

LUXULYAN NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN STEERING GROUP

REPORT OF A MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 17TH NOVEMBER 2017

Present: Robin Stephenson (RS) - Chairman; Nick Legard (NL) - Vice-Chairman; Dave Bunt (DB); Simon Hall (SH); Francis Payne (FP) - Luxulyan Parish Council; Sue Perry (SP) - Luxulyan Parish Council; Roger Smith (RSm).

Apologies: Mick Coleman (MC)

Minutes of the meeting held on 17th October 2017

These were approved as a true record.

Matters arising from the previous meeting

1. Weighting of responses to the questionnaire. It was agreed to review this later in the meeting.
2. RS, NL and RSm had met Tony Lee (TL). An agreement had been drawn up. It had been agreed that he would produce a first draft of the Plan by 10th December 2017 to enable it to be presented to Luxulyan Parish Council on 14th December. TL had raised the possibility of a further six-week public consultation. This would cause an unwelcome delay, so enquiries would take place about the need for it. FP asked for a copy of the finalised agreement with TL to be passed to the parish clerk. It was agreed to aim for a completion date of March 2018.
3. RSm would act as secretary.
4. The Institute internet connection had been restored.
5. The project plan had been updated provisionally. Confirmation would follow once TL had been contacted.

Finances

No change.

Consultant support

See **Matters arising** above.

Consultation findings/Steering Group response

RS had incorporated late returns into the document.

This was discussed in depth and some amendments made:

Q1. Do you have any suggestions for places and sites of significance /importance in Luxulyan Parish that should have additional protection E.g. 'Elephants butt', and are not included on the Historic Environment Record (please see historic environment display)?

The need to retain the rural character of the parish and the aesthetic importance of granite boulders was noted. Advice received from TL suggested that it was unnecessary to replicate existing documentation, for example by collating information relating to the historic or natural environment, or by undertaking landscape surveys.

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

1. 65 respondents commented about places that should be considered to be significant within the parish. It is clear that a significant number of people consider the large granite boulders to be a particular feature of the parish. Therefore, the steering group recommends that ~~this~~ *protection of these features* should be taken into account in any future planning applications.
2. There appears to be reasonably strong feeling that the heart of the village (churchtown) should ~~retain~~ *protect* its existing character.
3. There is a reasonably strong feeling about ~~retaining~~ *protecting* the rural nature of the parish (responses to later questions reinforce this).
4. Some of the suggestions are already covered by some form of protection, e.g. SSSI or WHS.

Q2. Do you think, in principle, that future housing development should be within existing settlements, e.g. village, hamlet etc.?

No changes.

Q3. Where do you currently live?

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

We feel that the split in responses is ~~fairly~~ *fairly* representative of the population of the parish.

Q4. Do you have any suggestions for potential sites for housing development within existing settlement boundaries? (The only site identified currently for potential development in the parish is Chapel Field – opposite the Village Hall.)

No changes.

Q5. How important do you feel new housing development in Luxulyan Parish is for each of the following?

It was agreed to alter the responses from **Very important, Quite important** and **Low priority** to **High, Medium** and **Low priority**.

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

1. The responses to this question further reinforce the need for development to support local people and local facilities, e.g. the school.
2. There is little appetite to develop property that is to encourage new people into the parish.
3. Therefore, any future planning agreements should be specifically aimed at *supporting local housing needs and ~~support systems~~ community facilities.*

Q6. When new housing is built within the parish, which would you prefer? Please tick only one box. ✓ (22 homes are allocated within Cornwall local plan for Luxulyan Parish till 2030.)

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

62% of the respondents believe that new development should be spread among a greater number of small sites. If this was the agreed policy it might make the building of low-cost house far less likely. Therefore, the steering committee believes that it is likely that there may be a ~~need~~ case for slightly larger-scale developments, ~~such as up to 10 houses to meet the wishes of the parish to have affordable housing for local people to help meet the ambition of the community to promote affordable housing for local people.~~

Q7. What priority would you give to different types of new housing in Luxulyan parish? and What priority would you attach to the following features for new housing development?

It was agreed to alter the responses from **Very important, Quite important** and **Low priority** to **High, Medium** and **Low priority**. The calculation of the weightings of the responses for this question and question 8 was changed thus:

A. ~~Very important~~ **High priority** - Figure stays the same

Add to

B. ~~Quite important~~ **Medium priority** – Divide in half

C. ~~Not important~~ **Low priority** - ~~Divide in half and subtract from total of A and B.~~
Divide by 4 and subtract from total of A and B.

D. **No priority** – ~~Subtract from (A+B) – C~~ Ignore.

Q9. What priority would you attach to the following features for new housing developed in Luxulyan parish?

It was agreed to alter the responses from **Very important, Quite important** and **Low priority** to **High, Medium** and **Low priority**.

The weighting calculation was altered so that **No priority** would not be subtracted from the other responses but instead would be ignored.

Q10. Have there been any difficulties for you or any of your family in finding accommodation within Luxulyan parish? If so, please specify in the box below.

It was agreed to use bullet points for the responses rather than numbers to avoid suggesting any hierarchy.

Q11. If you answered yes in number 10, what size of property would realistically suit the person or people with a problem finding suitable accommodation? and Q12. How important do you think it is to create extra job opportunities in Luxulyan parish?

No changes.

Q13. Do you have any suggestions for potential business development?

It was agreed to use bullet points for the responses rather than numbers to avoid suggesting any hierarchy.

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

1. The responses to this question indicate people in the parish would prefer small businesses to be set up if employment within the parish is to be increased and the suggestions varied from retail outlets/cafes to IT/office to light industrial units.
2. However, the committee feels that a few of the suggestions would not be sustainable given the size of the village/parish.
3. The committee agrees that ~~these small businesses are the sort of businesses that~~ should be considered *given that* provided they are located appropriately. It is recognised that the current infrastructure/road links is not adequate for any larger scale business.
4. It was noted that there were a number of comments that suggested that there should be no further business expansion.

Q14. Do you have any suggestions on sites for commercial development, and types of enterprises that do not adversely impact on residential areas or the environment (for example small-scale enterprises such as at Trevanney)?

It was agreed to use bullet points for the responses rather than numbers to avoid suggesting any hierarchy.

Q15. Do you have any suggestions on how to make roads safer for all users?

No changes.

Q16. If there are any other issues connected with housing and economic development you wish to raise which has not been covered by the previous questions, please write it briefly in the box below.

It was agreed to use bullet points for the responses rather than numbers to avoid suggesting any hierarchy.

The Steering Group comments were amended (changes are italicised):

1. The responses seem to indicate that most people are happy with the character of the parish as it is but understand the need for development (residential/business) as long as it is in keeping with the nature of the parish. There are some concerns about the capacity of the infrastructure to cope with too much expansion.
2. The committee recommends that the parish council look at the ~~suggestions~~ responses made to the question as it feels that many are a valuable source of making further improvements to the community.

Q17. If you would like to be kept informed of progress with the Neighbourhood Plan and other Parish Council news, please provide an email address in the box below.

A contact list would be made. RS, NL and RSm would make the agreed amendments which would be circulated to Steering Group members to respond to within two days. Then it would be sent to the parish clerk with a request to make it a public document.

Lessons learnt (positive and areas for improvement)

This item was postponed for a future meeting.

Proposed boundary changes for Cornwall Councillors

SP and FP summarised the work of the Local Government Boundary review. The number of Cornwall Councillors was going to be reduced and consequently there would be an adjustment of electoral districts. Consideration was being given to two options for Luxulyan parish: either incorporation in a new electoral district with Lostwithiel, St Blazey, St Veep, Fowey, Boconnoc and Lanlivery, rather as is the case with the current Community Network Area; or, being placed with the Clay Country parishes. There were arguments in favour and against either option, as well as a possibility that the parish might be divided between two electoral districts. The meeting favoured an alignment with Clay Country parishes, with which Luxulyan had more in common, possibly taking Lanlivery with it because of their mutual interest in Luxulyan Valley.

Any Other Business

TL had raised the possibility of alternative means of providing housing to the more usual speculator-led, open market, high price, and profit-driven approach. He knew someone who could provide more information about this. It was agreed that this might be useful. NL offered to find out more and let people know about a possible meeting.

Date of next meeting:

Tuesday 19th December 2017, in Luxulyan Institute, starting at 6.30 p.m.