

Rame Peninsula Neighbourhood Plan

Comments received from questionnaires, Oct 2014

Q1

FORM

People aspire to buy the freehold of rental property when they can afford it
With opportunity to buy after renting for a suitable period.
What evidence?
No more buy-to-let holiday homes
Struggle to get companies to build, no incentives, little profit in social housing
No, as I think the affordable issue will be exploited by property developers and such like.
Should be rent or sale.
1 st time occupants deserve a chance to buy & get on the property ladder. Would also like to see affordable working for 'local' (permanent residents for past 5 years, say) to buy.
A housing trust responsible so that a house cannot be bought and then sold on at an inflated price, excluding local person buying them. Similar to Jersey maybe!!
Because it is needed
No houses should be built for rent. Affordable houses for sale, should reflect the LOCAL demand. 80/20 Split
Affordable housing, should be built for sale. Prices should be made available to young local couples.
I believe houses should be available for ownership. Ownership responsibility.

ONLINE

They always end up in private hands and rented out anyway
Local people should be able to have the choice to buy their own home
My son and daughter in law would like to live nearer to me and would like to buy here but find it impossible to save for a deposit so some shared ownership to help them or people in similar circumstances would be helpful
because there should be an option for those people who wish to buy their home to do so by having access to buy affordable homes. The main point here is the choice which should be available.
Because I think that this would be built in Millbrook and I think we have our share for the moment
Because unfortunately it does not help the young locals. The property is offered to those already in local social housing and people from outside the area are moved in to the vacant homes.
Affordable homes to buy would help young local people get on the housing ladder. Not to be sold or part owned by anyone that does not reside on the Peninsula. We need investment in the area to be encouraged, not discouraged.
Some people want to buy their property. These properties could be kept for local permanent residences via a clause in the deeds.

Poor quality homes = poor quality buyers. Not wanted.
Cannot support it unless we know where it is. No point building more cheap rental housing if JOBS are nowhere near
This is an area of outstanding natural beauty- any affordable social development will bring the area down and any estate or affordable housing will soon look tired and not properly cared for
As a local family who cannot afford to buy a home in the area we feel some affordable properties should be available for purchase as well as to rent.
I think there is enough social housing in the area. New homes which are affordable for working families is in more need.
Need to provide for all members of the community including social homes and homes for your professionals looking to make a family home in the area.
..but only because the standard of design will be on the low side
Not enough detail. There is a demand for reasonably priced rented housing for families with local employment - at least 7 families need this in Millbrook alone at the moment, who are currently renting and shortly face eviction as owners seek to sell houses.
Some people need affordable homes to buy
the infrastructure at present will not support much more building of social or private homes
why not shared/outright ownership ?

Q2

FORM

What evidence?
Assuming that this relates to homes that remain unoccupied for large parts of the year. On are only occupied for 2-weeks
Same as above
No, in special ?????????? As future generations are concerned, I think property owners should be able to build dwellings for family members.
Cannot see how enforced! Constraints can be by other means. E. g. type of dwellings, second home restrictions, etc
But I cannot see that it is legally enforceable.

ONLINE

This policy could be construed as social engineering and as such should not be adopted. I would need to see the evidence before I could make a properly informed decision so for now I will have to answer 'no' to this question.
I can't see how this would work, who can make sure these new builds are not immediately put up for sale at a much higher price as has happened in the past
How will such a policy be enforceable. We all know that people can say whatever is necessary at the time. The key issue is the building of affordable homes and making land available for that purpose. No landowner will sell land unless he can do so for a profit. Having lived here for 25 years I can see the issues that second home ownership and the high price of property. This has been to the detriment of my own family. However, we live in a democracy and I wouldn't be happy putting covenants/conditions on new builds as much as it galls me that the only people who can buy into the community are generally second home owners.
Please spell principal correctly!
Not sure about this - many people need to rent - but it would reduce the number of new dwellings popping up.
Generally yes, but sometimes developments for holiday lets, as in barn conversions or other uninhabited buildings, can be an important economic asset for an area and should not be automatically ruled out.
see comments previously
Tourism helps support the villages

Q3

FORM

Cannot comment because I have not seen the Neighbourhood Plan in detail.
Agreed. But put in before allowed to build
Contribution to be decided before development commences.
Like to see projects blocked because demands placed on the developers are too restrictive.

ONLINE

will put off employers
I don't think there should be any more building until the roads are sorted
Development should not be of a quantity requiring improved infrastructure in order that we maintain the rural nature of the area.
Because again there's not detail on how such a policy would impact on a myriad of conservation concerns applicable to the area 9 different national stewardship laws for protecting special environments http://mapping.cornwall.gov.uk/website/ccmap/default.asp?minX=106414&minY=10642&maxX=266596&maxY=118572&layerName=Areas%20of%20Outstanding%20Natural%20Beauty
Highway infrastructure especially Hounster Hill, Dodbrook and the Tanyard area needs sorting out before ANY new housing schemes start
This could put off a developer willing to build affordable housing

Q4

FORM

No wind - as unsightly on the countryside.
Define 'unacceptable!'
Everybody wants power but they don't want it generated in their back yards! Pathetic! Why is a turbine any less pretty than a Pylon?
I do not think that renewables spoil the landscape and would support their development.
Is it possible to better define "unacceptable" to avoid "interpretations"
But I am very much in favour of renewable energy in the form of (quiet) wind turbines which are not close to houses. I object strongly to a piece of land covered with solar panels. All new buildings should have solar panels.
No, I think solar panels should be encouraged on roofs and wind turbines should be banned
Absolutely!
No wind turbines yet. Another study indicates hearing/health problems from the frequency.
Don't restrict! Renewables are too important.

ONLINE

This question is not clear - so I can't answer yes or no. What would the policy do? Please re-phrase to ask something like, do you support this statement? In that case my answer would be yes.
Renewable energy is needed even if it does affect the appearance of the landscape
we will have no natural beauty if we don't use alternative energy. Everything changes! Get used to it. Poron factory got permission! wind farms and solar have a LOT LESS impact than the factory's smoke stack
But there must be a way of stopping "NIMBY" objections, which are at present preventing virtually all applications.
The 'anti' wind farm lobby too negative and biased. Don't think wind farms or solar farms impact negatively on countryside.
I think the question is worded in such a way as to encourage a restriction on renewable energy developments without considering positive aspects of such initiatives.
I think we all need to embrace renewable energy and stop being nimbys
But only if a balanced view is taken rather than nimbyism
The damage that will happen to the local environment, species, and people as a result of increasing extreme weather and rising water due to climate change will have a far greater negative impact on the area than the visual impact of solar or wind turbines. The science on this is I think widely accepted now, and we need to be less nimbyish and short termist in our thinking.
Because there is one already and it should be enforced. please see link http://mapping.cornwall.gov.uk/website/ccmap/default.asp?minX=106414&minY=10642&maxX=266596&maxY=118572&layerName=Areas%20of%20Outstanding%20Natural%20Beauty
Generally yes, but as a society we need to support renewable energy for the long term welfare of the planet and the human race.
Some people will never support change/progress

Q5

FORM

Development must not harm special conservation/amenity value ever

Agreed. As before, put it before allowed to develop.

Very difficult to replace special conservation features when gone (eg woodland, countryside with bird/mammal/insect life)

ONLINE

I don't think it's relevant as there are too many areas on the peninsula which require protection, so offsetting isn't the issue for me. Development needs to be very small/local level, with due regard for the location. Offsetting might work but I've never yet seen this to be an advantage for the residents in other schemes which offset needs... it's always in favour of the developers.

Do not allow build in first place

I don't believe any special conservation areas should be developed

There should be no compromise on protecting the local features of special conservation or amenity value. They must not be displaced

Conservation and amenity values are a must on the Peninsula so unless there was a 100% guarantee of this being kept

Housing and employment developments should be avoided in areas of special conservation, there would seem to be sufficient other areas in which to site them.

I support development where infrastructure exists but not where it will need to subsequently be provided as a result of development.

This is a watering down of the current protection and it's unclear whether the local development planning process has the support of professionals dealing with conservation including bodies like English Heritage

Q6

FORM

Modern engineering solutions should be considered where impact at wooding is minimal.

Absolutely.

ONLINE

This is like asking is the sky blue . This policy already in place with building control

Q7

FORM

As amended statement above

Can't say - Who's decision would this be?

ONLINE

Each submitted plan for development should be judged on it's own merits. A blanket policy often means individuals could lose out on adding aesthetic value to an area, and that may be ultra modern in style, so if the idea is to have only trad style extensions/new buildings, it wouldn't necessarily 'reflect' the area, or more to the point, damage it by being 'out of place'. All improvement/building plans should be judged on individual benefit/detriment to the immediate locale.

However, some of these criteria will be open to opinion so may be contentious.

there should be room for permission to build in materials such as cob, straw bale and other such materials

Although I agree in principle with the above and this is supposedly already in place as we have a conservation officer who is involved in the planning process. How is it possible that people from outside of the area are always able to circumvent the planning whereas the indigenous population are not.

Everything changes, get used to it. Nothing wrong with variety

Too constricting and doesn't allow for positive changes such as modern architecture

Again this what building control is all about

However, I do not agree with 'pastiche' Cornwall vernacular.

Q8

FORM

As amended statement above

Sort of. Item designed or complement/blend in

Partly - It depends on what the "development" is (industrial? Domestic? Size?)

ONLINE

this sounds subjective and could close off a style that could enhance the AONB and be modern at the same time

see previous

Trad building means damp cold and inefficient. Older patterns of building were used due to difficulty of doing otherwise.

This seems to be too vague and leaves too many opportunities for possibly unwanted development

Who will decide if these conditions are met? i agree with the conditions, but have questions about accountability

AONB should not be touched by development

Nothing in these simplified regulations to protect habitats or species are mentioned.

I support 1 and 111. I do not agree that all new building should follow traditional lines there is merit in much modern architecture and the village should reflect this

Q9

FORM

Yes - as long as high priority is also given to affordable housing

Buildings that would fall into disrepair through total protection. Would not benefit in the disrepair long run

ONLINE

would like to know which forts we are protecting. some are an eyesore now and would just be a money pit

Depends on the alternative build location

some are eyesores. A blanket priority would be wrong. Selective would suit. eg, Maker and Fremantle are certainly historic but they certainly don't look pretty

No. Most of them are a blot on the landscape and a remnant of a more jingoistic age.

that English heritage , aren't they all listed anyway ?

Q10

FORM

The park in being asked to be self-financing. It would be difficult to fulfill this and keep the park as it is

Trees downed by winds + storms need to be sympathetically removed or conserved. Use the wood to help funds etc.

ONLINE

Trees and woodland is too woolly ! Trees need to be managed and replanted. Current management of hedges is poor

Would like assurance that Edgcumbe are maintaining and investing, ie Earls Drive hedges not cut properly this year making it impossible to pass without damaging car

I support the above in principle but we need to be flexible in our thinking. The primary concern is to retain the amenity for all and the park has to be self supporting. Maybe a few eggs will have to get broken in the process.

These are currently protected by professional national guidelines and with professional staff in the park. More funding should be given to the park to develop its assets but also to keep the necessary knowledge in house so that the long term restoration of all of the parks assets can eventually be restored.

Generally yes, but modern design and developments may enhance what we have already got. We do not have to be stuck in the eighteenth century.
again this building control

Q11

FORM

Only if the aerials or satellite dishes are small and discrete
Dishes should be unobtrusive and suitable colour to fit to surroundings
Need an impact study & detailed info, on, how many! What dishes etc would be required - all attempts to allow what residents require should be investigated.
Not necessary these days as tv can be obtained through BT boxes etc
Need to preserve the character of the Cornwall region overlooking to bay
The chalets themselves are invisible into the beauty of the cliff -minimise the damage
The use of such things is not suitable in this area due to the wind. Indoor aerials are available to do the job.
Not sure - depends on the size and appearance of those aerials dishes probably prefer to keep the restrictions.
Unightly and out of character with area.
Could be ugly if put on poles etc
Having owned a chalet an indoor aerial works perfectly well these are holiday chalets, I see no need for satellite dishes or large aerials.
But will need to have some restrictions.
If there are height, Size & Siting restrictions.
Would not enhance the character of the area
It needs to be controlled so that dishes and aerials do not spoil the scenic beauty of the area.
Because I am concerned that the question does not limit size

ONLINE

Only if limitations of height and size are imposed.
Already looks like a shanty town.
Within limits! Obviously don't want to see a forest of satellite dishes/ aerials but if discreetly placed? Could there be a height restriction? I don't see it as problematic, but could change my mind!
Some are ugly enough already
Chalets were never designed to be lived in and the area needs protecting against over development. Lift restrictions and next there will be 20m high masts I would like to see a feasibility study produced detailing how the resident's wishes might be granted but with a low impact upon the visual quality of the location. Only after proper consideration of the details of the suggested change(s) to planning policy should a decision be made. These are second/holiday homes and therefore should have no influence on restrictions designed to maintain or enhance the area.
The chalets are an eyesore already additional dishes and aerials will be even more obtrusive
Aerials and satellite dishes will spoil the already growing construction on the Cliffs. Alternative technology exists to enable TV watching.
This would destroy the appearance of Whitsand
But limit the size allowed
would not enhance the natural beauty of the area
AONB it needs to stay that way
They are holiday homes so why not just enjoy it.

Unsightly. The cliffs are still natural in appearance despite the chalets.
I would support small aerials but not dishes and anyway there are other ways to watch telly now such as a BT box through your phoneline
I don't know, what were the reasons for disallowing in the first place?
dishes do not have to be at roof level, they can be mounted at ground level
You can get it on the internet no dish is really needed.
All developments on the cliffs should bear in mind the overall view of the landscape. Anything which seriously detracts from this view is a problem.
Visual impact is detrimental. These are notionally not permanent homes
Only if they can be sited so they don't impact on the landscape
within reason ie 20ft dish ?

Q12

FORM

Amend Statement
Might be a bit late now!
Insufficient info
Also promote public access?
Only if it retains its present image does not become commercialised

ONLINE

not enough info for an answer!
Originally I would have agreed but now I would be happy for 'affordable housing' to benefit from the site
Why Maker Heights specifically? Such a planning policy is required for the whole area
Care must be taken to avoid encouraging quick profit enterprises from taking advantage of the undeveloped site to the detriment of the surrounding landscape environment
Maker Heights is a blot on the social landscape of the area and should not have been permitted in the first place
Being the closest property to Maker heights I oppose any development as I have chosen to live in an underdeveloped area and so would wish Maker to stay that way
As long as it's not so prescriptive that it prevents people from trying new ideas, particularly environmental ones. A lot of young local people are engaging with Maker and its good to allow them some latitude as it's relatively hidden
i think people would have different interpretations of what this means. the site has many scheduled monuments and i believe English Heritage have many restrictions about what is permitted there, historically planning restrictions do not seem to have held much sway
Maker Heights primary purpose is not to promote employment opportunities. The Rame Conservation Trust should have a look at its constitution and charitable objectives. As it has such a wide range of assets and such broad community use it is importance that a broad range of independent interests are involved in its future governance.
Needs to be regarded as a special case as the economic and cultural potential needs to be realized without detracting from the area.

Q13

FORM

No transport into the village. More delivery vans on the roads leading towards Millbrook. General increased traffic in the area.
I do not support any large-scale developments in the area.
What evidence? Where exactly do you mean?
Infrastructure already sketched to limit.
Not sure what this means! Where is this? It would help if consultation was accompanied by maps!
I believe there should be balanced development geographically in the village. The social housing that already exists in Southdown could be expanded
Development should be allowed at Southdown only if a new or improved road from the Poron Factory to the east side is provided. This would help reduce the choke point at the Dodbrook/West Street Junction
Yes, but: Not sure that would work - more people diving into village for shopping etc? Would maybe need a shuttle service to reduce traffic and the access to shops.

ONLINE

I'd need to know more. I say yes, but it's not really either yes or no, until explained further ...
Road cannot cope as it is
what evidence are you referring to? I am not aware of any. Also, where exactly do you mean by the West side of the village nearer the main road? I would need more specific information to indicate my support/not support for this policy
I would prefer no more development in this village but would prefer some other villages to have their share of development
More planning of this project needs considering, there are other sites on the outskirts of the village that could be considered.
There should be no more large scales in Millbrook
No more large scale development at all should be allowed. Infrastructure and roads will not support it
The best area for development is on the Southdown side BUT suitable infrastructure, especially access roads, needs to in place
I don't think Millbrook needs any more houses on either side of the road!
I can understand that this would prevent more traffic coming through the village but it would still mean that a lot more traffic will come through Antony and Crafhole to get to the outer edges of Millbrook.
We don't have the infrastructure, particularly roads, schools and doctors to support further development
i don't know enough about the possible sites to the west of the village. I don't think anyone supports any particular location for development yet. Southdown should be supported to grow and innovate as traditional employer and industrial landscape but obviously within the context of the AONB esp Wild Birds Not much space on west side so east side may be only option but means more traffic through village.
I think newly developed areas should be together, otherwise the old village and all its characteristics will be engulfed. There is a place for newer buildings which will always be attractive to newcomers, but each area within the village has its own characteristic and a mixed approach would lose this.

as stated before the main road into the village is a joke and this area is AONB
what evidence ? common sense to develop away from the water

Q14

FORM

See Q13 development should be allowed as long as roads are improved for access.
Yes, But It might increase through traffic in village of villagers going the work there? Would need unique road from shutdown

ONLINE

but also limited business use at Foss and Southdown
very good idea
It depends what sort of industry - I wouldn't want to walk to work there as the road is not suitable for pedestrians. Wouldn't it be better to have work units nearer the village centre?
but not exclusively
as long as built sympathetically.
Why not build it in Kingsand outskirts ?

Q15

FORM

Too much improvement would increase visitor numbers and therefore more traffic and less parking for residents

ONLINE

it needs to be looked after and protected but works well as it is
It already is very well used.
They already are

Q16

FORM

No Responses

ONLINE

would need more info. Increased traffic through the village would be a concern as would any sort of development which would lead to a high end 'luxury' marina.

We already have an enormous steel aircraft hanger type shed. As far as I know it went up without planning. it has a boat in it. How big are "small" boats? how can we have any more businesses down at Southdown and not have more traffic? traffic is dangerous now!

There is already too much growth in both old brick works. Both the water and phone supplies are already under too much stress. The water pressure at Foss Cottages frequently is so low that the shower does not work.

again building control will take this into account

Q17

FORM

Crafthole is only one of the affected villages (Antony and St John also) Need policy for all

Boundary Yes, but not too much more development allowed. The roads are too congested as it is.

ONLINE

No Responses

Q18

FORM

Costs would be astronomical mainly because of the very dilapidated condition of the pub.

Maybe, I do not think it is that simple. Certainly need some control over future development of creative of village.

ONLINE

Why Can't others comment on this. We all want pub open!!

As lovely as it is to have a village pub if it's not sustainable then why bother.

What not let reopen as a pub