

Comments on the Lanlivery Draft Plan

Suggestions: present the analysis of the community consultation in a more easy to understand format (charts?), also consider moving the actual analysis to your consultation statement and simply using relevant bits of data to support the objectives of the plan.

The idea behind a neighbourhood plan is that it adds a local dimension to the Cornwall wide policies contained in the Local Plan; in cases where a neighbourhood plan policy offers no additional protection, our advice is that it is unnecessary and should be removed.

There should be a statement setting out how many houses the plan provides for over the period.

Other policy areas you may want to consider

- Do you want to draw a settlement boundary?
- A policy that protects views and vistas from inappropriate development

Policy	Comment
LGEN1	Clarification: In Point ii, you comment that the NP policies should be taken into account but the statement above seems to suggest that point ii is relevant only when policies are 'out of date' – do you mean Local Plan policies (if so, please state this for clarity), if you mean the policies in the NP that are not out of date, please state.
LGEN2	Point ii) I understand that you are trying to favour older BF sites over ones that have been 'created'. I suggest a wording along these lines: 'Development on brownfield sites that have been vacant for more than [10] years or appropriate redevelopment of existing buildings will be supported. Development on newer brownfield sites or greenfield sites will only be acceptable where there are no such suitable alternatives.' iii) suggest 'complements existing...' to allow for some more modern design where it is complementary to the existing built environment. iv) and v) it would be helpful to map the relevant views and historic / environmental designations and to refer to the maps in the policy.
LLNE1	Suggests that applicants should demonstrate how they have responded to local character – how would you expect them to do this? Does it need a character statement or something similar?
LLNE2	Not sure that this policy adds anything that is not already covered in the Cornwall LP. Unnecessary? If you want to add additional

	protection for locally important non-designated habitats, then you will need to identify where these are on a map and what it is that is being protected.
LPCH1	Fine
LPCH2	If archaeological remains are unscheduled, how will a planning officer know they are there? If there are locally significant sites of architectural importance, these should be identified on a map.
LSF1	Fine – although I think covered by Policy 4 in the LP.
LH1	<p>We would like to help you to include a policy along these lines, limiting the size of properties may be a good way to maintain affordability, however a similar policy in St Minver has run into trouble (although their homes were less affordable). I need to explore some of these issues further with the affordable housing team before we can support this policy – I will come back to you.</p> <p>A few initial questions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would you identify a 'local' ? • What about homes for families (>2 beds) • Would you impose a timed restriction on resale (eg not within 5 years ?) • Would you want to limit it to permanent residence?
LH2	These will be new homes in the countryside – I think this would be contrary to certain provisions in the NPPF and LP. There is no limit on numbers – what if a farm wanted to build 30 holiday chalets, would that be allowed by this policy? Or 30 homes to rent to local people? Should the policy refer to single dwellings?
LH3	<p>Are these intended to be open market properties? If so, it is difficult to limit the sale to local people only (although you could encourage local marketing first)</p> <p>Change wording – suggest:</p> <p>'Proposals for housing suitable for and accessible to older residents, close to the village amenities will be supported where they comply with other policies in this plan. Developers will be encouraged to offer such properties for sale to people with a local connection to the Parish first.'</p>
LH4	<p>This may conflict with the LP policy regarding housing in the open countryside. In order to become permanent dwellings, sufficient amenity space and parking would also need to be incorporated.</p> <p>If you want to ensure that these are used for local, affordable homes then that restriction would need to be applied eg.</p> <p><i>Proposals to remove restrictions limiting the usage of properties to holiday lets only will be supported where:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the property is suitable for permanent occupation;</i> • <i>where sufficient amenity space and parking are provided;</i> • <i>where the property is restricted as an affordable home for sale or to rent to persons with a valid local connection</i>
LH5	No LH5

LH6	Not sure that this policy is necessary as it's probably covered by general planning policy. Also, some extensions will be PD.
LRE1	Many of these restrictions are in local or national planning policy and so should be removed from the NDP.
LRE2	Fine
LRE3	Fine
LE1	<p>The current government advice is that unless a Local or Neighbourhood Plan specifically makes provision for wind turbines, they will not be supported. There is no provision in the Local Plan. A simple sentence stating that large scale wind development is not supported in the parish should be sufficient.</p> <p>The second part of the policy should talk about the circumstance in which smaller scale turbines might be acceptable. Can you explain the thinking behind the turbine heights – the heights that you include are the max for PD domestic pole mounted turbines (guidance from Renewable UK suggests that a 15m turbine can only produce enough energy to power 5 homes). Also in point v), you state that the turbines must be a coloured – as most turbines are white, this could impact on cost and the reason should therefore be justified.</p> <p>Suggest `Proposals for large scale wind turbines in excess of [15m] will not be supported in Lanlivery Parish.</p> <p>Proposals for single, small scale wind turbines will be supported where they support an existing local business, or where they provide energy for the community and where the following criteria are met (include bullet points subject to comments above):</p> <p>Current government advice is: <i>`When determining planning applications for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines, local planning authorities should only grant planning permission if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>the development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and</i> · <i>following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.</i> <p><i>In applying these new considerations, suitable areas for wind energy development will need to have been allocated clearly in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan. Maps showing the wind resource as favourable to wind turbines, or similar, will not be sufficient. Whether a proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the local planning authority.'</i> (from written ministerial statement, DCLG, June 2015)</p> <p>Note also that for some small scale domestic turbines, planning permission is not required(pole mounted turbines up to 11.1m or building mounted up to 15m). See Class H here: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2011/2056/made</p> <p>The guidance here may be of help if you do want to allocate sites for wind development: https://www.cse.org.uk/downloads/reports-and-</p>

	<p>publications/community-energy/planning/neighbourhood-planning-wind-guidance.pdf</p> <p>If the intention is simply to allow PD installations, then the policy is unnecessary.</p>
LE2	<p>I think requiring that ground mounted solar should not be sited in any location that can be seen by the public is unreasonable – in many cases, solar arrays are sited next to roads, this would preclude those developments. A policy relating to the visual impact is fine but it must take a view on whether the harm is significant enough to reject the proposal. Other than that, the policy is fine. You should provide some justification for the size limiting to 100sqm.</p>