

## Andy Littlewood

good afternoon,

i have looked at the south hill neighborhood plan ,and would like to make a few points,

firstly, overall , it is concise and would appear to meet the parish going forward,i understand this plan is aimed at the next 10-15 years , i especially like the input regarding new build,it clearly sets out the need if required but in a controlled manner, acceptable to the current residents and the original survey , your green policy /renewable energy section although not over indulged, also reflects the survey in that wind turbines and solar farms are not at all favored by the south hill residents ,you only have to drive toward launceston to see how easily commercial wind turbines destroy a landscape, and solar farms ruin good farmland , i think biomass is the best area to project renewable spending as it can easily help communities, is more cost effective and has a real long term reward and has high value government funding at present, and most importantly not a blot on the stunning landscape enjoyed

in south hill and it vantage points , i would like to commend the hard work your members have put in, i think the overall plan is very in line with the parish, it meets and exceeds the requirements going forward

my concerns would be wind turbines and the solar farm issues, as once in place are there for the next generation to pick up the pieces and sort out- i am strongly against them.

i am currently based outside the parish, but as a contractor who works in the south hill area take a keen interest in south hill , also long term i hope to relocate my business,home, and workshops to the area so was also pleased to see your plan covers small enterprise /business , as far as infrastructure goes,i think you have it right again, as south hill is not saltash /iskeard ,its rural, people who choose to live, and work in my case here, appreciate it for what it is, it can be fine tuned to meet some needs, but such a stunning area needs safe hands to manage it, and i was pleased having read your plan it appears you have done and are doing just that very thing, so please pass my thanks to your team for the excellent work .

ANDY LITTLEWOOD

wood fabrications

## Kathryn Skelton

Dear Mrs Hoskin

I am writing with my comments on the South Hill parish neighbourhood development plan, as requested as part of the consultation period. Please pass the below on to the development team for their consideration.

Many thanks

Kathryn

--

### **About me and my connection to the parish.**

My name is Kathryn Skelton. I grew up in South Hill parish, leaving in 2008 to pursue my career. My continued interest is based on ownership (current and anticipated) of property within the parish, and the fact that I am a frequent visitor given that my family continue to

live in the parish. Perhaps even more importantly, I still see myself as a daughter of South Hill, so to speak, and continue to be invested in the parish's preservation and growth and in the community's ability to influence its own future.

### **Comments**

Appreciating that this sort of document is impossible to write 'by committee', I have attempted to keep my comments high level, and focused on what I feel are the most important issues. I have tried to make constructive criticisms; I recognise that a lot of work has gone into getting to this point, and that there are many good and relevant points within the plan too.

#### 1. Vision and objectives for the parish

Above all things, I was disappointed in the articulation of our vision for the parish. Given the amount of consultation and community engagement, and the strength of comments found in the survey, I suggest that you do more to set the plan up in the context of residents' desire to, in particular:

- continue to conserve the local environment, aesthetic, rural character and heritage of the parish;
- better support local people, in particular those who are young, elderly or impoverished;
- to this end, develop the infrastructure, sustainability, transport and local amenities of the parish.

Whilst some of this is referred to later in the narrative alongside the policies, it is difficult to understand the spirit and intent of the policies which follow without it being stated upfront in the vision and objectives.

I also think that the reference to the parish hall here, whilst nice, is not appropriate for a vision statement, as well as being unsupported by the evidence.

#### 2. Inclusion of policies unsupported by the evidence

In a number of places, there are policies contained within the plan which appear to be unsupported by (or in conflict with) the evidence provided in the form of the survey.

Examples are:

- the primary recommendation for new housing development to be through infill, whilst the survey indicates a preference for the conversion of redundant buildings and use of brown field sites (the latter of which is not mentioned within the policy);
- the specific mention of housing for rural workers as a housing development priority;
- the two policies around business, which are quite specific and restrictive in their nature (yet only aspects to do with owl / bat boxes, solar panels and traffic are explicitly referenced in the survey);
- the emphasis on promoting use of the parish hall, play area and recreation field, which are not a particular emphasis in the survey responses (regardless of my personal fondness for these spaces!).

If these decisions have been made by the development team on the basis of some other evidence, this should be clearly stated and explained. If it is simply an accident, this should be corrected.

#### 3. Exclusion of significant aspects of the survey responses

Conversely to 2 above, there are a wealth of insights in the survey which have not been translated into the policies.

Examples are the wishes expressed by the survey respondents to:

- avoid development in the form of flats;
- support affordable housing for local occupancy specifically;
- promote energy efficiency and renewable energy;
- protect the local environment, heritage and views, in particular the church, and carry out a conservation appraisal and heritage audit.

It is disappointing that these areas have been missed from the plan, particularly as they could all have significant impacts on the scale and type of proposed developments, and could be some of the more proactive and locally relevant aspects of the plan.

I suggest adding new policies to the plan which are designed to put forward the above wishes, unless the development team has chosen to discount these on the basis of further evidence - in which case, this should be stated and explained.

#### 4. Spelling, punctuation and grammar

There are a number of grammatical or typographic errors throughout the document. I assume it is intended to resolve these at the next stage of writing, but just wanted to flag this as such errors will influence the reader's perception and interpretation of the plan and should really be corrected before it is finalised.

I think, if the above issues 1 - 4 could be resolved, the plan would be significantly stronger. I would encourage you build on people's inputs, so that the plan truly does reflect the wishes of the local community and provides a strong foundation for the parish's development in years to come. South Hill is a lovely place, and we all want it to remain so and become even better in future!

Finally, what shone through in some parts of the draft plan was the effort made to engage the community and I congratulate you on managing to achieve this so well in the initial stages of developing the plan. I think this is incredibly impressive, and testament to the hard work of the development team as well as the community's enthusiasm. I just wanted to recognise this and thank you for your commitment to getting it this far!

## **Joseph Degand**

Hello Mrs Hoskin,

My name is Joseph Degand. I'm getting in touch with comments about the South Hill Neighbourhood Plan, as my wife owns land in South Hill; therefore we have a vested interest in the area and will likely end up living within the community sometime in the future.

It's for this reason that I spent some time reviewing and cross-comparing both the draft plan and the survey result document created by the parish council. As a result, I've developed a fairly comprehensive list of comments, notes and critiques about the South Hill Neighborhood Plan. Please see below my address in this email and attached.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to read my notes. I hope that they will be considered and passed along to the appropriate parties in due course.

Sincerely,

Joseph Degand

114 The Old Mill

Princess Street

Lincoln

LN5 7QL

## Notes About South Hill Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2031

1. Why are the Visions and Objectives on Page 7 identical to those listed on the neighbourhood plan for Quethiock?
  - <http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/10756283/Quethiock-NDP-Jan-2015.pdf>
  - This section of the plan looks like it has been copied, almost verbatim from the Quethiock Neighbourhood Development Plan, which is very **disconcerting as South Hill's plan should not be a copy of another parish's** plan. This is very irresponsible of whoever wrote the plan.
  
2. Why is 4.4 on Page 5 of the plan (Description of the Parish) so vague?
  - Grouping people between the ages of 18 and 65 into one age group is too vague, as census records should offer stats that allow this to be broken down into smaller, more relevant age groups – perhaps 18-30; 31-45; 45-60; 60+
  
3. Why is there no mention of preserving the church in the plan?
  - The results of Questions 1,2 and 3 in Section 2 of the survey make it clear this is something that should be explored.
  - There should be an exploration of why people believe the church is **important yet didn't mark that they'd like it to preserved** (106 responses for 'which buildings are important', but only 30 for 'are there any buildings that should be preserved')
  - Perhaps there should be a more in-depth analysis of the survey comments about this to paint a better picture and provide figures of how many of the respondents that answered selected which building / location.
  
4. Why is there no mention of preserving / maintaining public footpaths?
  - The results of Questions 6, 7 and 8 in Section 2 of the survey make it clear this is something that should be explored, as 39% of people use the **footpaths at least once per month and 55.7% of respondents say its 'very important' to preserve and maintain public footpaths. Many of the survey** comments say that paths are not clearly marked, difficult to access and are unkempt and that everyone wants better footpaths.
  - Perhaps there should be a more in-depth analysis of the survey comments about this to paint a better picture.

5. Within the plan, there should be mention of not creating more public open spaces, but instead maintaining what there is.

- The total replies to Questions 11 and 12 in Section 2 of the survey make it clear this is something that should be included in the plan, especially since votes were more than 55% against this and opening up more land for recreational use.

6. Why is there no mention about arranging an appraisal for conservation sites?

- The high response to Questions 13 and 14 in Section 2, along with the +54% positive response rate to this demonstrates that this is something that should be explored and implemented

7. **The numbers don't quite make sense on the survey results for Question 14**  
Section 2.

- How were there 256 replies when only 53 households responded to the question, especially when in Question 13, the total number of replies was 247 with 131 households responding?

8. There should be mention of allotments not being a priority.

- Because the responses was so mixed, it should be stated that **allotments should be a topic of discussion over the coming years, but isn't a priority.**

9. Why is there is no meaningful mention of renewables in the plan when it was a major part of the survey – the entirety of Section 3?

- It seems as if respondents wasted their time answering the 10 questions about renewables since they were not included in the plan.

10. There should be mention that the parish is in favour of solar panels on roofs, but not on the ground.

- The responses to Question 1 and 2 in Section 3 demonstrate people feel strongly about this, therefore it should be included, in some form, in the final plan.

11. There should be mention that wind turbines are not a priority.

- The results of Question 3 in Section 4 of the survey show more than **half of respondents aren't in favour of turbines, but that there is could be an opportunity to explore the prospect of this as 7% said they didn't know** if they were in favour of turbines. If they changed their minds to say they are, the results would be just about balanced.

12. Are people in favour of biomass / biodigestion? There is no question asking this in the renewables section of the survey.

- Unlike the Solar Panel and Wind Turbine portions of Section 4, there is no question asking if people are in favour of this type of renewable **energy / technology so Question 5 becomes irrelevant as it's unclear how many respondents actually support the overall idea of biomass / biodigestion.**

13. Why is there no mention of exploring the possibility of a local electricity tariff?

- The results of Question 6 in Section 4 of the survey show more than half of respondents are in favour of a local electricity tariff, but that there **are also 25.9% of respondents who said they don't know how they feel.** This shows that people should be better educated in the positives and negatives of this idea before any action can be taken.

14. Why is there no mention of exploring the possibility of a community-owned renewable energy project?

- Similar to Question 6 in Section 4, the response to Question 7 shows there is room for people becoming more knowledgeable over the coming years about the topic and that people should be better educated in the positives and negatives of this idea before any action can be taken.

15. Why is there no mention of speeding in the parish being an issue, along with it being a priority to explore ways of reducing this problem?

- With over 70% of the 255 replies from 139 households for Question 4 in Section 4 of the survey saying there are problems with speeding in the parish, it is clear this is a major issue and that effort should be made in developing ways of resolving this problem. Perhaps committing to creating a committee to explore the reason behind the speeding and possible solutions for reducing this happening, along with setting a timeline for actually implementing a variety of solutions.

16. Why is there no mention of transport links being an issue for the parish, along with it being a priority to explore ways of fixing this?

- With over 50% of the 226 replies from 129 households for Question 3 in Section 4 of the survey saying current transport links and infrastructure do not meet their needs, it is clear this is an issue that effort should be **made in further exploring this issue. For instance, the term 'infrastructure' is very vague, so perhaps a commitment to creating a specific 'Infrastructure & Transport' survey should be made in the plan.**

#### 17. Where is the 'Small Business – Change of Use' policy from?

- None of the information provided in the plan has been taken from the **survey, therefore it's not clear who wrote and included this policy**, why this was not part of the survey, and why it has suddenly been included in the plan without consultation.
- Similar to Comment 1, this section of the plan looks like it has been copied, almost verbatim from the Quethiock Neighbourhood Development **Plan, which is very disconcerting as South Hill's plan should not be a copy of another parish's plan. This is very irresponsible of whoever wrote the plan.**

#### 18. Where is the 'Small Business – New Build' policy from?

- None of the information provided in the plan has been taken from the **survey, therefore it's not clear who wrote and included this policy**, why this was not part of the survey, and why it has suddenly been included in the plan without consultation.
- Similar to Comments 1 & 18, this section of the plan looks like it has been copied, almost verbatim from the Quethiock Neighbourhood **Development Plan, which is very disconcerting as South Hill's plan should not be a copy of another parish's plan. This is very irresponsible of whoever wrote the plan.**

#### Final Comments

It seems that whoever wrote the South Hill Neighbourhood Plan did not want to commit the time and effort to writing a bespoke plan for the parish in which they live. Instead, it looks as if they chose to plagiarise **sections of the plan they 'wrote' directly from the Quethiock Neighbourhood Development Plan**. Clear evidence of this can be seen when comparing **Policy H1, Policy B1 and Policy B2 of South Hill's plan to shockingly identical Policy H1, Policy B1 and Policy B2 of the Quethiock Neighbourhood Development Plan**.

- <http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/media/10756283/Quethiock-NDP-Jan-2015.pdf>

- <http://south-hill.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/The-South-Hill-Parish-Neighbourhood-Development-Plan.pdf>

The worst example of this is on Page 7 of the South Hill plan – Visions and Objectives. These are taken verbatim from the Quethiock Neighbourhood Development Plan.

To be clear, South Hill is not Quethiock. It is its own community with a very rich history; therefore, its plan should have its own set visions and objectives for the future, decided in a democratic way that involves its people and those with a vested interest in the parish – not visions & objectives for a parish several miles away.

**South Hill's plan should be, in and of itself, its own entity – not a carbon copy of another parish's plan. There are several issues, concerns and sentiments from the parish survey that are not reflected in the plan, showing that the persons responsible for drafting South Hill's plan decided to knowingly disregard the opinions of those that took part in the survey.**

I strongly believe this plan needs to be rewritten to reflect the views of the people of South Hill (as taken from the neighbourhood survey that was carried out), no matter how much time and effort it takes to create standalone piece of text that does not simply replicate the policies, vision and objectives of a neighbouring community. South Hill is its own entity and, therefore, deserves to have its own neighbourhood plan, **not a copy of Quethiock's.**

Whether or not this revised draft can be created within the consultation period is beyond me; however, I believe wholeheartedly that something major needs to be done to this plan in order for it to be fit for purpose over the next 15 years.

## Heather Degand

Heather Degand 17.09.2016

### **Comments on South Hill Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2030**

I have a vested interest in the development of South Hill because my family lives in the parish and I expect I will live there in the future. I grew up in the village, I am a regular visitor and I own land in the parish.

Working for a landscape architecture practice, I often use Neighbourhood Development Plans, along with similar documents, to assess the suitability of proposed developments. I have looked at the Neighbourhood Plan, the questionnaire results, the Cornwall Local Plan and the neighbourhood planning toolkit provided by Cornwall Council to gain as much insight as possible.

My husband, Joseph Degand, has already sent in his response to the Plan. I would like to second all of his points. However, I have removed duplicate comments to stop my response from being extremely repetitive.

#### Comments on development of the Plan

Despite the good response to the survey from South Hill residents, it seems as though the opinions collected have been discounted when copy-pasting the Plan from Quethiock's Neighbourhood Development Plan. I don't really understand the thinking behind this decision, but it doesn't seem right to copy someone else's work, and it seems dishonest to people who care about having a Neighbourhood Plan that is about South Hill. For anyone reading both documents, it is obvious there



is a clear lack of correspondence between the survey results and the Plan.

A lot of my comments are suggestions which I think would be suitable, but I understand these would have to be agreed by the committee and the people in the parish. I feel that the changes required are extensive and further consultation will be needed. Because of this I would be interested to know what the next stages for developing the plan will be.

Comments on South Hill Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan

St Sampson's Church

- Separate to the need to preserve the church as a historical building, the plan should also include the need to preserve and enhance the church as a community space

- More detail on objectives and policy relating to the church can be provided by church users

Housing policy

- The plan should refer to supporting 'sustainable development'. The definition below from the Brundtland report is often cited as the best definition and can be included for clarity.

"Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

- Were the survey results on questions 1 and 2 analysed to show priority sites? The priority order should be shown in the policy

- Parking is a main concern raised throughout the survey results and should be mentioned in the plan for all new builds and conversions. Housing policy could require that all new housing must include off road parking for at least two cars (unless shown to be unfeasible)

- The policy should go into more detail e.g. require suitable architectural design, scale, and exterior materials choice

Heather Degand 17.09.2016

- Part C of policy H1 blindly requires new tree planting, regardless of situation. Instead it could have more detail, e.g. require suitable landscape design based on the site, neighbouring properties and wider landscape pattern; require native tree/hedge planting with suitable ultimate size and density

- Part D of policy H1 blindly requires bat and bird boxes, regardless of the situation. Policy could require suitable habitat creation measures, linking with existing and proposed landscaping, planting and ecology

- To reflect the survey results, the policy should include that roofs ought to be suitable for solar panels where ever possible. This is currently just in the supporting text

Small businesses

- Both small business policies in the plan cannot reflect residents' views as there were no questions in the survey about this

- It is fair to include some guidance on this topic, however, any policy written must be carefully put together with consultation and input from the community to ensure it reflects their views

- As with housing, more detail should be included requiring suitable design, scale and material choice

- As with housing, more detail should be included requiring landscaping suitable to the site, and immediate and wider surroundings

- Again, as with housing, habitat creation should depend on the existing site and be suitable to the situation

Renewable energy

- Solar panels should be included in housing policy (as mentioned above)

- The plan should note divided opinion on wind turbines, almost 50-50, and need for sensitive handling of this matter

- The plan should note support of community energy projects in general. This is a good starting point, but further discussion and research is needed before any policy can be written

Landscape & heritage assets

- Views, hedgerows etc. are clearly thought to be very important, but are not reflected in the plan at all

- Should we be looking at getting things designated, scheduled or listed? Should this be an objective/aim?
- Are there other ways of protecting these assets that should be incorporated?

#### Allotments

- Survey had a mixed response
- A better indicator may be applications for allotments, e.g. is there a waiting list? Are there requests for more space or any services from current users?
- The Plan should note the importance of protecting and maintaining the existing site and enhance it as needed

#### Section 106 agreements/community infrastructure levies

- Money gained through section 106 or CIL is probably not likely, but perhaps should be mentioned to help guide the council if they have access to funds
- Could be used on traffic calming measures (as below)
- Could be used on community energy projects, as people were quite interested in a local energy tariff, but not so interested in investing

Heather Degand 17.09.2016

#### Speeding

- Really strong response so must be addressed in the Plan
- Is this really bad driving or is it perceived only? The Plan could suggest research into perceived 'problem areas'
- The Plan should address the perceived issue
- Possible traffic calming measures should be discussed and , e.g. temporary signage can be effective each time it is moved, rather than permanent signs which people stop noticing over time
- The Plan could include intentions to communicate perceived issues to police force, possibly request support from them

#### Parking problems

- Comments in the survey results mention parking specifically as a problem
- Infrastructure is also mentioned in the survey results as a problem, which may refer to parking
- This can link with objective/policy about protecting and enhancing community facilities
- This can link with housing objective/policy
- Parish hall policy should include plans for managing parking long and short term – possibly temporary signage for use during events, potential agreement on use of a nearby field

#### The document

- Spelling and grammar should be correct throughout the Plan
- Perhaps should include contact details for the Parish Council, assuming the Development Plan committee will be disbanded when the Plan is complete
- The template supplied in the toolkit notes several points and questions that should be addressed in the Plan. Some things may not be an issue for South Hill, but the fact that these things are not currently requiring improvement may also be valuable to include