

Gwinear-Gwithian Parish Council

Community consultation on potential new affordable housing scheme on land NW of Relistian Park, Reawla

Comments received from the community via the GGPC website comments section (between 22-7-21 & 2-8-21):-

The infrastructure in Reawla would need to be severely updated to accommodate any more housing. The roads are not suitable, there are no amenities at all, a car is needed to get anywhere from here. Also there is a neighbourhood plan which I hope will be adhered to.

We don't need any more houses in this small village. Having small one bed units would increase the number of car as each person would need one, there is already parking problems in the village especially on Relistian Park. The ideal of a footpath though Relistian Park to access facilities, what facilities? Do they mean the bus stop? As Cornwall Council wish to increase the number of trees in the county why don't they use is land to plant trees and provide a breathing space for the villagers.

I am not against this development in principle as long as this community is provided with a large recreational area where people can walk and let their dogs off the lead. Plant trees may be wild flower meadow may be a seat or pond to attract wild life. Have open area cut once a year for hay to keep them open to stop them becoming over grown. All we have at present are the narrow roads, and the traffic is getting worse. Yes we have a small children playing area, it's not that good for wild life or where adults can go and sit for a bit peace and quiet. More houses more people more traffic this will become more important. Go back to the landowners and say if you want this then we want a large village green that can never be developed.

Further to the details above I would like the following to be considered:

The field is, I believe, prime agricultural land and last year the farmer took 3 and possibly four cuts for silage and or hay from the field. I understand that being prime grade 3 agriculture land this should not be up for a change of use. Also I believe the field is outside the village boundary at the moment.

No village facilities such as a village shop or pub. Both at Gwinear and Carnhell Green but no safe footpath all the way to either. No foot path to the school. All major safety issues.

Nothing in the village for young teenagers which could cause anti social behaviour issues.

No local doctors surgery and no bus to either Connor Downs or Praze surgery. Limited public transport and only to Helston and Camborne by bus.

I believe that brown field sites should be developed first and understand that there are such sites at Connor Downs therefore close to the doctors and with a bus into Hayle and Camborne.

This proposed scheme is, as previously considered schemes, unworkable, totally unsuitable for the area, and would have a serious ongoing effect on the existing residents. Noise, traffic, overcrowding, unsocial behaviour are all factors which are rarely considered by the Authorities. There are no facilities in the village, not even a corner shop. The local school is at bursting point, and the vast increase of traffic through Wall would no doubt encourage speeding and off road parking in the area.

Then there is the question of sewage and waste disposal, a topic which has caused several problems locally for many years already.

Reawla is a quiet village, inhabited by many retired, long term house owners, resident for thirty years or more, ourselves included.

We have paid a fortune over the years for the right to live here in peace. It would appear that this right is now to be forfeited.

I do not think any large development is needed nor do I think it suitable for the area.

There was extremely low local take-up of the housing in Copper Meadows which I feel is partly down to the "affordable" housing not actually being affordable inline with the local income levels. I should know as I am unable to climb onto the first rung of the property ladder.

There was a previous consultation for houses on this site which was objected to by a large number of local residence.

Since then we've lost our local shop so besides the park and the "Parish Hall" that sits largely unused I'm not sure what the facilities referred to are? (I believe the school is a several year wait list)

There also appears to be historic planning applications on the site BC14/00804/IN (52 dwellings - initial notice cancelled) W1/88/P/1728 (Residential development - refused)

W1/72/P/367300 (Erection of dwellings/domestic garages - refused)

The road by the pumping house also floods and has done for years, further loss of drainage via fields will only worsen this.

There have been other development "rumblings" on other sites nearby which have also been shot down e.g.

PA19/11278, creation of a new access which prompted a lot of objection due to concerns

it would be a precursor to a development.

So to summarise, I object to any development

We are totally against this scheme.

1 We should not be using Grade 2/3 agricultural land to build council houses.

2 The village has no amenities, shops pubs etc.

3 The roads are not adequate to cope with this development.

4 The school is at full capacity as is the sewage pump station.

5 We should not be even thinking about building outside the recently formed settlement boundary - if this is allowed what was the point of the settlement boundary

I ask that the Parish Council considers the following when discussing the proposal: A) determining the need for affordable housing

B) consider- is this grade 2/3 agricultural land the only and best option for affordable housing

A) Although a Housing Need Survey will be conducted, I remind the council of the Minutes of the meeting held on 11/7/16 where concerns were expressed that only 60% of the newly built Affordable Housing at Connor Downs was taken up by people with a local connection and that the Parish Council thought that this was not acceptable as this showed there was not a requirement for this type of property in the area.

Furthermore, I'm told by Cllr Pascoe that other sites at Connor Downs are available with the necessary approval for development, which includes the provision of Affordable Housing. Connor Downs would seem a more suitable place with a Dr's surgery, shops, a garage, school, public house etc all within level walking distance, whereas- although the proposal states that "there will be a footpath leading to local facilities" apart from the Play Park there are no other facilities, so a variety of amenities would need to be provided to make this site a reasonable place to live for those who end up living there and all of us already residing in the surrounding villages e.g. an extension to the school would be required.

B) The location and nature of the proposed site: I have had a conversation with Mr Carlshausen at Cornwall Council as I wanted to understand the concept of Council owned land/Affordable Housing, especially as this site is outside the village boundary agreed in the NP. It transpired that he did not know that The National England Classification of the site is Grade 2/3 Agricultural Land. He said he had been told that it had not been farmed in recent years, yet it is common knowledge, with photographic evidence showing a variety of crops being grown there over the years and up to the present time. Indeed the field has been used for haymaking- and 2/3 cuts have been harvested this year. Mr Carlshausen said he had been told that it had been "left to grass over". I therefore question that the Rural Exception Housing Sites policy could be applied to this site. The Open Space Study states- "with agriculture being one of the top industries within the area, the importance of protecting good agricultural land for the future makes sense to protect both jobs as well as sources of food and sustainability generally"

I ask that the Parish council does not support this proposal as Brown Field Sites, those already shown on the Cornwall Site Allocations Development Plan, sites already earmarked for development and sites within the NP are developed before any thought is given to using agricultural land.

I therefore feel that it should not logically follow that just because the landowner decided to sell his fields, that they are the right and proper place for a housing development. I would like to be assured that Mr Carlshausen will be given all this information and make his own intensive enquiries before the proposal is given further consideration

I have lived in the village of Reawla with my wife for 20 years.

We are unhappy to hear the news that Cornwall Council would like to build on the the grade 2/3 agricultural land behind us. This land has been used over the years to grow various crops- we have photographs to show this. This land Changed hands December of 2019 and was purchased by [REDACTED] they describe themselves as the construction of domestic buildings - about the same time the cropping of the land ceased and was replaced by the cutting of hay in the summer season.

I am surprised that Mr David Carlshausen of Cornwall Council Housing and Delivery Team did not know this. It's unfortunate that he is unable to attend this meeting

We as villagers signed up to the NP a few years ago to the tune of 88.6% in favour..where a settlement boundary was agreed and I for one believe there should be no building outside this boundary till 2030, and this does not mean a council housing estate.

I believe the sewage pump station is running to full capacity and also the pipe which runs across the golf course and down to angarrack..

The roads are not suitable for more traffic being narrow in this area and without footpaths . Very dangerous for children having to go to the nearest school which is at full capacity also.

Mr David Carlshausen letter on the 6th July to Mrs Vida Perrin states a footpath access will be provided from the development through Relistian Park to the local facilities. What facilities would these be? The village store has closed and the village store at Leedstown has closed also the PO in Gwinear . Public house at Carnell Green has closed too. The buses run one an hour at the moment.

We are constantly being warned by the government and other official bodies about climate change and global warming and that we must value green open space to limit climate change. This does not mean changing grade 2/3 agricultural land into a sea of concrete and tarmac which can cause flooding somewhere else which has already been experienced in Hayle.

Perhaps we should consider an alternative use for this valuable land - it could be a great asset for the village in future years. Maybe a Nature Park with a rewilding scheme. Perhaps it could one day be owned by the village to give enjoyment to future generations and help to resist climate change.

Just a thought

I would like the following to be addressed with regard to the above proposal :

Traffic generation - I do not believe there is, or will be sufficient road infrastructure to accommodate the increase in traffic serving the proposed housing. The roads already struggle to accommodate two way traffic through the day. This has already increased following the development of Copper Meadows.

Highway safety - how will the roads be kept safe for pedestrians? Will there be pavements for safe passage of children, especially when accessing Gwinear school? I walk my dogs along Relistian Lane and find this already a problem, without increased traffic.

Services - can Gwinear school accommodate more children? I believe it is already oversubscribed. Are there sufficient other services such as doctors surgery, public transport, local shops etc to accommodate the increase in local population?

Brown field site - is the proposed area brown field? I note that it has been farmed successfully for some years. My understanding is that brown field sites should be prioritised for development. Can you confirm there are no brown field sites in the locality? May I note also that Connor Downs has comparable farmland, and also supports a school, doctors surgery, bus route, shops and public house, with good road infrastructure and pavements already present.

Drains - the sub station located in Relistian Lane at the proposed entrance to the site has been flooded for most of the last 6 months. Will this be rectified and drainage improved?

May I also ask why there will be no vehicle access via Relistian Parc? There would appear to be adequate road and pavement already in situ?

I note that planning permission for this site was declined previously. Can you confirm that the new application has accommodated satisfactorily all previous grounds for which planning was declined? I look forward to hearing from you in due course. I work for [REDACTED] and sadly my shift patten means I will be unable to attend the meeting on 2nd August.

I know we desperately need more social housing in Cornwall, but it is irresponsible to build on high quality farm land while there are plenty of brown field sites and poor quality farmland available.

The field is great for growing crops, but it has always had drainage issues.

People, have been trying to get permission to build on the field for almost 60 years, but, it has always been considered unsuitable for building. If building does take place on this field, it will probably lead to flooding either in the new houses or elsewhere in the village.

This proposed development is outside the agreed village boundary. It is good agricultural land that has been farmed for years for crops and silage and hay. It totally goes against climate change issues. There is no shop in the village. The school is up to capacity and people living there will have to use their cars or scanty bus service. It will destroy the wildlife, badgers (see them regularly) bats and foxes live there. The doctors and dentists have no vacancies. Instead of destroying the environment and green fields we should be developing abandoned buildings and building on brown field sites. Building more houses does not solve the housing problem. It increases the need, more people from outside the area will be related to those who buy, and so it goes on! The only way to solve the affordability of housing is

tightening of mortgage credit and tax system (like Germany) PST using punitive levy on speculators and second home owners encouraging them to invest elsewhere. Stop the destruction of the countryside. Additional traffic is not needed in Reawla. I am all for affordable homes, but not at the expense of the beautiful green good agricultural land.

The idea that this land is to be considered for housing development is totally unacceptable because this area is Grade 3 Agricultural land, and is still in use. Firstly the focus of the Council should be to examine all other Brown Field sites or similar, giving priority to preserve this land for future food production.

Secondly, there are other important issues which also have a bearing on this proposal e.g. the unnecessary pressure on local services/infrastructure i.e. sewerage, access, pavements etc should be important factors when considering this proposal to avoid a huge negative impact on this village.

It has been noted that several houses have recently been built and 2 are in the process of being built in Wall and Reawla on in-fill sites- I ask the Parish Council - Why these have not been used for Affordable Housing if there is such a great need?

Before starting down the road of a major project in a tiny village, it is critical to consider the potential consequences. Would the majority of Reawla residents (human and non-human) benefit or be disadvantaged by the development, do the disadvantages outweigh the possible benefits, and consequently should the proposal be scrapped or proceed?

As a general note, the Cornwall Council plan currently lacks clarity. There is no indication of the total number of proposed buildings or residences (e.g. flats/building). Further, the distribution of property types is not specified. The information is couched in vague terms, indicating that there will be at least one of each of five categories. This makes it impossible to determine the numbers of buildings, residences or residents involved. The use of the term 1.5-bed is disingenuous marketing speak.

A primary consideration is the human population number shift. The most recent estimate of the current population of Reawla is 1,063, distributed in an area of just 0.3925 km² (https://www.citypopulation.de/en/uk/southwestengland/cornwall/E34003745_reawla/). It is currently impossible to estimate the number of new residents but, if an average of 2.4 people per household is assumed, and the rumoured figure of 61 residences is accurate, that might mean an increase of 146 people. This would represent an overnight 14% increase in the Reawla population. In contrast, the Reawla population increased by only 0.78% annually between 2011-2019 (https://www.citypopulation.de/en/uk/southwestengland/cornwall/E34003745_reawla/). It is challenging to imagine how any well-resourced community could successfully manage a sudden increase of 14% overnight, let alone how a tiny, under-resourced, facility impoverished village such as Reawla could cope with such an influx. It is illogical to believe that a 14% increase over a few months would be sustainable.

On a closely-related note, the current population density of Reawla is estimated at 2,708/km². The average population density in the South-West of England is 237/km² (<https://www.statista.com/statistics/281322/population-density-in-the-uk-by-region/>). In other words, the population density of Reawla is already 11 times higher than the average in the South West, and adding potentially 146 more people can only exacerbate problems caused by overcrowding. For comparative illustration, the population density of Penzance, considered to be a major town in the South-West, is just 1,616/km² (https://www.citypopulation.de/en/uk/southwestengland/admin/cornwall/E04011505_penzance/). That is, Reawla is already more densely populated (167%) than Penzance. Does anyone genuinely think that it is a good idea to exacerbate this situation? Cornwall is suggesting increasing the population density even further, when Penzance has fewer people per unit area than Reawla already does.

It is important to consider the environmental impact of a major development on a small, rural community. An obvious factor that would adversely affect the environment permanently is the inevitable increase in fossil fuel-powered vehicles. Assuming (as Cornwall has been reluctant to commit to numbers) a development of 61 residences, it is easy to imagine an additional 60-120 cars, vans and motorcycles. If a typical passenger vehicle emits about 4.6 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year (<https://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/greenhouse-gas-emissions-typical-passenger-vehicle#:~:text=typical%20passenger%20vehicle%3F-.A%20typical%20passenger%20vehicle%20emits%20about%204.6%20metric%20tons%20of,around%2011%2C500%20miles%20per%20year>), then 100 vehicles could be releasing 460 tons of this climate-warming gas into the air, some of it locally. There are also the NO_x gases and particulates that are so damaging to lungs, especially those of the very young and the elderly.

Building 61 residences in such a small area would be devastating to the non-human species too, notably the insects and small mammals that populate the targeted field. Pollinators are already at great risk in the UK; the effect on butterflies, bees and other pollinators that inhabit the intended field would be catastrophic. Several local small mammal species are also under threat. Only humans have the ability to protect these species, and we have a responsibility to leave a better world, not a poorer one.

It is understood that the proposed vehicular access to any new estate would be via Relistian Lane, opposite the entrance to Copper Meadows. This seems less than ideal. The creation of what is essentially a crossroads with

access to two estates is inevitably going to give rise to a traffic hotspot, with vehicles turning left and right from two estates, bringing an unavoidable increase in risk to vehicle occupants and pedestrians alike. And all this in a dip where traffic is coming downhill from two directions without very good vision, particularly in the Gwinear direction. Traffic would also have to contend with the semi-permanent local "lake" that builds up there each time it rains. Cornwall mentions some improvements at this new junction but their efficacy is subject to doubt. Standard traffic calming measures have not always proven highly successful, and this choice of entrance seems to be misjudged.

Even if the tiny area of Reawla could squeeze in a 14% increase in people, how would the existing facilities cope? To determine this, the existing facilities should be evaluated, along with any contracted agreements to improve them.

There are no shops in Reawla. There is no doctor in Reawla. No dentist. There are no secondary schools in Reawla. No nursery schools. The small Gwinear Community Primary school is about a mile away and already has 112 pupils. It seems unlikely that another possibly 60 children (one/residence?) could suddenly be simply incorporated into this facility. In any case, the school sits on a very narrow road that is always blocked at drop-off and pick-up times. Walking to and from this school carries risks too. There are no public houses or cafes in Reawla. No village green. No duck pond. It's too small for these basic features of a village life, making it an entirely inappropriate location for a large new development.

The bus service is hopeless. Very few buses run daily, they finish ridiculously early in the day, and are limited in their destinations. We have been left standing waiting for buses that never arrive on several occasions.

What new facilities are being offered by Cornwall Council to overcome the absence of these basic facilities? If new facilities are inadequate or not forthcoming, then this opportunity to force feed more people into Reawla would not seem appealing. I have not been made aware of any plans or promises in this direction, and I'd wager that Cornwall does not have the funds to provide adequate facilities. This appears more of a dumping exercise to me.

Looking at the benefits-to-disadvantages ratio, it seems to me that the current population (human and non-human) of Reawla would experience zero benefits and significant disadvantages. Similarly, it is unclear what tangible benefits any new residents would obtain, given the local lack of facilities and the fact that they would be placed miles from the facilities they want and need. In contrast, the number of beneficiaries would seem to be very small, and possibly zero. This smacks more of a dumping exercise than properly-planned progress to me. The case that it is acceptable to simply visit disadvantage on a whole community in order to meet political targets is hard to sympathise with.

Before starting down the road of a major project, it is critical to consider the inevitability of consequences element of chaos theory. If chaos is the inevitable outcome of one decision path, that path and that decision should be rejected. What are the consequences of a major development in the tiny village of Reawla, will the majority benefit or be disadvantaged by the development, do the disadvantages outweigh the possible benefits, and should the proposal be scrapped or proceed? Aside from the logistics that argue clearly against the proposal, it has become increasingly clear in the past decade or so that we have a greater responsibility to the wider community and future generations, that what we all saw as progress 50 years ago has had surprisingly negative outcomes, and we should learn from our past mistakes. Weighing up all the evidence, I'm of the firm opinion that the proposal is not beneficial or neutral to Reawla, and is actually detrimental.

3 bed housing for those who live locally and need affordable housing. Who have local connections are desperate for 3 bed housing due to having children needing local schooling only and not sold on to outsiders.

Allotments are good, better would be a local Shop for local product and people.

Dear Parish Council members I'm writing to you to register my dismay at another proposed planning scheme being discussed for Relistian Lane after this was overwhelmingly dismissed by the village during a previous application. As well as being outside the village neighbourhood plan, which the whole village took time and effort to vote on. This development doesn't count as infill development. My objection to this proposed development is based on the infrastructure, accessibility and nature of the village. We have no facilities within walking distance that would be required by the proposed development, Doctors surgery, shops or regular public transport. The village has a quiet rural nature and further development will bring more vehicle movements in narrow lanes with no public foot-ways. The infrastructure of the village is barely able to cope with the current level of housing in terms of the sewage disposal, with housing in the existing road of Relistian Park experiencing sewage back up during periods of rainfall, this will have to be addressed for further development. The proposed area to be built on is currently good agricultural land being farmed productively and is not a brown field site, building should be prioritised for brown filed sites first not taking out productive land because it's easier and faster to develop. There are brown field sites within the locality that should be forced into development to satisfy any housing need.

The village has already completed a housing survey need in 2019 with the outcome being that the majority of people completing the survey wanting to be housed in Connor Downs due to its better provision of facilities. Having lived in Reawla for over 20 years are we 'the village' going to have to go through this every couple of years because the land owner wants to make a better return than from farming. Because the village doesn't require or want this development. I therefore ask the Parish Council not to support any proposed development in Relistian Lane or outside the neighbourhood plan.

I do not support this proposed scheme. I feel it would have a negative impact for the village with increased traffic and population. It would hugely effect the residents who live on the boundary of the proposed build area.

As a resident of Relistian Park I am strongly opposed to the vehicular access to the allotments and pedestrian access to the housing via Relistian Park. This would be an increased security concern with more people coming through the road. It is a quiet cul-de-sac which is part of the appeal of living here and increased traffic through the road would spoil our quiet road.

If this scheme was unfortunately to be approved I cannot see a reason why the allotments could not be accessed through the new development. Also there is no reason why pedestrian access would be required through Relistian Park when there is another route out of the new development through Relistian Lane.

I would like to write to you regarding the proposed development in the land NW of Relistian Park. If this proposal from [REDACTED] and CCC were to tragically go to planning I would suggest that an open walk-through community information period is held over 3 days and for times that will suit all. And that a significant notification of this consultation is given to the community. We as a community need time to digest and we do not move as fast as the development companies and CCC.

It is heart-breaking that residents of Reawla have to endure this dance of planning on this particular green field land again and again. I have only lived in the village for 20 years and have had to experience the anxiety that this brings to my life. My neighbours who have lived in the village for over double this time have had to endure these many times.

I live here for exactly what it should be— village life- one of peace and quiet in a small community.

We are all aware of a housing need in Cornwall and the cause should be identified and corrected by CCC. I hope we all do not look back in 20 years and wonder why such decisions were taken to build on green field good farming/grazing land instead of CCC directing those developers build on all the brown field or disused buildings first. Then if there is still a housing need only then move to green field sites.

You don't need to take a bus ride too far to see brown field large sites for consent for residential staying vacant whilst developers move in on green field sites.

I have to admit the land owner of the parcel of land in Reawla, and any parties who will profit from any covenant, are determined at best to build on this land. Each time it is harder for residents to fight – we are not SMEs in planning nor do we have any legal representative as these development companies and CCC have.

And to add that it seems looking at the CCC website and historical GGPC information to hand the Parish has been subject to more housing need surveys than the majority if not all other Parishes of villages. Surveys were held in 2013, 2014, 2019 and now we will probably have another survey in 2021 just because of this land. The 2019 survey states that of all of the completed surveys 3 households wished to live in Reawla.

I appreciate your time for reading this and my hope is that as the GGPC you will all oppose and object to this large development.

The above planned development is not suitable at this site as the road infrastructure would not take any more traffic and would lead to a road safety issue.

I also fail to see the benefit of a foot path from the site into Relistian Park as there is already a pavement in place on Relistian Lane and also an alley way through the housing estate opposite the site which leads to the main road to access amenities of which there is only a bus stop, park and post box.

The site has always been used for agricultural use and is to this day. The hedgerows feed many different types of wildlife and is home to hedgehogs where a hedgehog highway is in place

I cannot support the scheme as believe there is no need for further housing development in reawla. The current proposal with allotments is merely a sweetener and carrot dangling exercise due to the issues with SW Water main sewer land drain crossing the top of the proposed development site. There is no need for allotments or housing in Reawla Village on a greenfield site outside of the NP Settlement Boundary (so shame on you County Council for your poorly identified choice) especially as Connor Downs already has an approved site ready to start, which will more than meet the housing needs for this parish. General concerns are lack of infrastructure in the village with zero level of amenities, except a bus route and one post box!

I do not support this scheme. The community voted and agreed on the village boundary and where schemes like this should be developed. This is grade2/3 agricultural land. The roads are not fit to safely accommodate the increase in

traffic. The school is already oversubscribed. This development would burden the community and infrastructure not benefit it.

As a villager of 30 years , I feel the proposed site is not acceptable and should not be approved . Reawla has no local Shop , no Doctor's Surgery , no local Green-space , the bus service is very limited , the school is full and has a waiting list Plus think of the wildlife around here

Community comments made at GGPC meeting held Monday 2nd August 2021:-

I have lived in village for 46 years, the application was rejected at the outset 5 years ago, development not a good idea no shop in village, Leedstown shop/post office gone, pub and Gwinear Farmers gone at Carnhell Green. Mr Carlshausen advised Cornwall Council (CC) are looking at old buildings/brownfield sites so why looking here? He was told that these fields had not been farmed for years but that is inaccurate.

I walk around the village and there is so much traffic and this will just get worse the traffic calming proposed could just cause an accident with some many roads coming off it. I have bee told there could be 61 houses that could be 60/120 more cars on the road.

This is prime agricultural land, there have been 3 houses built in the settlement boundary which could have been affordable and Connor Downs has taken affordable housing outside area.

Housing survey not needed have had plenty, should not be on a Greenfield will just open up development for the next field which could equate to 160 new housed which would change the village forever, do we not matter.

I have lived here for 44 years and I feel the general feeling is 'not in our backyard' but where does the housing go then? Why have the facilities gone-did you use them? school is using an infant class as a store room. Have son who is looking for housing and keeps getting turned down for not being local enough, in last 18 months house prices have gone up considerably

I am Governor at the school and they are not using an infant class as store room the school is almost full, could only take a couple more children at this time, people walking to school would be put at risk but I appreciate housing is needed as I have teenagers who would like to live in the Parish.

I am a young person who needs housing and would like to lie on the village I grew up in (Reawla) you cannot get anything for £180k these days and when they do come up they are gone before you can even view them. Not easy to get a mortgage you need 6/7 times your salary which would mean having a mortgage until I am in my mid 60's rent is extortionate at over £1k per month want to live near family, want my daughter to go to the school I did (Gwinear School) but I have had to move out of the area to afford something, I have been turned down for properties in Camborne for not being local enough but a person who lives in Manchester who has a sibling or parent living there could be housed. Even the part ownership schemes can equate to £600 for rent, £550 for mortgage and £50 for ground rent each month. There is a need for affordable housing on the area. Young people with low paid jobs have no chance. A site in Bodmin for part ownership properties were all gone before the properties were even advertised on the 'help to buy' website as the developer had a waiting list of his own.

Part ownership a good stepping stone it helped me get my own property, there is a housing need and I sympathise with young people who feel overlooked

Land would be owned by the Council and houses would be owned by the Council

Was there a call for land from the Council? Did they look at other sites?

What community benefit would there be for the school?

This development is not going to pay for things like new pavement to school, sewerage won't even be upgraded

The school needs a car park

Council money being used not an investor so what community benefit will there be

What other land is there in the village/Parish

If the properties are going to be for the older generation how will they get to amenities the only local transport goes to Camborne

We need the infrastructure to support development

Should be looking at sites that are not grade 2/3 agricultural land as once it is gone you cannot get it back

GGPC statement regarding this proposal:-

The Parish Council publicly advertised the proposals between 22-7-21 & 2-8-21 and held a community meeting on the 2-8-21 to give the community an opportunity to comment on the proposals (see above comments received)

The Parish Council has the following policy regarding this type of consultation:-

Pre-application and Pre-decision discussions

Pre-application presentations or other presentations by applicants to full Council should be limited to the development proposal and a question and answer session on factual matters. Members must maintain an impartial listening role. Questions to clarify aspects of a proposal or the expressions of policy concerns are legitimate as long as they do not develop into negotiations. It should be made clear at the outset of the meeting that discussions are not binding and that views expressed are not part of the determination process.

At each meeting where a pre-application is to be presented the Parish Council will make the following clear:-

"The Parish Council '**without prejudice**' may ask questions and raise local issues during pre-application discussions at this meeting which are based on the information currently available but this in no way indicates a formal decision by the Parish Council. The Parish Council will only make a formal decision on full planning applications when all the relevant information is before them"

The Parish Council will not at this stage make any predetermined view regarding the information received as it is not a formal planning application, it asked the community to provide its views and at this stage that is the information the PC will forward to CC for further comment from them. Any further information received regarding this site will be discussed at future public PC meetings or through community consultation and all parishioners who contacted the PC regarding this proposal will be kept on a database so that the PC may keep them updated regarding this site in the future.