

# Landulph views on development

## Introduction

Three discussion meetings were held in the Memorial Hall, Cargreen from 7:30 pm on the three consecutive nights of 23-25 November 2015. The discussions were advertised on notices and posters at several locations around the parish, in a leaflet delivered by hand to all households in the parish, on the Landulph Neighbourhood Plan website and the Landulph Neighbourhood Plan Facebook page, on the Landulph Innits Community Facebook page, via emails to members of the Cargreen Yacht Club and the Garden Club, and by word of mouth. Individual letters were also sent to 35 parish businesses, including the owners of the Pentille estate, the owners of the Crooked Spaniards Inn and other non-residents who have business interests within the parish. A comments page was provided on the Plan's website to allow those unable to attend the discussions to communicate their views. A local contact address and a contact telephone number were also provided on the leaflet for those not connected online.

The discussions were run by a professional social researcher with extensive experience of local planning consultations and planning research. A 'topic guide' was used as an aide memoire, but participants were encouraged to bring up other issues they considered to be of importance. The first two meetings were split by age, with the first for those aged over 50 and the second for those aged up to 50. The third meeting was conducted among individuals running businesses in the parish. At the end of each discussion, participants were asked to indicate how they would like any housing developments in the parish to be distributed, using one map of the overall parish and another more detailed map of Cargreen village. They were also asked to fill in a self-completion questionnaire.

The numbers of participants attending the discussions and completing questionnaires are shown below. In some cases, couples attending the meetings together completed a single questionnaire.

**Approximate numbers attending each discussion meeting?**

		<i>Approx number attending each meeting</i>	<b>Number of completed questionnaires</b>
Table 1	<i>Aged 50 or under</i>	<i>45-50</i>	40
	<i>Aged over 50</i>	15	14
	<i>Businesses</i>	25	19

The profile of attendees at the groups (including those in the business group) differed from the profile of the adult parish population (aged 16+), with younger residents being under-represented and those aged 65+ being over represented. However, the degree of consensus across the age groups makes the bias by age of limited significance on most issues.

**Group age profile v parish population profile (all aged 16+)**

		<b>Profile of group attendees</b>	<b>Profile of 16+ population</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Table 2	aged: 16-24	0	6%	-6%
	25-34	0	9%	-9%
	35-44	12%	15%	-3%
	45-54	25%	17%	+8%
	55-64	15%	21%	-6%
	65-74	38%	18%	+20%
	75+	10%	13%	-3%

## Community and environment

The sense of community in the parish and the attractiveness of the environment were two features that attracted residents to the area and attitudes to these aspects of the parish have a significant impact on residents' views on development. A number of participants looked back nostalgically on the nature of the community in the past and regretted the loss of local facilities (eg the shop, bus service and pub) and most saw many current features of the community as worth preserving and were anxious that any new development did not detract from the perceived attractiveness of the existing community.

One positive feature of the parish community that was widely commented on was the perceived increase in the number of younger families in the parish. The village was thought good for younger children and it was *"safe for kids to roam"*. However, there were comments about the lack of facilities for older children and concerns that the lack of public transport prevented older children from easily accessing suitable facilities outside the village. There was a considerable degree of support for the provision of a youth club or sports facilities. It was remarked that even the cricket field, owned by the parish council, was let to a Saltash cricket club and unavailable to local people.

*"Nowadays with the buses, the kids are trapped and the parents have to take them"*. (aged under 50).

*"Something for the older children, there's not much for them – no youth club, the yacht club is good but not everyone goes to that. Sports club, tennis courts, nothing like that is available"*. (aged under 50).

*"When the kids go to secondary school, the families move out. There are no facilities for teenagers, no social life"*. (aged over 50).

Whilst a minority of the business community were unhappy about the restrictions placed on their business by the area's AONB designation (for example controls over horticultural tunnels), a very large majority (indeed, all non-business participants) saw the parish's location in the Tamar Valley AONB as one of the attractions of living in Landulph. Residents were generally anxious that any future developments should not harm the AONB.

*"You move to a beautiful place, you want it to be conserved as a beautiful place."* (aged under 50).

*"Yes of course, it's nice to live in the AONB, it puts filters up for development as to where it can be."* (aged under 50).

*"We should protect the area for future generations. People on the other side of the river should have their views protected"*. (aged under 50).

**Do you think the designation of the parish as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is a positive or negative feature of the Parish?**

	<i>nos</i>	Positive	Negative	DK
<i>Under 50s</i>	14	100%	0	0
<i>Over 50s</i>	40	100%	0	0
<i>Businesses</i>	19	79%	11%	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>

Table 3

The river frontage was a particular concern and a number commented on the need to preserve the attractive river frontage. Concerns about possible development on the Cargreen quayside drove many of these concerns and the majority of residents and business people would support restrictions on building on the river frontage.

*"I would like to see something to ensure that the quayside is protected". (aged under 50).*

**Would you support or oppose restrictions on building on the river frontage ?**

		<i>nos</i>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK</b>
Table 4	<i>Under 50s</i>	14	64%	29%	7%
	<i>Over 50s</i>	40	50%	35%	15%
	<i>Businesses</i>	19	68%	21%	11%
	<b>Total</b>	73	<b>58%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>12%</b>

## Growth and housing

Despite their desire to preserve the positive aspects of the parish, Landulph residents and business people strongly favour the parish growing - both in terms of population and the number of homes. Indeed, some saw growth as the most effective way of preserving and improving the community. Overall, 79% of participants across the three groups would favour growth, nearly eight times the proportion that would oppose such growth.

**Would you like to see Landulph grow in terms of population and number of homes?**

		<i>nos</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK</b>
Table 5	<i>Under 50s</i>	14	71%	7%	21%
	<i>Over 50s</i>	40	73%	15%	13%
	<i>Businesses</i>	19	100%	0%	0%
	<b>Total</b>	73	<b>79%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>11%</b>

One common reason why people favoured growth was a concern that the local population was ageing and that the parish needed to attract younger residents in order to retain existing facilities and maintain its viability. There was also a view that a good mix of ages made the area a more pleasant place to live. The primary school was seen as key to achieving this aim and its protection was seen as important for the community.

*"I like the primary school. It encourages younger people to live in the village. Many communities are dependent on older residents; we are more balanced as a community". (aged over 50).*

However, one barrier to achieving a better mix of ages was considered to be the lack of suitable property, in terms of size and price, for younger families.

*There are parents at pre-school who plan to move to the village, should affordable buying opportunity arrive". (aged under 50)*

*"Families are key to the future of the village. Affordable housing is essential". (Business)*

There was also a view that younger adults who had been born, or grown up, in the village were unable to stay or return due to the lack of suitably affordable homes and had, as a result, been forced to either remain living with their parents or to move to Saltash or elsewhere. Consequently, there was a strongly held view that any new homes built in the parish should include a substantial proportion of 'affordable' homes.

*"I've seen too many young people that have had to leave the village because they were unable to afford to buy.. We need more social/council houses or affordable homes which are AFFORDABLE for young couples". (letter sent after groups).*

*"Young people should be encouraged to stay in the village". (business).*

"I would like people who own their own land to be able to build a local need house for their children". (aged over 50).

"I would like to see houses for young families and affordable land for young people to self-build". (aged over 50).

"New homes must have eligibility criteria so they are for people with proven local links". (aged under 50)

On average, people would like to see around half of any new homes to be 'affordable'.

**If 20 new homes were to be built, how many of these do you think should be designated a 'affordable homes'?**

Table 6

	<i>answers</i>	<b>Average to be affordable</b>
<i>Under 50s</i>	12	52%
<i>Over 50s*</i>	35	54%
<i>Businesses</i>	18	46%
<b>Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>51%</b>

\* Excludes the business group, all of whom were over 50

When it comes to the building of new homes, residents favour limited growth and a majority would approve the building of no more than 20 new homes. Local business people (some of whom owned the land on which new homes might be built) are in favour of a larger number and, among this group, the majority would support the building of up to 30 new homes.

**How many new homes do you think should be built in the parish over the next 10 years?**

Table 7

	<i>nos</i>	<b>None</b>	<b>&lt;10</b>	<b>&lt;20</b>	<b>&lt;30</b>	<b>&lt;40</b>	<b>&gt;40</b>	<b>DK</b>
<i>Under 50s</i>	14	0	36%	29%	21%	7%	0	0
<i>Over 50s</i>	40	5%	23%	50%	10%	8%	0	5%
<i>Businesses</i>	19	0	16%	16%	37%	26%	5%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3%</b>

## Housing development location

During the meetings, the participants discussed suitable locations for housing and other developments and, at the end of those meetings, indicated on maps where they would like to see housing built and the scale of development they would like to see. Map 1 and Map 2 (see the end of this report) show the scale and distribution of suggestions made by participants across the three meetings. On these maps, the first number circled indicates the number of participants suggesting that site as a suitable location; the second number indicates the average number of homes that those participants felt could be built on that site.

There was a high degree of consensus regarding suitable locations and (despite the desire of business people to see more housing built) reasonable consensus on the scale of development thought suitable on each site. There were one or two suggestions of sites in hamlets on the roads leading into the village (eg at Stockadon or North Wayton) or on the road to Landulph church, but these were minority views. There were also a couple of suggestions that the site of the Pasty shop on the A388 could provide a possible site for new housing or workshops.

*“If we are forced to have houses, they should be close to public transport. The land we designate could be the pasty factory. This was an agricultural research station, why not put it there?”* (aged over 50).

Most suggestions, however, focused on sites within Cargreen village and on sites that had already been proposed for development. One reason why the village tended to be preferred as a site for development was a feeling that young families (whom participants generally wanted to attract to the parish) *“want to be in the village for walking to school, pre-school etc”*. (business).

The most popular site was the Cloake nursery opposite the Memorial Hall. Twenty four people considered this to be a suitable site, with the average size of development suggested being 12 houses; however, this number was boosted somewhat by one outlying suggestion that 30 houses could be built here. A number (though a much smaller number) also suggested extending development along both sides of Church Lane, to the south of this site.

The second most popular suggestion was the field to the west of Coombe Drive, between *“The Oaks”* and the extension of Fore Street. This was suggested by 17 people who, on average, suggested it as a site for six homes. The next most popular location was the site to the north of *“Crumple Park”* – where nine people suggested an average of 7 houses could be built. Despite participants tending to favour sites that have previously been proposed for development, it was noticeable that not a single participant suggested the pub or quayside as a suitable site - as reported elsewhere, several residents expressed specific concerns about development here.

---

## **Roads and traffic**

Whilst participants in the discussions were generally positive about growth, it was widely felt that the potential for such growth was limited by poor road access from the A388 to the parish and village.

*“We are on the end of a ribbon road – if you put in too much, there will be more traffic”*. (aged under 50).

*“The public roads into Cargreen are running at full capacity. If the pub takes off, this will increase traffic”*. (aged over 50.)

*“The road is one of the big issues”*. (aged over 50).

*“The roads are getting busier. If we have more development we will need to increase the infrastructure”*. (aged 50+).

Car parking was considered a problem that could be further aggravated by new housing development. There were some calls for a village carpark.

Traffic and transport problems were thought to be aggravated by the lack of public transport within the parish and, as one commentator put it, *“with the increase in the village, everyone has to have wheels to get in and out of the village”* (aged over 50). Some hoped that development might provide a *“critical mass that might get the bus route started”*. (aged under 50).

As a result of these concerns, when residents were asked to suggest the number of new homes they felt should be built, the numbers they suggested were influenced by these concerns about road access and traffic issues. Indeed, around half even felt that the roads were inadequate to support the very number they themselves had suggested. Businesses tended to favour a greater number of new homes, yet were more confident of the ability of the road system to support the accompanying increase in traffic.

**Do you think the existing road network in the parish would be able to cope with the increase in traffic from this number of new homes (IE THE NUMBER SUGGESTED THAT PARTICIPANT)?**

		<i>nos</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK</b>
Table 8	<i>Under 50s</i>	14	36%	50%	14%
	<i>Over 50s</i>	40	48%	48%	5%
	<i>Businesses</i>	19	74%	16%	11%
	<b>Total</b>	73	<b>52%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>8%</b>

Despite criticism of the access roads from the A388, only a minority of residents or businesses would support the widening of the main access road into Cargreen village. The general view was that such a widening would detract from the rural character of the parish, would encourage vehicles to travel at greater speeds and would increase traffic volumes. However, there was some support for provision of more, and better, passing places.

**Would you support or oppose widening the main access road from the A388?**

		<i>nos</i>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Oppose</b>	<b>DK</b>
Table 9	<i>Under 50s</i>	14	36%	43%	21%
	<i>Over 50s</i>	40	30%	65%	5%
	<i>Businesses</i>	19	0	58%	26%
	<b>Total</b>	73	<b>38%</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>11%</b>

## Development style

Whilst residents were in favour of additional homes being built in the parish, there was widespread agreement that new developments should match the existing vernacular style and, in particular, architectural irregularity and “*higgledy design*” of old Cargreen. This was linked to a desire for individual developments to be limited in scale to avoid the introduction of estate-style developments. As one person commented:

*“Personally, I think two or three smaller developments of three or four houses. In Landrake they built a few small houses which slot in nicely”.* (aged under 50).

There was also some feeling that controls should be placed on new development to prevent a repetition of what happened in Hodders Way, where 3 storey ‘bungalows’ were built. A large majority specifically wanted any development in the conservation area to match the style of the existing buildings.

**Should the Neighbourhood Plan ensure that new developments in the Conservation Area match the style of existing buildings?**

		<i>nos</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK</b>
Table 10	<i>Under 50s</i>	14	64%	7%	29%
	<i>Over 50s</i>	40	68%	18%	15%
	<i>Businesses</i>	19	79%	16%	5%
	<b>Total</b>	73	<b>70%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>15%</b>

Whilst some participants were critical of solar panels installed on roof tops, considering them often unsightly, their use seemed generally accepted.

## Employment and business

Levels of unemployment in Landulph are low, with the last census showing only five unemployed people in the parish. Consequently, whilst residents saw some benefit in provision of business premises, this did not seem to be high on their list of priorities. Reflecting the high proportion of working people in the parish who work from home (30% compared to an average of 14% across Cornwall) more concern was expressed about facilities that enable effective home-working - in particular the poor quality of the broadband connections in many parts of the parish.

*Number 1 needs to be broadband, number 2 mobile". (aged under 50)*

*"Broadband is an issue". (aged under 50).*

*"Decent broadband is essential". (aged under 50).*

*Could do with better broadband, lost business because of speed of connection". (business).*

However, around half would support the development of additional workshops and premises for small businesses as long as this did not result in significant increases in traffic or the introduction of heavier vehicles on the parish roads.

*"The problem with this is access ..... more industrial units around will make it worse". (aged under 50).*

Although there would seem to be little opposition to additional (small scale) development adjacent to the existing workshops at Long Orchard on Church Lane, several participants favoured business development nearer the A388, to avoid an increase in traffic in the village and on its access roads (see map 1 and map 2).

*"I would be happy to see industrial nearer the main road. If they had decent telephony, I would rent there". (aged under 50).*

**Would you like to see more workshops and premises for small businesses?**

	<i>nos</i>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>DK</b>
<i>Under 50s</i>	14	50%	36%	14%
<i>Over 50s</i>	40	48%	35%	18%
<i>Businesses</i>	19	58%	11%	32%
<b>Total</b>	73	<b>51%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>21%</b>

Table 11

## Community assets

Residents expressed some concerns over the loss of amenities in the parish over the past years and there was a desire to protect those amenities that remained. Large majorities of those attending the discussions were in favour of all the sites suggested for protection being designated either as *green spaces* or assets of *community value*. Previous plans for the development of the pub raised some concerns about community access to the quayside and the potential loss of access to the river.

*"We have lost access to the water in the form of the slipway. We used to have informal access at the pub. We should have an aspiration to regain some form of facility". (aged under 50).*

*"It is possible, and it happens frequently for planners to put their buildings to block access to the water. We have to protect access to the water. Sammy Sands and the steps by the pub quay. If the pub gets its way, we could lose this". (aged over 50).*

Which, if any, of the following would you like to see protected by being designated as a “community asset” or “green space”?

Table 12

	<i>nos</i>	Penyoke playing fields	Memorial hall	The quayside	Cricket field	Rectory rooms	Yacht club	none
<i>Under 50s</i>	14	100%	93%	93%	93%	71%	64%	0
<i>Over 50s</i>	40	95%	100%	88%	83%	85%	83%	0
<i>Businesses</i>	19	84%	74%	63%	63%	63%	53%	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>0</b>

## Summary

- There is strong support in the community for some growth in housing in the parish, but only on a limited scale. Up to 20 new homes would be acceptable to a majority.
- The preference was for development on the margins of the village, even if this involved (limited) encroachment on greenfield sites.
- Any new developments should be small scale (no big estates) and to fit with the existing vernacular style.
- Given concerns about the need to encourage younger families to improve the viability of the community, people would like to see half of these to be ‘affordable homes’.
- However, a major limitation on development was considered to be the poor access roads. Most, however, opposed the widening of these roads.
- Linked to a desire to attract younger families, there is seen to be a need for improved facilities for teenagers and older children.
- There was a call for key existing facilities to be protected (eg by designation as ‘assets of community value’, and there were some specific concerns about future loss of access to the river.



**Map 1: Suggested Landulph development locations**



## Map 2: Suggested Landulph development location

**KEY:**  
Number of participants : average number of houses suggested

