites are often isolated by their very nature.

5) “any new building reasonably blends with existing properties”

I agree that the survey supports this. People were not specifically asked whether they would be in favour of exciting modern projects.

5) “pitched rooves for new buildings should be orientated to allow for the efficient use of solar panels”
In the questionnaire results, there was also significant support for energy efficiency in new homes, so this should be stated here too.

The Business section:

I can find no evidence in the Questionnaire results to show what or whether the Parish population knows or cares about Business development. Yet the policies B1 and B2 are quite specific and (to me) unnecessarily restrictive.

It is probably the case that people would oppose a large business development or industrial estate, and would probably be cautious in their approach to any business development.

It is my opinion that we need to encourage some development of the local economy if the Parish is not to become a retirement village. I would add that there is more than just a few B&Bs going on in South Hill.

I feel strongly that this policy does not represent the will of Parish residents, and would welcome further consultation on this.

The Community Policies section:

This section is fine as far as it goes, but says nothing about developing Community infrastructure over the coming years. To address the concerns expressed at the top of this document, further consultation is needed to identify acceptable ways of achieving this, if families and young adults are to be encouraged to join our community.

Other Policies:

Based on the responses to the Questionnaire, I wonder if there should be Policies relating to;

The built and natural environment – architecture, heritage, hedgerows, trees

Visual amenity – views from the Parish

Infrastructure – traffic, parking, footpaths

I am particularly disappointed to see no Policy on Renewable Energy. When the Questionnaire was developed, SHARE had not yet been thought of, but has since grown to include (by my calculations) at least 20% of the adult population of the Parish (from some 22% of households. To me this indicates a significant interest in issues of sustainability and renewable energy in the Parish, and since SHARE's reason for existing is to serve the community in these matters, there should be a Policy concerning the prospect of community energy projects in the years to come. SHARE is preparing a Comment on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan which I hope will be taken into account in developing the Plan further.

It may be the case that some of the omissions I have identified are already covered in the Cornwall Local Plan to a certain extent. In this case perhaps our Neighbourhood Plan should refer to the relevant parts of the Cornwall Plan in the interest of clarity.

In summary: I feel that the draft plan very much emphasises protection and restriction in its policies, and of course some element of this is necessary to retain the character of the area. However, I would welcome more reference to innovation, development and growth if South Hill is to remain a viable community until 2030 and beyond. I believe some of the evidence from the Questionnaire supports this, and that further consultation is necessary.