

Lanner Submitted Neighbourhood Development Plan
Further Submissions to the Examiner

In response to specific questions raised by the Examiner in her email of 17 September:

Delivering New Housing

1. Paragraph 14.1 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that the two favoured housing sites were chosen as they were the two locations for which the community expressed a preference. I also see that Section 8 of the Basic Conditions Statement, in the section on the Household Survey, explains that residents were asked for their preference between six possible sites which are mapped at the top of page 23. I am interested in knowing a little more about how these six sites were selected and, in particular whether any physical constraints and information about land availability and ownership were considered. A brief explanation would be most helpful.

The sites were identified from our original public consultation day which explored ideas and preferences on which to base our household survey. It was clear at a fairly early stage that Cornwall Council felt our Basic Housing Requirement under the Local Plan could be satisfied simply through infill and “rounding off”. However, we were alive to the fact, even before our Housing Needs Survey, that there is a demand/need for smaller properties to assist downsizing and starter homes. In addition, both the Group and Parish Council are keen to see some form of supported accommodation for the old or infirm. The likelihood of these needs being met by relying on infill seemed remote. In addition, we did not want to have to accept any and all development through infill as this could mean having to accept locations, designs and densities (particularly, inappropriate reduction in garden size which would adversely affect street scene or landscape impact). It was therefore considered prudent to exceed the Basic Housing Requirement to provide a degree of discrimination, so to speak, in seeking the variety and quality of new housing which the community needs.

The detail regarding the six sites is as follows:

Site 1. This field used to be the starting point for the Lanner Carnival. The Carnival has ceased because of the high cost which would fall on the organisers for road closure and diversion. The site was put forward by a developer with an option on the land at the public consultation. Subsequent discussion within the Steering Group saw no problem in principle with the site subject to a reduction in the initial density proposed and quality of design as the site is key to defining the eastern entrance to the village. During the consultation phase

of the NDP a planning application for five detached dwellings has been granted and the site is therefore not included within our Plan.

Site 2. This agricultural land was not put forward at any stage through our consultation, although owned by a local person, but was/is included in Cornwall Council's SHLAA. It's inclusion on that list was a major factor in the community coming forward to request a NDP as it is a site subject to profound opposition. Not only is the site prominent within the southern slopes above the village but the size is such that the village infrastructure (from school to access and probably drainage) could not cope. Not surprisingly it received the weakest level of support from the community. It has since been indicated by Cornwall Council that as the land does not fall within its (draft) Allocations DPD it would be very unlikely to be granted permission if an application did come forward.

Site 3. This site is mainly in the ownership of the Trevince Estate but includes one field inherited by the owner just before the NDP process. Both came forward at the initial consultation to see if their land could be incorporated into the Plan for development. The Parish Council had conversations and correspondence with all parties after the consultation and, with the Steering Group, it was considered that this would be ideal if both owners worked together to bring forward a scheme that would include some supported or sheltered housing and a public car park (not for residents) which could be used by the two churches, the Village Hall, and those visiting the adjoining cemetery. A car park of about 20 spaces is thought sufficient. The Parish Council did obtain planning permission for a car park here a few years ago to be leased from the Trevince Estate. However, it was dependent upon grant funding which – in the time formalities were resolved – timed out.

The Trevince Estate also owns fields beyond the site, northwards to Lanner Green. Neither Steering Group nor Parish Council considered these should be developed as Lanner Green is not a lane made up to good standard and, more importantly, we did not wish to see a through road being created as the sight-lines onto the A393 are poor.

In addition, Trevince Estate suggested other land owned fronting the A393 between the physical boundary of the village and the commencement of South Downs. Development of this would compromise the identity and individuality of Lanner village from Redruth as well as destroy valued woodland/amenity landscape.

Site 4. This is another piece of land owned by Trevince Estate which it was felt could suitably offer up to 15 affordable homes to accommodate local needs. However, its status in the Plan would be as a rural exception site and – since an exception site cannot be planned for –

the idea was dropped on the advice of Cornwall Council. In addition, it is clear that the proposed site would not find approval with Historic England due to its proximity to the Tresavean Trail.

Site 5. This is another SHLAA site which has not been allocated within the Allocations DPD and the indications are that it has no prospect of gaining permission. It's inclusion in our survey was simply because it is on the SHLAA list (albeit it was listed by mistake under Redruth and not Lanner).

Site 6. This site is owned by Rowe Estates Ltd and has an expired permission for 14 homes. We have seen a new drawing for 10 homes on the site of January 2018 but this has yet to be submitted for planning permission or indeed for pre-app discussions.

CC Comments: We confirm the advice given on infill and rounding off and on the status of SHLAA sites. A site's inclusion in the SHLAA does not imply that it will be made available for housing or granted planning permission. The SHLAA is a technical study and not a policy document. It will identify possible housing sites and assess overall housing potential to support the development/review of the Local Plan as part of the evidence base and inform the brownfield register. We do not recommend the allocation of exception sites in in NDP – since they are, by definition, an exception to the plan.

2. There does not seem to be any guidance in the NP about the number of houses that could be accommodated on the site at Lannarth Farm. If the site at Sunnyside can accommodate 10-14 dwellings, would it be reasonable to assume that the Lannarth Farm site could accommodate 58 -62 dwellings to ensure that the NP target of 72 dwellings can be achieved? More specifically, was this scale of housing development taken into account in estimating the number of car parking spaces which are also to be accommodated on the site?

We were advised by Cornwall Council not to “allocate” sites as to do so would require a much more detailed appraisal of density, access, layout and environmental evaluation. This would be particularly difficult to achieve, given the desired mix of land use, house style and tenure, and mixed ownership, for the Lannarth Farm site without expense and prolonged discussions. Therefore we opted to indicate the site as one “preferred” for development placing the onus on the landowners to come forward with ideas for a satisfactory scheme which delivers the goals sought.

Para 14.1 anticipates 72 new homes off a Basic Housing Requirement of 57 for year 2017-18. The BHR for 2018-19 has been reduced to 43 which gives an anticipated total of new homes from now to the end of the Plan at 58.

With our anticipated 10 units on Site 6, a minimum infill number of only 10, the Lannarth Farm site should provide at least 38 dwellings to take us comfortably above the outstanding BHR. There is clearly the possibility, as you have suggested, of more dwellings here. However, the size and siting of the car park needs to be defined together with suitable screening or buffering from residences; the public footpath requires protection as do existing hedgerows; the layout and amenity provision for supported housing worked out; access to the site created with a widening of Rough Street and the density of development is possibly going to be lower than on Site 6. We therefore feel we have created a very flexible approach, minimizing restraints yet maximizing opportunities.

As mentioned in answer to your question 1, the object of the car park within site 3 is to accommodate visitors to community buildings and cemetery. The absence of off-street parking for these community facilities is a major cause of irritation among residents in Rough Street and in Henscol and, in addition, acts against the optimised use of those facilities. It is not anticipated that the car park should be used by residents.

CC comments: For clarity, the advice given was that a more detailed evidence base and Strategic Environmental Assessment would be required if formal site allocations were made.

Transport

3. There does not seem to be any supporting text for Policy Seventeen which deals with car parking provision. It would be helpful if you could provide a short paragraph which could then be inserted as supporting text.

Would it be helpful if Policy Seventeen is moved to follow para 20.2? What we're trying to say here is that Lanner residents rely heavily on the car: this is reflected in the high number of households having two or more cars. Consequently, whilst Cornwall Council generally seeks 1.5 parking spaces per household we feel 2 parking spaces to be more appropriate in our case. This is not to surrender any desire to encourage and plan for greater use of public transport or for more people to walk or cycle: but there is a need to accommodate reality. Economic conditions also precipitate more domestic garages being used as utility rooms,

storage space or even the footprint for home extensions – all making 1.5 a weak figure for accommodating on-site parking.

CC Comment: The proposed approach seems reasonable. We have other NDPs that include local parking standards, where they show evidence of accessibility issues, problems with on road capacity availability of public transport and local car ownership levels.