

Newsletter 7 Responses

(154 responses)

Number	Question	Yes	No
1	Do you agree with the development boundary criteria?	121	17
2	Do you support the revised Development Boundary?	114	15
3	In future, there may be a need for additional affordable housing than can be provided within the proposed boundary. If this becomes the case, in which direction(s) (see numbered green arrows Fig 1) should this development of 'Rural Exception' sites take place Northwards	80	59
4	As Question 3 but Southwards	68	64
5	<p>Conversions to business use: <i>Proposals to build or redevelop properties within the Lostwithiel Development boundary which are suited for retail, small business services or light industrial or engineering activities (Use classes A and B1) will be encouraged subject to them:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>being sympathetic to the area in which they are proposed; and</i> • <i>not creating noise, dust or smell directly or indirectly.</i> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	141	4
6	<p>Conversions to residential use: <i>Apart from changes allowed under permitted development rights, proposals to convert present business or commercial properties into residential properties will be resisted; and applications for a change of use to an activity that does not provide employment opportunities will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that:</i></p> <p><i>(i) the commercial premises or land in question has not been in active use for at least 12 months; and</i></p> <p><i>(ii) the commercial premises or land in question has no potential for either reoccupation or redevelopment for employment generating uses and as demonstrated through the results both of a full valuation report and a marketing campaign lasting for a continuous period of at least 12 months.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	138	9
7	<p>Conversion of redundant buildings outside the Development Boundary: <i>Safe and convenient access and adequate parking should be provided without significant adverse impact on the local environment</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	145	4
8	<p>Housing development in gardens: Zone 6 Fig: 2 :This character zone provides the lowest density and greenest area of the town: it comprises villa's overlooking the river valley. To preserve this character we propose the following policy:</p>	117	21

	<p><i>In Zone 6, housing development in gardens will not be permitted.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>		
9	<p>Should this policy apply to other zones, if so, which ones?</p>	<p>13 said all zones 1 said 5 1 said 3 5 said 4. 3 said 5 1 said 7 13 said 8 4 said 9</p>	
10	<p>Sympathetic development: <i>Layout for new development should be designed and constructed to a high standard, reflect existing scale and density of housing in the defined settlement area, make sensitive use of local topography and avoid development on the skyline surrounding the town. Design and use of materials within the conservation area must be in accordance with the principles that will be identified in an Appraisal and Management Plan.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	133	8
11	<p>Design standards: <i>The Lostwithiel Neighbourhood Plan design policy requires all applicants to demonstrate how their design process responds to the character statements in the NDP, as well as local and national strategic policy. The Town Council may request a design review in order to demonstrate how the proposal reflects RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects) or CABI (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) design review guidelines.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	141	5
12	<p>Spacing and density: <i>New housing development at the edge of the development boundary must be of a lower density so it blends into the countryside beyond.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	141	8
13	<p>Affordable housing: <i>All affordable housing to be delivered in the Parish should be visually indistinguishable from the open-market value housing and be of a type, size and tenure that meets the local housing needs of the Parish.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	145	3
14	<p>Housing for the elderly: <i>Housing for the elderly should incorporate the HAPPI (Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation) principles and be equipped with sprinkler systems. See: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-our-ageing-population-panel-for-innovation for more detail.</i></p> <p>Do you agree with this policy?</p>	145	4

15	Mature trees and hedgerows: <i>Developments will be expected to incorporate existing mature trees, hedgerows other landscape and wildlife features into the layout and provide landscaping and sufficient spacing, appropriate to the rural character of the area</i> Do you agree with this policy?	149	2
16	Use of materials: <i>Where practical, materials should be sourced locally, and there should be sufficient richness of detail in the design and materials.</i> Do you agree with this policy?	147	4
17	Off-street Parking: <i>In addition to any garage space that may be provided, proposals for housing development will be required to provide a minimum of one off-street parking space for units with 1-2 bedrooms and a minimum of two off-street parking spaces for units with 3 or more bedrooms. Proposals for housing developments of four or more dwelling units will also be required to provide one further off-street visitor parking space per four dwelling units.</i> Do you agree with this policy?	140 5 who answered 'no' wanted more parking	9

Comments

(numbers in brackets show the number, if more than 1, of responses received)

Subject	Comments
Affordable housing	Deposits are high; mortgages are difficult for the young so they are not genuinely affordable (3). New development must support local young people and be affordable. Family affordable housing needed on infill sites. Building affordable housing outside the development boundary should be considered only after all the land within it has been used. Rural Exception sites should contain more than the minimum proportion of affordable houses. Rural Exception site could be by old sewage works by A390
Building materials	Building should accommodate contemporary design and not be restricted to copying traditional buildings (2) The requirement should be rephrased to read 'building materials should be those which originate in Cornwall or are sourced from Cornish producers'. A high percentage of building materials should be environmentally friendly/low carbon materials sourced locally.
Businesses	Small businesses must be encouraged; we are losing too many. Business rates discourage small businesses. We need return of Post Office and Bank.
Conservation area	The Conservation Area should be restricted to the area immediately around the church and restrictions enforced more assiduously.
Conversion of business premises to	It is better for a building to be converted to residential use rather than remain empty. May be unsupportable if current trends in shopping habits continue (2).

residential	<p>Should allow 24 months before a business premise can be converted to residential.</p> <p>There should be finance available to help shop premises be re-let for shops.</p> <p>The policy is not realistic in Lostwithiel with business premises difficult to sell.</p>
Conversion to business use	<p>Include a requirement that the business should not be unduly intrusive by requiring servicing outside working hours.</p> <p>New businesses and small shops should be encouraged. It should be made easy to convert residential properties for this purpose.</p> <p>Conversion should not be refused on the grounds of food-smells.</p>
Council housing	<p>More Council housing, for rent, should be built (2).</p> <p>More social housing is needed; 'affordable housing' is beyond the reach of many.</p>
Design	<p>Ref Question 11; Respondent circled 'NO' but said all applications should include design instruction.</p>
Development	<p>Would prefer new development to be at the end of Pendour Park with access onto the A390</p> <p>New development should be avoided on environmentally sensitive and amenity areas.</p> <p>Development should not be allowed in cells 26 & 28 along Tanhouse Road as it forms a wildlife buffer zone between Poldew Woods and the town.</p> <p>Field to South of Tanhouse Rd does not fit criterion 2.</p> <p>The general creep of development on the old golf course is spoiling that area and the views towards Restormel Castle (3).</p> <p>There should be no development Northwards of the old golf club house.</p> <p>A new development area could be provided around St Winnow School.</p> <p>The restriction on development in gardens should apply to the whole area except in gardens where the plot is more than twice the area of those nearby.</p> <p>Development in gardens in zone 6 could be allowed if not visible from the town centre. We must prevent a Golant-style fill-in.</p> <p>Housing density should mirror that in adjoining areas.</p> <p>Low density only in the part of the development that abuts open country</p> <p>Will the sewage system cope with increase in development?(2)</p> <p>No Gilbury phase 3, there is already a traffic problem in Castle Hill or Rosehill.</p> <p>No more apartment blocks high on hillsides; it spoils the look of the town (2).</p> <p>Development should not be allowed where it impinges on the skyline and green horizon.</p> <p>Development should no intrude into the landscape; Gilbury 2 already does.</p> <p>We need more intermediate-priced market-value housing. There is a preponderance of either expensive or lower-priced but little in between.</p> <p>Lostwithiel has already grown too big; any more development would spoil the joy of the town.</p> <p>Any new development should the only for local families' need.</p> <p>Concerned that if there is housing development at Tredethick, it will put intolerable strain on the Lanwithan Road.</p> <p>As Lostwithiel's minimum target for new houses is 25, no more than this</p>

	<p>should be built.</p> <p>Small areas of high-density terraced housing as infill is preferable to an extension of the developed area with low-density large suburban-type housing (no more 'Knights Courts').</p> <p>The responder prefers, in general, decisions to be made on a case-by-case basis rather than applying blanket policies.</p> <p>Each proposal for development should be considered on its own merits and not be dictated by a development boundary (3).</p> <p>There should be no areas where building is prevented.</p> <p>It's too late to adopt a criterion of avoiding development on upland sites as many such have already been developed.</p> <p>Any development that offers parking spaces, in addition to those required, should be supported.</p> <p>Development has already occurred on high land so that horse has bolted.</p> <p>Initially development on high ground stands out but not when it's been there a while.</p> <p>Responder unable to agree to any of the policies as is under the impression that 300 houses are to be built; infrastructure could not cope.</p> <p>Largely agree with the criteria in Q1 but realises that some ribbon development is inevitable followed by infill.</p> <p>Responder wondered why there was no option for Eastwards development along A390 of Rural Exception sites</p> <p>Restriction on development in gardens should apply to Bodmin Hill and Terras Hill.</p> <p>Respondent would prefer commercial to residential rather than build outside the proposed development boundary.</p> <p>Proposal by respondent 787 that two sites East of Lostwithiel should be developed.</p> <p>Grey field sites should be prioritised.</p>
Development boundary	<p>The boundary should include all existing areas of building and infill even if it doesn't have to</p> <p>Agree with criterion two and three but not the part of criterion one which restricts development to 3 areas (2).</p> <p>The restriction of new building within the Development Boundary is reasonable.</p>
Flood risk	<p>Development should be restricted so as not to increase the risk of flooding (2).</p> <p>All development should minimise the increase in flood risk (2).</p> <p>Should housing be built alongside rivers in view of the flood risk?</p> <p>The Coffa stream already floods badly because of development alongside it. Further development could exacerbate this problem (2).</p> <p>Developments on cells 25, 26 & 28 could increase the flood risk along the Tanhouse Stream (4)</p>
Hedgerows	<p>The mediaeval longstrips, opposite the Castle Hill Cemetery are, at present, outside the plan.</p> <p>The destruction of hedgerows is changing the character of Lostwithiel this is particularly so along Castle Hill.</p>
Heritage	<p>The old mill pond in Tanhouse Rd should be protected and celebrated.</p>
Housing	<p>Is there any way we can avoid having more second homes in</p>

	<p>Lostwithiel? (2) Respondent is concerned at the number of empty houses; this is increasing.</p>
Housing for elderly	<p>Housing for the over 60s should include one-bedroom cottage style properties. Single story dwellings are needed for the elderly or disabled. HAPPI housing would allow elderly to down-size.</p>
Parking	<p>Provision of additional parking should be a high priority (8). Short-term parking should be provided either on the playing field all the Parade. We need parking permit zones for residents. Not enough parking for shoppers. Business owners, commuters and those going on holiday take-up car parking spaces in the free car park (2). Could the old football field be used for car parking? There need to be at least two parking spaces for every household; one off-street parking place is insufficient even for a one-bedroom property (5). Would like a car park in the Cott Rd recycling area. Create a parking area by the railway station. Don't allow parking along the parade. This would improve the area. Where a business premise is converted to residential use, there should be no requirement to provide parking spaces as this would be impracticable. The same parking allocation criteria should be applied to business-to-residential conversions as for new housing. Land East of the station signal box could be used for a two-storey, timber-clad car park. Parking along Granville Road up to Lanwithan Road could then be prohibited with residents being given spaces in the new car park. Turn the railway sidings into a car park (3). Restrict parking on Bodmin Hill and Duke Street to residents only. This might allow a footpath to be built as far as the school. We need to enforce the current parking restrictions better than we do (2) Town Council should share a traffic warden with, eg. St Blazey. Off-street parking may increase the flood risk as more area would be covered over. Incorporating garages into buildings results in them being used as an external storeroom; this does not ease the parking problem. It may not be practicable to provide parking where, for example, an attic is converted into low-cost accommodation (2). The lack of sufficient parking is having a detrimental effect on the town's life and economy. All new builds should have at least two parking spaces. More houses would mean more cars parking outside Lostwithiel school; this already causes a problem (2).</p> <p>The Community Centre collected 87 signatures to a petition reading <i>"If you would like to emphasise that The Neighbourhood Plan must provide best possible flexibility for addressing Lostwithiel's car-parking needed, please add your name to our petition"</i></p>

Pavements	Pavements in Fore St being damaged by Co-op delivery lorries (2). Smaller vehicles should be used and Co-op should remedy the damage.
Second homes	Any new houses should not be for second homes (2). We need to restrict the number of second homes in Lostwithiel. We need to restrict the number of holiday lets in Lostwithiel.
Self-build	Encouragement should be given to identify an area for local self-build houses.
Speed limit	Lower speed limit needed on A390 East of Lostwithiel
Tourism	We need to take into consideration the impact of tourism and its importance to the town and its impacts on, for example, second homes.
Traffic	Before any new building is approved, account must be taken on the implications for access; Castle Hill, Rosehill and Dark Lane have reached or are beyond capacity. Developments south of Lostwithiel would result in unacceptable increase in traffic along Lanwithan Rd (3). Also there is no footpath along part of it. Concerned lest development to the South would have access through Coffee Lake. No more development along Tanhouse Rd as access on to Queen St is dangerous (3). Traffic advice should be sought before further development is allowed along either Tanhouse Rd or Rosehill. On Bodmin Hill cars park too close to junctions. Church Lane (South) should be made 'access only' and speed humps should be considered to slow traffic along it. Development in gardens in Victoria would lead to unacceptable increase in traffic in that area. Put yellow hatching on A390 at North St junction to assist drivers turning into the A390.
Transport	Public transport needs to be improved. We need a bus service (2). A footbridge at the level crossing would be good. Very poor public transport provision means access to employment opportunities is compromised and creates dependence on cars which, in turn, compromises parking and the success of local businesses.
Trees	Strongly agree with the policy that existing trees should be preserved; with the exception of one which is on the border between Uzella Park and cell 28 that causes the responder concern. Veteran trees along Tanhouse Rd (sweet chestnut) should be protected (2). Trees must not be damaged by the building process.

Responses from Outside the Network Area

Number	Question	Yes	No
1			1
2			1
3	Development northwards (question 3) should not be for rural exceptions, but should be included within the development boundary. Cells 26 and 28 would not be able to viably deliver affordable	1	

	houses & cell 11 may have proportion of affordable houses reduced. The golf club land would be more suitable.		
4			
5			
6	Too restrictive and proscriptive; not in accordance with NPPF		1
7			
8	Too proscriptive; should, at least include the word 'normally'		1
9			
10			
11	Should be restricted, if included at all, to listed buildings and conservation area		1
12			
13		1	
14			
15			
16	What is meant by 'locally'?		1
17	Not clear and too restrictive, particularly for town centre sites where such a requirement may result in no development at all.		1
	.		