

## Comments received during Final Consultation for Luxulyan Neighbourhood Plan

1. The plan seems a good one, addressing all the issues that I marked. I have one doubt however, concerning Housing Zone 2. This is on one of the main entry routes into Luxulyan for many people. No housing close to the road should be of more than one storey to reduce visual impact, and match the estate of St Cyriac opposite.
2. I am writing to note my agreement with the Luxulyan neighbourhood plan that we as a village don't want or need any large housing developments in the future.
3. I'm writing to give my support to the recently published draft neighbourhood plan.  
It covers the points raised in the questionnaires and also sets out the community's views on future housing needs.
4. I write in support of the draft Neighbourhood plan. I feel it covers all various points and issues raised by the local community, and sets out the housing and development needs of the village for the future, while retaining its character and rural feel.

May I first congratulate the Committee members for the production of an excellent document, something of which to be really proud. (I have only copied this to Roger as that is the only Committee member email address I still have).

Now to nitpick - sorry.

Section 5.1 3rd bullet point: What is meant by 'significant minority of negative responses to further development'? I can't understand what this is trying to say. Could it be expressed as a percentage or number?

Section 7.19 Spelling error 'seach' instead of 'each'.

As an 'old person' I find the section on Housing for Older People 'confusing'. It seems to suggest that accommodation is needed but will only be available to people with a limited income. How does this apply to someone selling a large 'unsuitable' property now having a large cash windfall? How is the 'mean local income' calculated? What is the incentive to downsize if the property bought with the proceeds is then subject to a 106 agreement with the future sale restricted to locals only and the price subject to the 'mean local income'? Whilst I appreciate this might sound NIMBY it could well be that it needs a clearer definition.

Doesn't the section on 'Extensions and Annexes' provide the opportunity for housing to be extended which, whilst catering for short term needs can lead to the property becoming oversized for the occupants

when they become 'Older People '? Should there even be a policy that seems to actively encourage extensions and annexes?

With respect to the 'Standard undertaking required' section. What is the determination, and who has the responsibility, for consideration of any offers received in response to the marketing activities?

Section 7.31 references 'in accordance with a scheme to be approved by the Parish Council', who is responsible for developing the scheme? Will it be mandatory or optional? Will the workings be published? How will it be policed? Who will do the policing?

It is my understanding that a significant number of parishioners believe that there are issues in the current Parish Council and, if it is true, that there are times when Standing Orders are followed and times when they are not; and sometimes the processes are not quite as democratic as they should be. If this is indeed the case: as the Neighbourhood Plan is to be a legal document, this 'scheme' must also be a legal document and therefore shouldn't it be part of the Plan document? I personally would not be happy to sign off on a Plan that referenced a process yet to be determined.

Section 7.32 Is there a State Retirement Age any more? Isn't it now dependent on the year you were born?

Section 7.33 States not supporting extensions to existing sites, makes no mention of new sites, does that mean they would be allowed?

I might have missed it; there does not appear to be anything regarding restrictions on second homes. I thought this had been expressed as a concern by parishioners?

I have only read through this once over a period of several days and made comments along the way. Further readings might well clarify/modify my thinking, but I thought it appropriate to pass on my 'first impression'.

Once again may I just say how impressed I am with this document and commend the Committee for their hard work in getting it completed in such a short time.

Regards  
George Haywood

5.