

Appendix 14

Pre-Submission Consultation – Individual Community Responses Received

The table below sets out the individual comments received from members of the community during the Pre-Submission consultation and the action taken.

Message 1	<p>I am writing to comment on the draft Landulph NDP. When I returned the original questionnaire I commented that new housing should be kept to a minimum and I still believe this is essential to maintain the character of the village. I support the importance of delivering high quality housing in keeping with the essential rural character of the Parish which should most definitely be of a small scale. Development of up to 20 houses in the Parish over 12 years is low impact controlled development, (conversion of barns, infill, individual house build) whereas large clusters of new housing in the village is not.</p> <p>I think it is absolutely crucial to maintain the village in its current form which is a quiet rural community which could quite easily be spoilt by over development. In my opinion it is already a thriving community and I am unsure why additional housing is required to maintain this. I think the current Local Need register is nil for Landulph Parish. Possibly because families start off living outside the Parish and as houses become available through natural movement of households out of the area for various reasons new families move in, and there are examples of this occurring in the village.</p> <p>In fact my own two children would probably prefer to start off adult life living outside of Landulph, possibly Saltash, as it will</p>	Discussed and noted.
--------------	---	----------------------

	<p>be nearer to work, social life, local amenities, and return to the village a little later in life.</p> <p>I am therefore keen to ensure that the draft Landulph NDP remains as it is relating to housing within the Parish; if housing has to occur it is ideally on a basis of one or two as and when required and not a housing estate, so as to maintain the quiet rural area people are used to living in.</p>	
<p>Message 2</p>	<p>Having studied the Neighbourhood Development Plan I wish to make the following comments: Whilst I agree with the key priorities on Page 4 in principle, I cannot see how limiting developments to five houses with a maximum of 20 over the next 12 years will provide the opportunity for affordable housing to attract young families to sustain the community. This limit of 5 also precludes any benefits to the community or school from 106 agreements. As a governor of Landulph Primary School and knowing the precarious situation of the Under 5s, to me, it is so important that we make every effort to facilitate a more balanced age profile within the parish to safeguard its future.</p> <p>In addition, whilst there is a desire to protect facilities and amenities, in reality, in my view, if the village does not evolve, then it will be difficult to sustain the Hall, the Church (the Methodist Church has recently closed) and the School.</p> <p>Regarding the Cargreen Quayside, some resolution needs to be sought as it is currently an eyesore and the fabric of the quay itself and the buildings are deteriorating rapidly which is</p>	<p>This was discussed extensively by the steering group. The evidence from the consultations showed that the figure of 5 reflected the residents wishes.</p> <p>Landulph is in Value Zone 2: on advice from Cornwall County an increase to 6 would not guarantee the delivery of an affordable home but would give a contribution to an offsite affordable housing contribution, in line with higher level policies. In view of this, the group agreed to keep the maximum of 5 dwellings.</p> <p>Discussed and noted.</p> <p>The condition of the Quay is not part of the NDP's remit.</p>

	<p>not in keeping with an AONB. What positive measures can be taken to facilitate appropriate development?</p> <p>Once the NDP is in place, what will be the opportunity to review or revise in the light of changing economic and socio-political developments over the next 12 years?</p>	<p>As per current legislation, the Plan may be reviewed by the relevant Parish Council – see Landulph NDP, para. 1.3.</p>
<p>Message 3</p>	<p>I as many others have concerns regarding the parking situation at lower Fore Street. It is often very crowded, and you cannot park near your house.</p> <p>If the housing was increased in this area, there would not be enough parking space to accommodate it.</p>	<p>Discussed and noted, please see Policy 2 of the Landulph Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Message 4</p>	<p>I am responding in a personal capacity as a Parish resident.</p> <p>My view is that everything in the plan should support the future growth of our parish with particular focus on future generations and the wellbeing our excellent school. (The school's details and requirements are not mentioned in the plan) This should be the litmus test on any conclusion and policy of the LNDP.</p> <p>The Survey Report I have reviewed in detail the figures of the LNDP Survey Report from February 2017. This is what the LNDP is based on and I wish to pass on the following comments. We live in a democracy which I will defend as a first principle. I fully appreciate the LNDP was conducted in a democratic way but it is also important, to understand the profile of the village voices that have been captured.</p>	<p>The Steering Group made every effort to involve all residents – see Evidence Base.</p>

LNDP Survey Report Section 2 Page 5

There were 155 respondents to the survey and of these,
0% were 18-24 years in age
3% were below 35 years in age

58% were over 55 years in age, with the largest group of respondents being over 65 years in age at 41%

I am therefore very concerned that the views of those who are 35 and under (who will be possibly 48 by the time we get to 2030), have not been reflected in the LNDP. It is precisely this group that feed the key requirements of our school, employment and housing. i.e. Our parish future generations.

I now draw attention to the actual draft Landulph Parish NDP (as on noticeboards and online)

2.The Preparation Process

2.3 Delivering (i.e. greater than five)

New development (i.e. five or fewer)

Section Delivering Landulph Parish Housing

7.3 Page 11

"The Landulph Parish NDP seeks to facilitate the delivery of approximately 20 new dwellings of individual and small developments of no more than 5.

LNP Survey Report Section 3 Question 2 Page 6 (as attached)
The 5 Houses Max requirement. .

I cannot find any specific mention of where the maximum "5" came from. It is the only option given to define a "Development of small numbers". Why wasn't it up to "10" as in the previous

Taken together, the numerous consultations were made available to all, particularly the questionnaire (Public Consultation 3) which was hand delivered to all dwellings in the parish. The Committee has dealt with the responses received.

Landulph views on Development report dated November 2015: "The degree of consensus across the age groups makes the bias by age of limited significance on most issues"

This was discussed extensively by the steering group. The evidence from the consultations showed that the figure of 5 reflected the residents wishes.

Question 1? This is the critical figure. There is no explanation in the LNDP to make respondents aware of CIL / 106 agreements so that they understand the implications on 5 House developments not needing any contribution from landowners on funding obligations.

I think the overall figure of "approximately 20" would be the correct figure for new builds before 2030.

I'm not clear on this report's evidence that there is a clear requirement to limit this to a maximum of 5 in one development.

I feel that due to the word "approximately" being used in the housing requirement, it is reasonable to use it again for the 6 and not fix a hard limit. Over the next 12 years the ability should be possible to judge new proposals for development on their merit and benefit to all concerned. My fear is that some of those proposals could be rejected for planning because of the hard limits imposed by the LNDP impacting on precisely the very low % of respondents below 35 years of age who will need the houses to sustain our future generations.

Water Taxis

I am aware that from the Mayflower 400 celebrations that a project has started and funding will be available to support better use of the River Tamar for transport. We have many complaints on how busy our lanes will become so it makes sense to use the river as another route in and out of the parish. Routes are planned between Plymouth - Rame Peninsula - Torpoint - Saltash and I believe Cargreen should be a northern destination. Provision should be given in the plan to develop

Landulph is in Value Zone 2: on advice from Cornwall County an increase to 6 would not guarantee the delivery of an affordable home but would give a contribution to an offsite affordable housing contribution, in line with higher level policies. In view of this, the group agreed to keep the maximum of 5 dwellings.

Evidence for small scale can be found in Landulph views on development, November 2015 and Consultation Questionnaire, December 2016 both of which can be viewed in the Evidence Base.

Discussed and noted.

	<p>our water frontage and resources to accommodate pedestrian access to the River Taxis for commuting and leisure. This also is a very "Green" option in an ANOB and supports Policy 2, 2 to promote the use of public transport. I accept that the LNDR committee or the parish would not have been aware of these Water Taxi proposals which is why there is no mention in the plan, which brings me onto the need for reviews.</p> <p>Review Process In the introduction of the plan, under 1.3 it states as follows:</p> <p>Landulph NDP runs in tandem with the Local Plan, which runs to 2030. It is appropriate that it should have the same end period and therefore it will be reviewed and updated in 2030. The Parish Council may however deem it necessary to update the NDP at an earlier date if circumstances warrant an earlier review.</p> <p>I have concerns that we need a clear statement in the plan about the precise review process details and timings. Is it every 12/24/36 months as example? Or at anytime the Parish Council consider. It is a long time until 2030 and the plan will need to change to support the social and economic need of the parish in that time.</p>	<p>There is no requirement to review or update a neighbourhood plan, however policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date. The Plan needs to be up-to-date and responsive to changing circumstances and it can reviewed on a regular basis.</p> <p>The Parish Council has the capability to monitor the effectiveness of the Plan. Where material modifications do not change the nature of the plan (and the examiner finds that the proposal meets the basic conditions or would with further modifications) a referendum is not required. Where material modifications change the nature of the plan, the local planning authority would publicise and consider the examiner's report in line with the procedure for making a new neighbourhood plan.</p>

Message
5

Dear Sir.

I wish to comment that the neighbourhood development plan could be, in one respect, self defeating.

I attended a recent parish council meeting at which a planning application for a small number of houses was discussed. The number was greater than the 5 defined in the draft neighbourhood plan as the maximum for any one site, but it was less than the 20 described in the plan as the target maximum for 2018-30.

The neighbourhood plan notes (quite rightly, in my opinion) that some level of house building within the parish is desirable to maintain the vibrancy of the village. However, by stipulating a maximum of 5 houses on any one site, this effectively limits building to infilling between existing properties. The nature of much of the housing in the village will preclude this, so my feeling is that this effectively stifles future house building. There are sites in the parish which might be used for new housing, both brownfield sites and extensions to other, relatively recently-built estates, but all of these will require significant infrastructure work in order to make them viable. Infrastructure works are very expensive, thus any developer needs to spread the cost between a number of houses, and a limit of 5 makes the cost per house high. This in turn pushes the price of each property up, making it even less likely to be bought by local residents.

I support the concept of keeping any future house developments small in number, but I feel the arbitrary limit of 5 will thus effectively stop most building. It should be replaced by a flexible limit, and the parish council can then judge whether the actual number is appropriate.

Yours faithfully.

This was discussed extensively by the steering group. The evidence from the consultations showed that the figure of 5 reflected the residents wishes.

Landulph is in Value Zone 2: on advice from Cornwall County an increase to 6 would not guarantee the delivery of an affordable home but would give a contribution to an offsite affordable housing contribution, in line with higher level policies. In view of this, the group agreed to keep the maximum of 5 dwellings.

<p>Message 6</p>	<p>Dear Committee</p> <p>I would first like to thank you all for your hard work in developing the plan to this point</p> <p>My only concern is the following proposed policy: Proposals for minor housing development and redevelopment (defined as 5 or fewer dwellings) that meet the criteria set out within Policy 3 of the Local Plan will be supported.</p> <p>I believe restricting any new development to 5 dwellings would mean the Parish will not be entitled to a financial contribution where a affordable element is not included in the scheme. This is clearly identified in the Cornwall Plan and is set at 6 to 10 units.</p> <p>I believe the limit should be set at 6 rather than the 5 as stated in the draft plan. The financial contribution could then hopefully be used within the Parish.</p> <p>This is the paragraph taken from the Cornwall Local Plan which covers the area I am concerned with.</p> <p>In Designated Rural Areas and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the threshold will be more than 5 dwellings. For developments of between 6 and 10 dwellings in such areas a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision of affordable housing will be sought per unit of affordable housing that would have been provided.</p> <p>I do not think the increase by one unit would have a major</p>	<p>This was discussed extensively by the steering group. The evidence from the consultations showed that the figure of 5 reflected the residents wishes.</p> <p>Landulph is in Value Zone 2: on advice from Cornwall County an increase to 6 would not guarantee the delivery of an affordable home but would give a contribution to an offsite affordable housing contribution, in line with higher level policies. In view of this, the group agreed to keep the maximum of 5 dwellings.</p>
----------------------	---	--

	<p>effect on the community but would hopefully allow funding to be available for the community.</p>	
Message 7	<p>Comments on NDP, NO MORE DEVELOPMENT IN FORE STREET OR THE LANE BEHIND IT: Given the paragraphs cited below and the assertion that they have been taken into consideration in developing the NDP, there seems to be a conflict between the content of the NDP and the cited paragraphs. When considered together, these reveal a substantial oversight, in the plan, i.e. that the community and road infrastructure cannot support the addition of ANY new residence in Fore Street.</p> <p>The reference to "adequate off road parking" in para 10.2.2 does not go far enough in addressing this parking problem. Very recently the last of the two additional dwellings created as a result of the overdevelopment of the previous [REDACTED] at the lower end of [REDACTED], which, I feel, we all neglected whilst battling the pub application extant at the time, has been sold. This development was permitted on the specific condition that 3 off street parking spaces were provided. They were, but their use is unenforceable: one resident has converted hers to garden and the others do not use theirs. Additionally the unoccupied cottage has since been occupied. Likewise, when the [REDACTED] was converted, a condition was made for a garage, which the residents do not use. The PC has also failed to address the issue of the unlicensed, unregistered street</p>	<p>Discussed and noted and please see Policy 2 of the Landulph Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

trading of secondhand cars from [REDACTED], which further exacerbates the problem. Therefore, since mere mention in the NDP of "adequate parking" cannot address the parking problems in Fore Street, development of additional dwellings in Fore Street and the lane behind it facing Penyoke Lake, should be expressly excluded within the NDP.

Even during the relatively short time since thinking around the NDP began, parking and access in Fore Street have worsened, as described above. Whilst some Fore Street residents and SPECOSA are planning to present the issues and proposals on how to deal with them to the Parish Council in September, it would be imprudent to neglect this issue within the NDP now.

A count has been made of how many additional cars now park on lower Fore Street since 2012. That number is about 15. It does not include the 4 second/holiday homes, which add another 4, at least, when occupied. Most houses are one car length wide, max. No regard is now given to the few privately owned spaces. Some residents, whose gardens can be accessed via the lane to Sammy Sands have gone to vast expense and effort to create parking behind, severely compromising their own amenity space and gardens.

Recently cars from higher Fore Street have been taking spaces at the lower end when they are free and the higher end is full, so congestion there must also be at capacity.

Constraints on Development Para 7.7

"There is little, if any, scope for creating additional,

	<p>off-street car parking areas in close proximity to existing village housing."</p> <p>10.1.1without any significant improvement to the local highway infrastructure. This can lead to unreliable journey times and friction that affects residents... This reduces [the]quality of life...</p> <p>10.1.2 Public Consultations have revealed.., some parts of the Parish experience issues with parking, such as Fore Street, Cargreen.</p> <p>.1.3. Policy 2 reflects the above views and</p>	
<p>Message 8</p>	<p>This is an excellent document and must have involved a great deal of work. Congratulation to all involved in the production. Few things are perfect, and at the risk of being classified as seriously pedantic I offer the following comments:</p> <p>Para 2.3. Delete 'of' in first line.</p> <p>2.3.2. 'Sufficiently' do you mean 'suitably' or 'appropriately'?</p> <p>2.3.3. Add 'street and exterior'</p> <p>Para 4.1. St. Dominic should be added to the neighbouring parishes</p> <p>4.5. There is also some arable farming</p> <p>Para 6.1.1. Add 'houses, bungalows or individual flats'</p> <p>6.1.3. Suggest delete last sentence, and add 'where houses or bungalows are built in groups, care should be taken to ensure that they are of differing appearance'</p> <p>6.1.4. Add. 'New housing should be energy efficient'</p>	<p>'of' deleted 'sufficiently' removed 'exterior' added</p> <p>St Dominick is not a neighbouring parish 'together with some arable farming' added</p> <p>Dwellings encompasses all of these Discussed and noted – the Cornwall Local Plan contains much guidance on design</p> <p>The Cornwall Local Plan contains guidance on this</p>

	<p>Para 12.1.3. As you provide no evidence of an astounding outbreak of religion I suggest 'beside' rather than 'along' the Tamar!.</p> <p>The word 'sustainable' appears in numerous places, one of the better definitions of the word is 'relating to, or being a method of harvesting or using a resource so that the resource is not depleted or permanently damaged'. Hard to see how this applies to a house.</p>	<p>'along' replaced with 'beside'</p> <p>Sustainability is a prime tenet of Planning Policy.</p>
<p>Message 9 - first of two responses received</p>	<p>I have just read the final draft and I would like to thank the NDP working group for all their hard work and determination over the last couple of years. Their efforts have resulted in a clear, simple and understandable document. Thank you.</p>	<p>Discussed and noted and thank you.</p>
<p>Message 10 - second of two responses received</p>	<p>Further to my initial response of 18th June, in which I thanked the working group for all their efforts in producing a clear, simple and understandable document, I would now like to turn my attention to the contents of the plan. Please note that I am writing to you as an individual and not in my capacity as a parish councillor.</p> <p>I have now had a chance to read the plan a number of times and I have three major concerns. They are i) the maximum number of houses permissible in any development, ii) the overall number of houses to be built and iii) the concept of reviews.</p>	

Before I expand upon these items, it should be noted that I believe that there should be development in the parish, as a moratorium would not be beneficial and would probably be disastrous for the future of the community. Furthermore, I also believe that development should be evolutionary and not revolutionary. Therefore, a cap on overall numbers is a good idea as a concept.

The maximum number of houses permissible in any development

The setting of a figure of 5 has, in my opinion, a number of detrimental effects.

It prevents the parish from potentially benefitting from CIL and Section 106 payments as I understand that these only kick in on developments of 6 or more properties.

It prevents developments, which are potentially good for the community, being adopted purely on the grounds that they are for more than 5 units. This is clearly nonsensical.

A consequence of adopting the number 5 is that developments of 3, 4 or 5 units may not be economically viable. If this is the case then we could be looking at up to 20 single unit developments across the parish rather than say 2 or 3 “clumps” of houses. In recent weeks a number of people have told me that numerous sites have been developed over

This was discussed extensively by the steering group. The evidence from the consultations showed that the figure of 5 reflected the residents wishes.

Landulph is in Value Zone 2: on advice from Cornwall County an increase to 6 would not guarantee the delivery of an affordable home but would give a contribution to an offsite affordable housing contribution, in line with higher level policies. In view of this, the group agreed to keep the maximum of 5 dwellings.

the last few years. That is all well and good but those sites have been used. I wonder where the next 10 or even 20 sites are going to come from if we are not going to blight our parish with houses popping up here there and everywhere.

It could said that the setting of this figure of 5 will actually stifle development across the parish apart from possibly the A388 corridor. I do not believe that this is in accordance with the wishes of the community in general. Therefore, it could also be said that the end result is that there will only be the odd 1 or 2 units built which would be disastrous for the community as a whole.

If this is the case, which I fear it may well be, then I can understand why some residents feel that the plan is a non development charter rather than a neighbourhood development plan. Furthermore, I have heard it say that it smacks of nimbyism which, if true, is rather distasteful given that the majority of the dwellings within the parish are probably less than 50 years old.

The overall number of houses to be built

The plan sets this figure at 20. Whilst I believe that an overall cap is a good idea as a concept, I do not believe that it should be a rigid and unmovable figure. It should be used as a guide. My reason for this opinion is that any development which takes the number to say 21 would automatically be

20 is an approximate figure and not an absolute.

	<p>rejected regardless of its merits. This can not make sense and I do not think that this is the intention of the plan.</p> <p><u>The concept of reviews</u></p> <p>The plan appears to be fixed and not open for review during its life. I feel that this is fundamentally wrong as it is highly unlikely that factors affecting the community will remain unchanged for the duration of the plan's life. Therefore, I believe that review dates should be embedded into the plan to allow for changing circumstances to be reflected in a revised plan. If reviews are not permitted then the parish council may well have its hands tied by a rigid out of date plan which does not suit the community.</p> <p>In conclusion, I do not feel that the plan, in its current format, is fit for purpose. It may well have been created out of a democratic process but I do not believe that the resultant document represents the wishes of the broader community. I fear that the community has slept walked into their own version of Brexit despite the fact that democratic due process has been done. Therefore, I urge the committee to consider carefully the matters I have raised.</p>	<p>Current legislation allows for the Parish Council to undertake reviews and make changes to an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. See Landulph NDP, para. 1.3.</p> <p>Discussed and noted.</p>

<p>Message 11</p>	<p>We wish to confirm our acceptance and agreement with the general contents of the latest version of the LDP. We believe that the conclusions reached are accurate reflections of the various consultations and feedback sessions. We feel particularly strongly that the following areas are most important to the community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Housing;<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ The total number of houses proposed over the plan period of 20 is reasonable.➤ That developments greater than 5 in number should be refused, so as not to over load individual areas of the community.➤ That developments should only be considered on brownfield sites and not greenfield sites with the exception of individual infill.➤ That developments should be encouraged outside of the centre of Cargreen village towards the boundaries of the Parish where there are closer links to main roads, public transport and less overloading of village access roads.2. Transport;<ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ As much as possible, priority should be given to ensuring that the centre of Cargreen village is not overloaded with extra vehicles, either residential or internet shopping deliveries.➤ Fore St has limited parking for residents that overflows into making Coombe Lane a car park.➤ Safety of pedestrians especially children attending the School must be a priority as there are no footpaths from the centre of the village to the Cross.	<p>Discussed and noted.</p>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------------

	<p>3. Small business; ➤ Small businesses should be encouraged on the outskirts of the Parish.</p> <p>4. Waterfront; ➤ The Waterfront must be protected at all costs from unsympathetic development.</p> <p>We are grateful for the hard work and long hours spent by the LDP Steering group in putting this plan together and hope that it has the full backing of the community.</p>	
<p>Message 12</p>	<p>A great plan which I endorse wholeheartedly. The plan has been made with great consideration to the people and the environment that we all call our village. One thing I would like to see as a wheelchair user is a provision for the accessibility to the public footpaths and their upkeep to a standard to allow the few disabled of the village to enjoy the beautiful vistas.</p>	<p>Discussed and noted and this information will be passed to the Footpath Representative.</p>
<p>Message 13</p>	<p>I am generally happy with the draft plan, even though I cannot see any reference to "Affordable Housing". I know that there is no requirement for this, but I am sure there would be no objections by the public. However funding for it would be very difficult to find.</p> <p>However, my main concern is that further increase in traffic, without a specific plan to improve passing places, will exacerbate an already difficult situation. The passing places at the moment are too short and narrow for anything but a modest car or small van. They are mainly on the left hand side when approaching the village and therefore of no use to the larger vehicles.</p>	<p>Discussed and noted.</p>

Traffic seems to be on the increase, particularly commercial traffic (greater use of online buying) and farm vehicles appear to be getting wider and wider. No mention has been made about the local Infrastructure Levy. Has this been abandoned by the County Council? If not what are the current proposals for levying it? Could not any monies be used by the CC in dealing with out passing bays?

We have had discussions about these matters in the past and the public also raised them. I quote from the Draft of 21-8-17:-

2. Policy 2 - Roads and Parking

Policy 2 Justification

1. *Both Public Consultation 1 and 2 revealed concern by residents about the amount of traffic using the access roads to the parish and the congestion caused by this traffic together with the need to avoid substantial additional traffic as a consequence of further building or business development.*

2. *Landulph Parish has seen developments over the years without any significant improvement to the local highway infrastructure. Congestion causes unreliable journey times and friction that affects residents and more particularly businesses requiring delivery by larger vehicles.*

In the earlier drafts we had an appendix on roads but in the latest draft I could not find such an appendix. Perhaps I missed it!

In our latest draft matters concerning roads have been watered down e.g.

10.2.1 The intention of Landulph Parish NDP Policy 2 is to ensure that additional traffic brought about by new housing and business development can be accommodated within the existing road network, which predominantly lacks access to public transport.

Please see Highways response in the Pre-submission Consultation – Formal Consultee engagement

Appendix A – maps of the Parish.
Evidence Base – all other documentation.

Appendix A and the Evidence Base are available to view on the Landulph Plan website.

	<p>We do not say what, when or how any additional traffic can be accommodated. Please advise what we have in mind.</p> <p>When verges are cut (as now) there is a big improvement to visibility up and down the narrows from Wayton up to the Pines. However, when uncut in the growing season, it becomes very dangerous. There was an accident to locals last week.</p> <p>Visiting vans always seem to be in a hurry, many do not know the width of the road, and will still come down the hill too fast even when they see a vehicle coming up. There are no signs saying "Single track road" which I think there should be. In foggy conditions we take our life in our hands.</p> <p>Some potential house buyers have shied away from Cargreen due to the awful approach road. I now share their views.</p> <p>I will raise these matters at the next Parish Council meeting when they discuss the outline application for 9 houses.</p>	
<p>Message 14</p>	<p>I am writing to let you know that I support the vision for Landulph Parish and the objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>In particular the limit of five properties max in any new development and use of sites away from village centre to prevent further traffic and parking problems in the lanes and Fore Street.</p> <p>I put these points in response to the planning application PA18/04579 and enclose a copy of the letter I am posting to Cornwall Council</p>	<p>Discussed and noted.</p>