

# St Erme Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire Results June 2017



## Overview:

The Questionnaire was hand delivered to every household, known business and organisation in the parish at the end of May 2017.

A total of 648 Questionnaires were delivered as follows:

620 Households  
16 Parish Organisations  
12 Businesses

The consultation lasted 3 weeks with a deadline date for responses of 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2017.

The community were asked if they agreed with the statements highlighted in the Questionnaire and if not to state their reason why. These statements had been taken from the surveys and consultations held so far during the Neighbourhood Plan process.

The response rate worked out on per household, business and organisation is as follows:

Household response: 169 returned = 26%  
Business response: 2 returned = 0.3%  
Parish organisation response: 1 returned = 0.2%  
Not stated response: 32 returned = 5%

## 31% response rate

*\* Please note additional questionnaires were available from Trispen Post Office and the St Erme Community Centre, as well as on St Erme Parish Council's Website*

## Total Number of Responses:

203
-----

## About You

Male	74
Female	91
Joint (2 people)	3
Organisation	2
Business	1
Not Stated	32

## Age

76 +	26
66 - 75	46
56 - 65	46
46 - 55	38
36 - 45	27
26 - 35	10
16 - 25	3
Under 16	4
Organisation	2
Business	1
Not stated	

## How long have you lived in the parish?

Under 1 year	8
1 – 5 years	38
6 – 10 years	24
11- 20 years	41
Over 20 years	82
Not stated	3
Organisation	2
Business	1
Not Stated	4

# 1 Housing

Please note the St Erme Housing Needs Survey will form part of this section

178	Yes	Future development should be for local need only – Housing Needs Survey
25	No	

## Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Developments should be both for addressing the local need issue allowing the village to thrive. By restricting too much is a risk that the village will not modernise in line with times and fall behind which translates into a lesser voice / influence in the county.
- St Erme is part of the wider Cornwall and UK community and should not consider itself too inward looking. Encouraging a flow of citizens refreshes the community.
- Anyone should be welcome to the village
- You should be open to all
- Future development should be available to those requiring homes (affordable houses could be made available/set aside for local need only)
- People from other areas might need to move here for work purposes
- An introduction of additional people will help the school, pub, church's and shop.
- A diverse movement of people should be encouraged as well as local needs
- Future development should consider a wider variety of need e.g. people moving from further afield.
- We moved to the village from out of county
- No because the village still be able to have new people moving into it
- 'Local' not defined! Trispen/St Erme or Truro or Cornwall!
- To include family members, local employment, care and support
- Depends on what 'local' means
- Everyone needs a roof over their heads
- Need to bring new blood into the village
- I feel that any future development should be led by local need however some open market housing may be acceptable as enabling development to bring forward the local need element.
- Unsustainable for larger builds. Cornwall requires movement of people. E.g. Key role workers close to local services. Housing needs to support movement in the economy
- I am standing up for the children of the village. We do not believe that Trispen and St Erme need any more development because the countryside is important to us. We find the natural world as an escape from daily stress and anxiety. Our backlanes and country side is the only thing that gives our village real beauty.

- We have always felt that St Erme & Trispen over the past 30 years have seen a disproportionate amount of development compared to other local villages. This village has seen enough development
- Local need should be truly affordable, or scheme should be set up to help over time. Market price helps off set the local resident's. All new estates should include local need that stays local residential
- The housing requirement is across the country
- Future development should enable others to move to the area and not be constrained to local needs only – development needs are a county / national challenge
- Open market housing will be made available to make it viable, the scheme should be local need led.

203	Yes	Any future development should provide a good mix of housing suitable for all generations, disabilities and retirement properties - to suit local need
	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Bungalows need to be of a good size

198	Yes	Any future development should focus on suitable brownfield sites first
5	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- I am not convinced there are enough brownfield sites available or present

189	Yes	The provision of self-build plots within new housing schemes will be considered if a local need is highlighted.
14	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Self builds would need to be built to a plan
- Self-build could disrupt building by developers in a housing scheme
- A nice idea, but it is slightly contrary to the need to focus on building enough homes for local people by 2030. It could be argued that those wanting to do

this will want to find their own plots and a self-build section of any development could take longer to complete and be disruptive overall.

- Self-build houses should strictly adhere to the character of surrounding houses.
- No because the houses might be all different style and colour and it won't fit in.
- Self builds won't be the same
- Self-build plots will not be in keeping with the other properties
- If built to set plans and if self-build plots are offered up in terms of 1 plot for 1 developer so that no one developer can take advantage of these self-build plots for their own financial gains
- On the basis that one plot is sold to one developer, the buildings also keep within village design. Not to be bought as multiple plots by 1 developer and sold for financial gain! Be good to see local people in our pariah benefit from housing
- Self-build plots could lead to vacant undeveloped sections in a new build plot and be unsightly whilst build is awaited
- The danger is so called self builds can drag on and on
- Self-build plots should be kept apart from new housing schemes due to the length of time self builds could take off to the completion of the properties
- All housing within a scheme should follow a distinct style and character, as well as meeting certain standards. A self-build project may not conform to this
- Enough house building currently self-build plots will only highlight the fact that we have no infrastructure in place to deal with more families etc.
- Only with set guidelines, so in one area and design etc. all in keeping with the area and other buildings

198	Yes	New housing to be in keeping with the 'St Erme Local Landscape Character Assessment' and the 'St Erme Village Design Statement'
5	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Should be design style free
- Whilst I agree to be in keeping – design must not be stifled by 'standardisation'
- In the future housing needs will change, we may have to look at more sustainable housing different building methods and systems we should adopt with the times if the future needs may not be the 'chocolate' box village and I feel the standard type of house will quash any imagination
- Housing should be very limited and if houses have to be built – for locals at affordable amount based on wages in the area – very low

## 2 Infrastructure

202	Yes	Developers must ensure there's adequate service connections and infrastructure prior to any future development.
1	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Essential
- Developers should be expected to ensure they do a full Environmental impact Assessment of any scheme. Rainwater capture is particularly important, and there is a need to future proof.
- Note – as I know sewage and telephone/internet connections are of particular concern I wonder if it is worth mentioning these specifically.
- We do not require further development on our parish
- Developers should contribute towards actual village services, not just water, electricity and sewerage capacity
- We knew we have a problem with BT and internet, also sewage, gas would be a good thing to bring to the village

### 3 Open Spaces

202	yes	Any new developments must make provision for open space
1	No	

#### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- This assumes any new development is a number of houses, if only one house is built no need for more open space.

203	Yes	Open space should be suitably linked to the community
	NO	

#### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

203	Yes	The open spaces we have should be protected
	No	

#### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

201	Yes	All the communal open spaces for community use within the Trevispian Parc Estate should be protected irrelevant of size and ownership
2	No	

#### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- I have put yes to all but unsure of the 3<sup>rd</sup> statement? Is this space open to all?
- Not sure to what this refers
- Not all open spaces can be protected, this is a less important issue
- Needs to be recorded

197	Yes	Open spaces should be suitable for all ages
6	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- This could say that within the village there should be a range of open spaces to cater for all ages
- How about creating a space which is more tranquil for older people to sit and enjoy
- Age specific open spaces should be made available
- Could have some for supervised children only
- I think there should be a range of open spaces which address local needs and ages but not all spaces to be necessary suitable for all ages
- Open spaces are a priority to protect
- Not all spaces as size could make inappropriate
- All ages should have some suitable open space, but not necessary to have all open spaces suitable for all ages



## 4 Highways

193	Yes	Any future development must contribute towards a safe commuter cycle route to Truro along the A39.
10	NO	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Cycle route too costly – better ways of spending money
- How many people in the village cycle to Truro?
- I do not consider a cycle route necessary
- Too few cyclists to warrant this when we could signpost lane routes through to Idless
- Needs to link to other routes such as national cycle network
- Can't narrow road further, no room, expensive to add more room? Not big enough demand
- Very few use cycles compared with cars – so cycle route not required – It just slows traffic down
- Is there demand for a cycle route? More buses would be good
- Cycle routes throughout the village should also be a priority for children to be able to use safely
- Don't feel its relevant
- Yes if quantified as needed
- The parish council cannot install a cycle route beyond the parish boundary, are other parishes bothered
- Would the use justify the expense
- A cycle route was promised last time – what happened?

170	Yes	Traffic calming measures are required along Trispen Hill, Chapel Road/School Lane and Eglos Road
33	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- No calming measures required if people park sensibly
- No need for traffic calming measures
- A 20mph limit in the village with name and shame policing
- School Lane looks after its self/ something at Trispen Hill needed
- No need for traffic humps, fine as is
- We do not need any speed bumps
- Only for Chapel Road / School Lane not required for Eglos Road and Trispen Hill
- I don't think they work well
- Too many road humps make for very uncomfortable driving. Places additional strain on chassis
- Traffic calming bumps add to noise – add a flashing speed warning sign

- I do not consider these calming measures necessary
- Physical traffic calming increases CO2 emissions and road noise as people accelerate between them. If necessary suggest flashing warning signage
- Not Trispen Hill
- I'm not aware that traffic speeds along these roads
- Yes we need to slow traffic down, but not always with bumps, ambulance drivers hate them
- Speed limit restrictions and any measures to stop drivers treating village like a race track
- Why? Not heavy traffic
- The current traffic calming creates problems – Chapel Road – fear if we have more it will make it worse
- Bad for the environment (accelerating and braking), makes driving more difficult and possible damage to car
- No 'sleeping policeman' please. Agree need to reduce speed but would prefer enforcement rather than physical barriers
- If people obeyed the laws (highway code) no more calming would be needed as anymore will make matters worse
- I'm not sure, I think the speed limit could be dropped - evidence to support this
- And all parish roads and lanes
- I've put no above as I don't know if traffic calming measures are needed. Possible reduced speed limit on Trispen Hill – 40mph
- I don't think that there is any need for these measures as the roads are narrow enough to slow traffic down and it will enable the money to be spent on something more suitable for the community
- Never seen any sign of traffic calming measures being required
- All motorists should obey the Highway Code; traffic calming measures frequently add danger to the highway.
- Eglos road needs double yellow lines continuing all down the roads as buses currently get stuck
- I would prefer to see parking restrictions to one side of Eglos Road as parking both sides could restrict access of emergency vehicles. Also it can be very painful for passengers when a car goes over them at even at a slow speed
- Not sure it's needed in all areas
- Speed bumps create bud noise when lorries go over them
- Traffic calming – not speed hump, people just drive round them and thus towards pedestrians/cyclists
- Not sure traffic calming is necessary down Trispen Hill
- Unconvinced of the effectiveness of traffic calming measures. Some options results in erratic driving and increased pollution
- Far too many speed bumps in Truro already
- Calming measures in village along Chapel Road only
- Gateway to Trispen Hill with new development - rumble strips
- Not busy – only if complaints made

198	Yes	Any future developments to include at least two car parking spaces per household, plus additional visitor car parking suitable for a rural village
5	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Better public transport
- Must be identified spaces numbered
- Do not consider visitor car parks necessary
- Two spaces plus additional visitor parking for all new development is impractical. Maybe for bigger developments.
- 2 parking spaces + visitors is against planning legislation and not enforceable
- 1 parking space is more than adequate for 2 property

199	Yes	Any development in the area of Chapel Road must not put further pressure along this narrow road due to safety and lack of parking provision
4	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Improve the road, don't restrict development
- Improve road
- There should be no development on Chapel Road

201	Yes	Any development that could put further pressure on Eglos Road would need to address existing parking issues
2	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Supply identifiable numbered spaces
- I don't think new developments can be expected to address existing problems – only ensure not to make worse
- Eglos Road needs widening to cope with increased traffic

203	Yes	All new roads must maintain clear access for emergency vehicles
	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

203	Yes	All new developments must incorporate pedestrian routes designed to integrate new housing and residents with the existing village.
	NO	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Pedestrian and cycle routes

202	Yes	Any alterations to the highway should include dropped curbs for easier access for pavements, as with any new development
1	NO	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Dropped kerbs show care to invade areas of the road reserved for other purposes more easily
- And include cyclists and horse riders

202	Yes	'Public Rights of Way' to be maintained and signage upgraded and replaced when necessary
1	NO	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Some public rights of way could/should be rerouted perhaps

## 5 Historical and Natural Environments

200	Yes	The ancient field patterns at Trevella Valley north of the village should remain as they are important historical features
3	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Unaware, so are they important?
- Don't know enough about Trevella Valley to comment
- The money could be better used elsewhere

200	Yes	The Medieval Woods at Tregassow should be safeguarded
3	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- They are! – Large area has been cut due to disease in larch trees – government order
- The money could be better used elsewhere
- They are!
- This is currently used for pheasant shooting only, which I object to. The land adjacent to the Medieval woods is covered in solar panels with concrete foundations. This is hardly safeguarding the local countryside and wildlife
- Not all historical features can be protected I have said no to the least of the list.

198	Yes	Any alterations to historical or listed buildings must be in keeping with the historical character of the area in which it sits
5	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Listed buildings add texture should not limit design and improvement, modern addition to older textures can be good
- Alterations should allow for historical / listed buildings to look better than they would if not altered due to overly restrictive policies.
- The money could be better used elsewhere

- Not all historical features can be protected I have said no to the least of the list.

201	Yes	The boundary milestones and finger posts are important assets and should be protected, to keep the rural feel of the parish
2	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Boundary milestones and finger posts are not that important
- The money could be better used elsewhere

196	Yes	Historical assets that are not currently listed, such as the Methodist Church, the Water Pump at Churchtown, Phone Box at Trispen Hill, the old School House and Railings, and Public House should be protected as important historical features of the parish
7	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Listing buildings causes problems when you try to make alterations
- The money could be better used elsewhere
- No need to protect elements of the parish which are obsolete or derelict.
- These should be protected but we wouldn't want the Chapel listed
- The pub shouldn't be listed it should be improved
- Not sure about pub!
- Phone box at Trispen Hill needs to be tidied up or removed

202	Yes	Local wildlife and biodiversity is important especially the Nature Reserve and Ponds at Trevella which should be protected
1	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Local wildlife and biodiversity are extremely important but the nature reserve and ponds at Trevella need sorting

202	Yes	Cornish hedges and hedgerows should be protected where possible
1	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- I thought that there were stronger rules in place at present anyway
- Protection of hedgerows should take precedence over development profit
- Cornish hedges that are destroyed need to be replaced in a different location

## 6 Rural Dwellings

199	Yes	Some diversification of existing farms to support core businesses will be supported where there are no negative impacts on the landscape or neighbours
4	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Introducing new businesses to farmsteads could ruin the beauty of the countryside and pave the way to future expansion and uglification
- Whilst sympathetic to farmers need to diversify, I think it gives a blank cheque to potentially alter and ruin the countryside. And we will look back in 50 years and regret having opened the floodgates of inappropriate expansion
- In fitting with local area and not which puts profit in front of landscape etc.
- But any applications for diversification needs to be passed by residents before approval
- Full consultation with neighbours needs to happen
- No new businesses required – don't really understand wording, needs to be worded exactly what you mean

190	Yes	Farming communities need to be able to improve/convert unused barns to dwellings on a small scale for local people
13	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Farm buildings should be left and used for farm animals
- It can lead to development in the countryside
- Less restrictions on land owners to do what they see fit with their property
- You have no current legal way to enforce this – to keep ownership to local people
- At affordable prices
- No as will impact on listed buildings
- No should be within the village its self
- Too many barns have already been converted causing loss of habitat to owls and bats
- Too many barns have already been converted to non-agricultural use. This causes loss of habitat to owls and bats
- I think that protection of wildlife e.g. bats barn owls etc. is firstly important, before applications are approved, but then agree that small scale for locals, keeping original character or sympathetic materials



197	Yes	Any barn conversions should be in keeping with the original character with sympathetic materials; as not to detract from the rural historical nature
6	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- As long as design is good then why not
- Yes for traditional buildings, no for modern barns which could be replaced with housing and sold separately
- Less restrictions on land owners to do what they see fit with their property

192	Yes	Conversions and diversity applications should be tied/attached to the farmstead.
11	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Not necessary
- Don't know
- Yes for traditional buildings, no for modern barns which could be replaced with housing and sold separately
- Each conversion should be assessed individually as to be fit for purpose
- Not tied
- Not really sure what you mean by that?
- Less restrictions on land owners to do what they see fit with their property
- Unnecessary
- Maintain character is critical
- I agree to the statements in this section but in here needs to be a statement to preserve the rural lanes and roads and put responsibility onto the transportation/farmers who destroy the hedgerows, roads by their massive vehicles that are too big for all the parish lanes and roads
- Depends on circumstances

## 7 Leisure and Community

198	Yes	Existing facilities need to be protected and maintained before the implementation for further equipment/areas
5	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Existing facilities will need to be updated and modernised
- Can't see why new equipment / areas have to be put on hold because other areas are not protected or maintained
- Expansion is a good idea and this may mean new premises
- - I don't understand what this is aiming to achieve. If it is saying developer contributions should be spent on existing spaces first we could miss out on provision of new spaces and developers increasing density as they don't need to provide open space
- This needs to be done in conjunction with new equipment and areas. Which will be needed for any new building developments/housing estates? I.e. we'll need new areas and protect and maintain current areas.

198	Yes	To look at extending the Community Centre with Phase 3 to include an indoor sports hall and facilities
5	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- What about an outdoor all weather pitch as well?
- Will children be allowed at the community centre with Phase 3?
- Phase 3 needs to be looked at very carefully before permission granted. Indoor sports hall should be built in school expansion
- I am concerned about this group of questions – we should not develop the community centre at the cost of other facilities
- No one project should be considered until all other projects have been addressed. Don't take money from a few projects to benefit one
- Will an indoor sports hall and faculties be used enough to cover the costs. Is the hall at the moment not sufficient for community

203	Yes	The loss of any existing community / recreation facilities will not be supported unless appropriate replacement facilities and services
-----	-----	---

	No	can be provided in a location suitable / appropriate for the community
--	----	--

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- We also need to consider the activities of the parishioners and leisure activities, dog walkers, cyclists, horse rides all of which require suitable safe areas to enjoy the rural landscape and countryside. Please could some protection be given to the landscaped area outside the community hall entrance to restrict vehicles who insist on parking on the grass and destroying the hard work completed by the villagers.

## 8 Landscape

Please note 'The St Erme Local Landscape Character Assessment' will form part of this section.

203	Yes	The avenues of trees that line the rural roads around the parish are an important natural feature helping the village to retain its rural feel
	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- **More tree planting on hedgerows and a better hedgerow management plan is needed – 3 year rotational cutting**

203	Yes	Natural woodlands, native trees and hedgerows in and around the village help to keep its rural nature and break up the built environment; providing a soft border to the village boundaries leading into the open countryside
	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Too much habitat has already been destroyed for developments that we do not really need

202	Yes	The approaches to the village must retain the rural feel and not be prominent
1	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- These have already been damaged by development near Killigrew Gardens. Looking at company who is building description these are houses being obviously sold to high income non-locals as they clearly do not seem to be advertising towards local prices or needs. Obvious profit before the local people in this case.
- Agree overall, however it's disappointing that this is not applied in the new development opposite Killigrew Gardens. Feels like profit was higher priority than thinking of local people's needs and landscape requirements
- Why was a solar farm allowed on the edge of the village then

## 9 Renewable Energy

196	Yes	Solar panels should be encouraged on roofs of houses, community buildings and commercial buildings rather than fields
7	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Solar fields disguised with hedges are preferable to ugly windfarms
- A solar field shielded by hedgerows is preferable to unsightly short-term roof panels – definitely no wind
- It has to blend in with existing houses and to look at how many solar panels that one house can have.
- Solar panels look unsightly and are not efficient on houses
- But solar panels should be discreetly placed where possible
- Solar panels are out of keeping with this lovely village from what I understand the return is very little
- It should be up to farmers re fields, but encouraging than on houses etc. is a good idea
- Unless they are self-funded and not reliant on subsidies or a burden on tax payers
- Some solar panels add nothing to buildings, consider their use very carefully
- If the parish aspires to have benefits from renewable energy, a larger scale facility is likely to be the only feasible way of achieving this. We shouldn't rule this out.

198	Yes	New builds should consider renewable energy such as ground source heat or solar panels
5	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Better on roofs than in fields but unsure of overall eco benefit
- Ok for commercial properties
- Ideally panels in less obtrusive areas
- Big eyesore
- Planning regulations do not require this. There would be issues with enforcement
- Using fields for solar farms means plastering the land in concrete. This destroys habitat and ensures these fields will never be fit for agricultural use
- They seem to be expensive and do not produce what they say
- Unless they are self-funded and not reliant on subsidies or a burden on tax payers

## 10 Business

200	Yes	Small businesses should be encouraged
3	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

198	Yes	Small cottage industries on farmsteads to allow for diversification and sustainability
5	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- But depends on intrusion for neighbours
- No wood processing business at Trevella Farm

179	Yes	Light industrial units if the need is shown could be considered along the A3076 corridor to the north of the village, but should not impede on the village views, landscape and amenities
24	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Would want advance notification and discussion regarding the nature of the units and their impact
- Small cottage industries!! The risk of ever-increasing expansion
- Cottage industries on farms could lead to undesirable and intrusive expansion
- This forms part of Trevella with the Ancient Woods, to the north and fields system. Why not look at the south side closer to housing
- No only if there is small business
- And flow of traffic
- Wood processing business at Trevella Farm is unsuitable and unsightly and very noisy
- Not in favour of turning a rural community with an industrial site. This is a too grey ended question
- Keep village distinct and don't creep along main road to join up with Truro
- The industrial units already at the top of the village and often noisy and obtrusive and could do with landscaping more industrial units would be

detrimental to the feel of the village. There are enough employment opportunities available close by

- Light industrial units would have an effect on the village
- There are already enough industrial units in the area which are often noisy and need landscaping.
- The development of further businesses on the out skirts of the village will damage the natural environment that is now several years old along that corridor. Consultation with residents of exact plans must be carried out.
- It could increase traffic/journey times for residents
- Due to spoiling of natural environment
- Having previously lived where commercial / industrial units were allowed to be built on the same type of promise it was evident from what occurred less than 10 % of local people found employment and most e.g. 90% commuted into the village causing traffic chaos.
- Previously lived in a similar village. The 'light' industrial units did not employ many villagers. Resulting in people commuting to and fro the village, increased traffic and accidents. Then it ended up as a massive industrial estate.
- This is a parish statement not restricted to the village!
- Where does this end!
- Light industrial units are currently in place in three areas and do not give tend to local people. They are north of the village and would not be seen by village views only those outside of the village, this is a discriminating comment to those living outside of the immediate village.
- There is more than enough development at Killigrew and Trewaters and its spreading creating an eyesore for us. Impeding the views for non-village residents who seem to be forgotten
- The design of light industrial units i.e. metal sheds would not add anything to the parish excepts more traffic/pollution
- Not sure where this would be exactly
- Not industrial units, but small business units would be more appropriate to the area
- We already have industrial units at either end of the village that suffice the need of village. No more required

195	Yes	Businesses could give employment opportunities for local people
8	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Not sure how you would enforce this

- There are plenty of employment opportunities available close to the village, with transport links in place already.
- It appears local people are not at the current industrial units therefore not applying with the above.
- Employment of local – Not a Neighbourhood Plan issue (but I agree)
- Should not could

191	Yes	It is noted that the village shop is now landlocked, if the need requires suitable land may need to be sought
12	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Perhaps could read as - The village values the village shop and wants to support anything that will assist in its retention and would expect all parts of local government to do likewise.
- Shop should stay where it is
- Shop to stay where it is
- It is an individual responsibility to acquire land for a village shop not the parish council's
- Why? For what? If for parking for customers – Pub car park is more than big enough and underutilised. Some pub users park on the road even though the car park is never anything like full
- Not in village though
- New pub before new shop
- Note the business enterprise not a public service
- Village shop is a private business
- This question needs explaining a bit more if a new shop is required the developers should be responsible for providing some
- Extra land for a larger village shop would be expensive if the public house went, the village shop could be relocated in its place.
- The local shop is just that, local and its position is just so.
- Shop – it a commercial business and really sold be the responsibility of the business owner. But – If it is suitable location can be found this could be noted – I'm slightly conflicted over this one.
- The shop is a commercial business. How does the parish determine which business needs and support what? What about the pub? Is that not landlocked too? Or the other local businesses. I'm not sure it's part of the plan. Where is it located? a shop.
- The current position (central) of the village shop is preferable to moving it to a less 'landlocked' position. Plus this should be at the discretion of the owner / occupier not the parish.



- I am not sure what this means. If a community business – yes. If a privately owned business, I don't think this needs to be in a community plan
- The shop and post office was considered one of the most important assets of the parish during the Parish Plan and survey March 2015. In the future as the village develops we need bigger premises somewhere sustainable

202	Yes	The provision of the local shop, post office and public house are important in helping to retain a sustainable rural village
1	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Yes but not the pub
- More amenities are needed in the village
- Very similar to the shop

## 11 Education and Adult Learning

202	Yes	The land around the school should not be developed without allowing the school to expand, this is important for the sustainability of the village
1	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- The land could be used well as expanding the school for a new shop
- The developments are going to need the school to be enlarged
- The school is big enough – its field is an important asset

200	Yes	Adult education classes to be considered if the need is shown
3	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- We have a fantastic college in Truro
- I do agree with an increase of educational activity, but it needs to be embraced by all to allow suitable efficient and quantifiable activity
- Not a NDP issue – but I do agree
- It's not relevant to this plan

## 12 Health Provision

195	Yes	We can inform Doctors surgeries of a need for a local surgery
8	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- Without full facilities and staffing a local surgery / drop in surgery is pointless – believe me I know
- Times available would be very limited and the range of treatment is better catered for in larger group surgeries
- Too many small doctors surgeries not efficient – bigger centres better
- I understand there was a GP service within the village and a Pharmacy drop off by Boots Pharmacy. This would be an unnecessary extra financial worry
- The direction for primary care is not supporting the evening of small outlying facilities. Access to Truro is good. Technology now allows for on-line consultations. No point has a local GP's without a local pharmacy.
- Not NDP issues – not about land/buildings or development – but yes I agree
- Is there a need?
- There used to be a surgery run by the Lander Medical Practice at the Methodist Church until the practice cancelled it.
- We urgently need doctor's surgery back in village. As community growing rapidly
- Too much current pressure on the NHS

192	Yes	We can work with surgeries to provide a venue in existing facilities for a drop in surgery or consider land/premises if approached.
11	No	

### Reasons for stating No and general comments:

- It is hard to see how this would work in practise, with the trend being towards larger surgeries that offer a wider range of care and medical facilities
- Full surgery facilities prohibitively expensive
- The village needs a doctors surgery to help the elderly and young
- Doctors have been approached before not practical
- Too many small doctors surgeries not efficient – bigger centres better
- Drop in surgeries do not happen in today's world – the best you can hope for remotely is a ore-booked satellite surgery. All facilities have to meet CQC standards

- Heath facilities need to meet strict criteria for confidentiality, privacy, access IT etc. Bespoke or purpose built premises would be needed
- Not NDP issues – not about land/buildings or development – but yes I agree

200	Yes	Look at the possibility of a voluntary drivers service
3	No	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Don't know?
- Not NDP issues – not about land/buildings or development – but yes I agree
- Urgent

198	Yes	Look at a pharmacy delivery service in the area
4	NO	

**Reasons for stating No and general comments:**

- Already a delivery service available from the pharmacy
- We need an actual chemist rather than just a delivery service
- There is one already
- Would rather have a local chemist than a delivery service, as we work full time and can't guarantee to be in. We can drop into a local chemist
- Boots already deliver to me. No-one should not have this service. It should be available to everyone.
- Not NDP issues – not about land/buildings or development – but yes I agree

**General comments**

- I found some statements really logical and this was difficult. One's ambiguous and also difficult to answer. I'd have liked an alternative yes/no