

## Day Imogen

---

**From:** St Erth Residents Association <admin@sera.st-erth.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 February 2018 17:23  
**To:** johnslaterplanning@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Peter Rylett; Day Imogen; Furley Sarah; Furley Sarah  
**Subject:** St Erth Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** Decision\_Notice-3227109.rtf; Chenhalls Site E 16 feb 2018.jpg; HI 1 amendments 16 feb 2018.doc

Dear Mr Slater

I have been asked by Mr Peter Rylett to correspond with you to clarify a couple of points. I have been involved with the St Erth Neighbourhood Plan since its inception and have worked closely with Mr Rylett during its drafting.

Firstly, regarding the development now taking place off Chenhalls Road I attach a copy of the approval of the Reserved Matter for your information.

Secondly, apologies for any confusion over Chenhalls Site E. This site is the remainder of the land fronting Chenhalls Road and adjacent to the new development, which no doubt you saw during your visit to St Erth. Chenhalls Site E is shown outlined in red on the attached picture taken from Google Earth.

I note that you are aware of the application on The Treloweth/Little Mill sites.

I must apologize to you for an error for which I am responsible and only noticed today. Whilst working on the amendments following representations from Historic England in respect of HI 1 I inadvertently forwarded the incorrect document to Cornwall Council for uploading to the Neighbourhood Planning portal and forwarding to you. The errors are on page 4, in the penultimate paragraph where the words "..., despite opposition from the Parish Council, Cornwall Council and the Residents Association, at the planning stage" had not been replaced with "on appeal" and in the same paragraph the penultimate sentence " It is believed that any application for development of this site would succeed, certainly on appeal." should have been removed. The inclusion in the second paragraph on page 5 of the Policy HI 1 of the words "and the design of the scheme should demonstrate that it is based on these findings." was also omitted. I attach the correct version for your use.

Sarah, please would you ensure that the correct version is posted on the Council's website.

Yours sincerely

Claire Casey

Website Editor

St Erth Residents Association - working for the community

## Day Imogen

---

**From:** Day Imogen <Imogen.Day@cornwall.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** 19 February 2018 09:37  
**To:** John Slater Planning  
**Subject:** RE: St Erth

Hi John,

Yes, St Erth Parish is a designated rural area.

Kind regards,  
Imogen

---

**From:** John Slater Planning [<mailto:johnslaterplanning@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** 16 February 2018 16:03  
**To:** Day Imogen  
**Cc:** Pete Rylett  
**Subject:** St Erth

Sorry another question . This ones for the LPA. Is St Erth Parish, a rural area designated under [section 157\(1\) of the Housing Act 1985](#). This enquiry relates to the question of thresholds for tariff based contributions under Section 106s.

Kind regards

John Slater BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

[johnslaterplanning@gmail.com](mailto:johnslaterplanning@gmail.com)

[www.johnslaterplanning.com](http://www.johnslaterplanning.com)

01404 851467

07592 644760

John Slater Planning Ltd is Registered in England & Wales Company No.10365719

Registered Office: The Oaks, Buckerell, Honiton, Devon, EX14 3ER

This e-mail and attachments are intended for above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please e-mail us immediately at [enquiries@cornwall.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@cornwall.gov.uk).

Please note that this e-mail may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with the relevant legislation and may need to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

Security Warning: It is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free. The Authority will not accept liability for any damage caused by a virus.

## Day Imogen

---

**From:** St Erth Residents Association <admin@sera.st-erth.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 16 February 2018 17:23  
**To:** johnslaterplanning@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Peter Rylett; Day Imogen; Furley Sarah; Furley Sarah  
**Subject:** St Erth Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** Decision\_Notice-3227109.rtf; Chenhalls Site E 16 feb 2018.jpg; HI 1 amendments 16 feb 2018.doc

Dear Mr Slater

I have been asked by Mr Peter Rylett to correspond with you to clarify a couple of points. I have been involved with the St Erth Neighbourhood Plan since its inception and have worked closely with Mr Rylett during its drafting.

Firstly, regarding the development now taking place off Chenhalls Road I attach a copy of the approval of the Reserved Matter for your information.

Secondly, apologies for any confusion over Chenhalls Site E. This site is the remainder of the land fronting Chenhalls Road and adjacent to the new development, which no doubt you saw during your visit to St Erth. Chenhalls Site E is shown outlined in red on the attached picture taken from Google Earth.

I note that you are aware of the application on The Treloweth/Little Mill sites.

I must apologize to you for an error for which I am responsible and only noticed today. Whilst working on the amendments following representations from Historic England in respect of HI 1 I inadvertently forwarded the incorrect document to Cornwall Council for uploading to the Neighbourhood Planning portal and forwarding to you. The errors are on page 4, in the penultimate paragraph where the words "..., despite opposition from the Parish Council, Cornwall Council and the Residents Association, at the planning stage" had not been replaced with "on appeal" and in the same paragraph the penultimate sentence " It is believed that any application for development of this site would succeed, certainly on appeal." should have been removed. The inclusion in the second paragraph on page 5 of the Policy HI 1 of the words "and the design of the scheme should demonstrate that it is based on these findings." was also omitted. I attach the correct version for your use.

Sarah, please would you ensure that the correct version is posted on the Council's website.

Yours sincerely

Claire Casey

Website Editor

St Erth Residents Association - working for the community

## Day Imogen

---

**From:** St Erth Residents Association <admin@sera.st-erth.co.uk>  
**Sent:** 17 February 2018 00:26  
**To:** johnslaterplanning@gmail.com; johnslaterplanning@gmail.com  
**Cc:** Day Imogen; Peter Rylett  
**Subject:** St Erth Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** St Erth Open Spaces vers5 Jan 2018.jpg; St Erth Open Space assessment JAN 2018.doc; OBJECTIVE 3 OS amendments response to Open Space Officer 8 January 2018.docx

Dear Mr Slater

I am writing in response to your two emails to Mr Peter Rylett regarding Open Spaces and the Well Field.

### Open Spaces

I attach, as requested, a copy of the most recent Open Space Assessment carried out by Cornwall Council, dated January 2018 although this does not, for me at least, help to clarify the issue. However, the 40 sq m per dwelling was the figure given to us by Stuart Wallace, Cornwall Council's Open Space Officer, in an email of 9 September 2016 and worked out based on the approximate anticipated growth of St Erth Parish during the Plan period, the figure of 54 is given by us in 1.1 and HI 1, Stuart used 55. We initially had the higher figure of 63.85 in Policy OS1 but this was corrected by Stuart Wallace to the minimum quantity needed of 40.00. An extract from his email giving an explanation of how the figure was arrived at is below.

The figures to match the column title (quantity provision per new dwelling) may be calculated relatively easily once an approximate number of new houses are provided. At the time of the study this was not yet available, as it was something the steering group had to consider.

Do you know the target for new house numbers for the NDP period? I couldn't see it in the NDP.

As an example, if say you anticipated growth to be 55 new dwellings, the table would read as follows: -

**Table 2**

Type of open space	Future quantity provision standard parish wide (m <sup>2</sup> /person)	Minimum quantity needed for new housing (m <sup>2</sup> per dwelling)	Min size new (m <sup>2</sup> )
1. Parks, amenity	5.93	13.63	1000
2. Natural space	47.02	5.26	1000
3. Public sport	8.74	19.04	7000
4. Children's Equipped Play	0.7	1.61	500
5. Teen provision	0.1	0.46	500
6. Allotments	1.36	0.00	2500
<b>Total</b>	<b>63.85</b>	<b>40.00</b>	

## Well Field

Following the submission of the Plan to Cornwall Council and the six week consultation the Principal Public Space Officer (OPEN Space) commented as follows

In Policy OS 2 - Open Space Protection, the Well Field (WF), as stated previously, is not an 'open space', and its protection as such may weaken the protection afforded to the rest listed under the title 'green space' in table 4. The Karting track also listed is neither open or green. If it is essential to include protection of features not shown as POS on map 4, I would suggest that OS1 is restricted to open space provision and its protection, and OS2 be used for other non-OS leisure attractions or areas of local landscape value.

In view of this we amended Table 4 and the text above it to reflect the Officer's concerns while still including spaces identified by residents as locally important. We also amended the wording of Policy OS 2 omitting reference to the Well Fields but referring instead to

Development proposals for privately owned sites of locally valued open or green space.

The full comments by the Public Space Team on Objective 3 and our suggested amendments are attached, these were posted on Cornwall Council's website at <http://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/neighbourhood-planning/neighbourhood-planning-in-cornwall/tab-placeholder/s/st-erth-neighbourhood-development-plan/>

Also attached is Map 4 which now shows the two SSSI sites within the Parish following a request from Natural England for these to be depicted. We did not feel it necessary in view of the amendment to Policy OS 2 to include the Well Field on this replacement map (erroneously left off the previous version).

My apologies if the two amendments documents for Objective 1, Housing and Infrastructure 1.1 and Policy HI 1 sent to you earlier and Objective 3, Open Spaces 3.1 and Policy OS 2 are not clear. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further clarification by email or phone 01736 751763.

Yours sincerely

Claire Casey

Website Editor

St Erth Residents Association - working for the community

## Day Imogen

---

**From:** John Slater Planning <johnslaterplanning@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 16 February 2018 16:16  
**To:** Pete Rylett  
**Cc:** Day Imogen  
**Subject:** Well Field

Pete

Sorry to keep coming back but as you may have guessed I am coming across questions as I write my report. Please can you provide me with a map that show which is Well Field as I cannot identify which site it is on Map 4. I think I know which site it is from my visit but I want to be sure.

Kind regards

John Slater BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

John Slater Planning Ltd

[johnslaterplanning@gmail.com](mailto:johnslaterplanning@gmail.com)

[www.johnslaterplanning.com](http://www.johnslaterplanning.com)

01404 851467

07592 644760

John Slater Planning Ltd is Registered in England & Wales Company No.10365719

Registered Office: The Oaks, Buckerell, Honiton, Devon, EX14 3ER