

HX1 Site, Helston

STATEMENT OF
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Place Studio Limited
For the Helston North East Partnership
July 2014

CONTENTS

Section	Section Title	Page
1	Introduction	2
2	The Process as a Whole	3
3	Main Activities and Results	6
4	Final Audit of Proposals against Results	12

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 As part of the work undertaken on the proposals for the HX1 site on the edge of Helston, there was a planned programme of community engagement, consultation and communications. In order to explain and appraise the proposals, a thorough record – an audit trail – has been kept from the start of the commissioned process (also drawing on previous consultation by others). This report and the accompanying File/CD describe that audit trail by covering what took place, the background to it and the summary results. The final section includes an independent audit of the application proposals against the key results from the engagement and consultation work.

1.2 This overall report is in two parts. This Summary Report sets the scene and describes the process in broad terms, focusing on the overall pattern of work, the main activities, key results and the flow from initial issues to the final proposals. It is backed up by the second part, an Appendix that contains specific and full reports from workshops, actual results from exhibitions, basic information about publicity, ad hoc responses and so forth. The latter includes all the verbatim, raw material to which this report is the summary.

1.3 This report was put together by Place Studio Limited, the company appointed by the North East Helston Partnership (hereinafter called the Partnership) to plan and deliver the engagement programme. Though focused mainly on the interactive engagement and consultation process, the report also covers, as will be explained, closely related aspects of the public relations and communications work led by PPS Limited. Place Studio was represented by Jeff Bishop and Vaughan Thompson.

1.4 Where links are made to items in the Appendix they are shown as follows: ITEM X.

2. THE PROCESS AS A WHOLE

2.1 Engagement Policy Context

2.1.1 Pre-application community engagement is beginning to be established as a regular procedure but is not currently a statutory requirement. The following three paragraphs highlight the position at the time of the work on site HX1.

2.1.2 Cornwall Council's Statement of Community Involvement states (para. 39) that:

"Cornwall Council positively promotes pre-application processes, in-line with requirements set out in the Planning Act 2008. Where appropriate, in terms of the scale of the development proposed, a project management approach will be taken, for example Planning Performance Agreements or similar."

2.1.3 The Localism Act (section 61W: Consultation before applying for planning permission) stated that a statutory requirement for pre-application would be introduced, and associated material suggested that this might apply to larger projects, ie. of over 200 houses. This would require secondary legislation but that is not yet in place. The requirement would place responsibility on the applicant to (inter alia) offer consultation opportunities at appropriate times to all relevant parties, agree this with the local authority and submit a full report with the resulting application.

2.1.4 Early in 2012 the government published the new National Planning Policy Framework. In this it stated (para. 66) that:

"Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably."

2.1.5 Though published while the work on HX1 was underway, it also relevant to mention a report entitled '10 Commitments for Effective Pre-Application Engagement' (available on the Planning Advisory Service website). This was produced collaboratively by, amongst others, the Local Government Association, the RTPI and the Home Builders Federation.

2.1.6 The above are described here because they set the standards to which the work on HX1 relates and against which, in our view, the outcomes should be assessed (see section 4).

2.2 Planning Policy Context

2.2.1 The key point to note about the planning policy context of this work is that, during the application preparation period, site HX1 was not formally allocated in any adopted plan. At the outset, it was however one of three sites shortlisted as potentially appropriate by the planning officers and the Helston Town Framework Steering Group for what was described as an urban extension. This is all elaborated more fully in other application documents but key points to note for this report are:

- None of the engagement work covered here focused on aspects of whether the site should be developed; the sole focus was on how it might best be developed.
- However, as is always the case in such circumstances, comments were made on several occasions about the basic principle of development, ie. whether to. All such comments were recorded and are in the relevant event reports.
- Although this was not an allocated site, Cornwall Council officers signed up to a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) with the Partnership. That not only included agreement to

support engagement work generally but also to provide officer presence at appropriate events.

2.2.2. The implications of the points above become clear in section 2.4 below.

2.3 Agreeing the Process

2.3.1 Before the appointment of Place Studio, representatives of the Partnership met with Cornwall Council policy and development management planning officers to discuss the overall approach. One result of that was the PPA as above.

2.3.2 Once Place Studio had been appointed, Jeff Bishop arranged meetings, in all cases without Partnership members being present, with Cornwall Council planning officers, two senior Helston Town Councillors and all of Wendron Parish Council. Jeff outlined Place Studio's general approach and shared and discussed the specific suggestions for engagement on the HX1 project.

2.3.3 Given the scale of potential development, likely local concerns (based on experience elsewhere) and the need to give some emphasis to more general communications and public relations issues, PPS Limited were then commissioned to address those aspects, working closely with Place Studio.

2.3.4 Following these meetings, and after discussion with the Partnership, an overall design for the engagement process was produced, shared back with those listed in 2.3.2 above and placed on the project website (see later). What follows below is the key elements of the agreed process; the full text is in the Appendix as ITEM 1. In addition to these main events it was always planned that there would be a number of ad hoc meetings and smaller scale activities, for example with specific groups or with planning officers.

1. Scoping Workshop: An invitation -only event for selected stakeholders, to be an evening event at a local venue. Its focus to be on completing and agreeing the constraints, opportunities and project content aims for the site and initial, shared layout sketching work.
2. Community Drop-in 1: To be a two day event at an accessible local venue, widely publicised and open to all. To be highly interactive, giving the wider community an opportunity to see, comment on and elaborate the results of the Scoping Workshop.
3. Design Workshop: With a clear direction emerging for the scheme layout and design, this to be a second invited event for the same group as before, perhaps with additions. Its focus to be on layout and design, testing and advancing the emerging scheme (or scheme options).
4. Community Drop-in 2: With an illustrative scheme in place, this to be a second, open drop-in event focusing on final issues and amendments. To be slightly less interactive but still enable community input while the proposals remained open to change.
5. Report of Community Engagement: This is the report as here.

2.3.5 Full reports were to be produced for each workshop, circulated to all participants and available on the website. Full reports were to be produced for both drop-ins, all participants were to receive a short summary and the full report was to be placed on the website.

2.3.6 In close parallel with this engagement work, PPS were commissioned to undertake a programme of communications work. This was to include setting up a website, general and regular mailings, assistance with stakeholder identification and access, press releases and so forth and responses to queries via a telephone line.

2.4 Delivering the Process

2.4.1 Helston Town Councillors and their staff, the clerk at Wendron Parish and the planning officers were very helpful in putting in place arrangements for meetings, the workshops and drop-ins. They also provided invaluable advice in identifying and providing contact details for an ever-expanding list of potential project stakeholders – elected representatives, Cornwall Council officers, statutory bodies and local groups and organisations. That list also expanded after Drop-in 1 because it now included contact details for all who had signed in (legibly).

2.4.2 It is common to find, in areas immediately adjacent to potential developments, that there are community groups or residents' associations. This makes communications with 'neighbours' relatively easy. There were at the time no such bodies in the areas adjacent to the HX1 site so contacting those people became a significant challenge.

2.4.3 Stages 1 and 2 above – the Scoping Workshop and Community Drop-in 1 - proceeded exactly as planned (see later). Shortly after Drop-in 1, the Partnership were informed by the planning officers that the Helston Town Framework Steering Group had, with their guidance, decided to select another site - HX2 – as their single preferred location for the planned urban extension of Helston. However, the arguments behind this, which would have been of great value in considering how best to approach further consultation, remain unknown because there are no publicly available minutes from Steering Group meetings (and, in fact, the constitution, role and status of this group are also unclear).

2.4.4 This created a major dilemma for the Partnership. Their belief, argued fully in other reports, was that more than one site would be needed to accommodate the likely demand for housing in and around Helston and also that, regardless of total numbers, development on more than one site would deliver new housing more quickly.

2.4.5 The result of this was a team decision to focus on communication of the scheme to be submitted. This led to a shift of leadership from Place Studio to PPS, although details and key outcomes of the PPS work are included later in this report to ensure completeness.

2.4.6 The main final stage was therefore a public exhibition of the scheme to be submitted with the application for planning permission. This was to be open to all, maximising all current contact details and networks, but also targeting the key stakeholders. The material to be used would be primarily the illustrative layout to be submitted with the application and its derivation from earlier consultation results. There would be scope for comment and subsequent changes; it would however be mainly for information display.

2.4.7 Following the Town Framework decision, a meeting was held with Cornwall Council planners to discuss the implications of this and possible next stages. Notes of that meeting are in the Appendix as ITEM 2. At this point the planning authority withdrew from the Planning Performance Agreement.

2.4.8 By the time of the first drop-in, what is apparently a 'Friends of North East Helston' group had emerged. However, despite attempts, we could find no contact details for the group, or any information on leadership, format, membership etc., so were unable to contact them and invite them. There is in fact some informal evidence to suggest that the group is largely one person and, when asked, nobody at the final event, even those resident in the area, knew any further details of the group.

2.4.9 All of the above activities were to be supported by a careful communications programme to maximise awareness and, where appropriate, attendance

3. MAIN ACTIVITIES AND RESULTS

3.1 Scoping Workshop

3.1.1 This took place on 26th February 2014 at the Helston Guildhall. There were two main aims to this event. The first was to enable those involved to comment on, query, extend and elaborate some of the initial work that had been undertaken by the design team and others in preparing the brief for the project. The second was to give participants an opportunity to take their own results and apply these to the site, sketching out some very initial layouts. Key points from this event were then to be used at Drop-in 1.

3.1.2 It is important to note that, in line with the principles outlined earlier (see 2.2.1), this event was set up on the basis solely of discussing how best a development might take place, not whether it should.

3.1.3 Participation at the event was by invitation only, using a list drawn up on the basis of local advice (see 2.4.1). Participants included representatives of a wide range of local organisations likely to have an interest in the project. The design and project team attended and contributed fully at all stages

3.1.4 The programme for the workshop was very simple and interactive:

- On arrival, people were invited to comment on (a) an initial 'Constraints and Opportunities' plan prepared by the design team and (b) a set of 'Issues' (eg. flooding) raised by the team and by local people in preparing for the workshop.
- Following an introduction (by Jeff Bishop) and a short outline of the Partnership's approach (by Michael Griffin of the Partnership) there was a discussion of the results of the arrivals exercises.
- The core of the evening was small group design work to produce early, broad sketches of possible approaches to the site development. Groups were mixed and all included a project team member. Each group was also given a slightly different brief – varying the focus on the main site, an extended site and the introduction of the potential Trewennack by-pass
- The group ideas were then discussed prior to a closing presentation about the next stages and a request for suggestions about how best to manage the drop-in in particular.

3.1.5 15 stakeholders attended (6 sending apologies), a very mixed group. 4 project team members were present and the session was designed and facilitated by Jeff Bishop and Vaughan Thompson.

3.1.6 Only a few comments were added to the Constraints map, people preferring to comment on and elaborate the Issues lists. The Full Report, containing the full list of comments (and the full results of the later group work) is in the Appendix as ITEM 3.

3.1.7 The most commonly raised issues (in a very rough order of priority per topic) were:

Environment And Landscape:

- Natural, environment-friendly flood protection/management
- Sensitivity to views from the adjacent housing and to the wider landscape
- Retain all possible hedgerows and trees and create good new planting throughout
- Initiatives to enhance biodiversity and ensure some wildlife corridors
- Create a clear, strong, green boundary to development
- No intrusive lighting, no light pollution

Urban Design:

- Good quality, long-lasting materials

- Designs to pick up on the best of Helston's character
- Clear arrival point/gateway
- Variety of street and building characters
- Everybody to have some open space nearby
- Smallish clusters/sub areas, not all one 'lump'
- 2/3 storeys (mainly or only?)

Access And Movement:

Walking, Cycling and Buses:

- Home Zone ideas to reduce speeds and improve safety
- Easy access to any facilities
- Ensure public transport routes connect
- Create more/better footpaths links into the adjacent area and town centre
- Create more footpath and cycle links into the wider countryside
- Full disability access throughout

Driving:

- Develop to include first part of Trewennack by-pass
- Create a clearly understood road pattern within the development
- Care needed if only one main road entrance
- Minimise all impacts of any by-pass on housing, views, ecology etc.

Homes And Community:

Homes:

- High environmental standards – energy, insulation, water, waste disposal
- Deliver a variety of opportunities – different types, sizes, cost
- Ensure appropriate standards and types of parking
- Mix the different types around – no 'ghettoes'
- Affordable housing to be first priority to local people
- As many houses as possible to have gardens

Community:

- Any facilities to also serve the adjacent community
- Provide some sort of MUGA (multi-use games area)
- Contribute, directly or indirectly, to school places in the north west of
- Include community hall/meeting room
- Create one main central open space/park.
- Provide some of the health service provision lacking in the north west of town

3.1.8 The main points emerging from the group design exercise, noting that each group had a slightly different brief, were:

- Wendron Parish Council and Helston Town Council should work together on this.
- Roundabout access off A394 to site is preferred to an alternative junction.
- More than one vehicle point of access required.
- Queries about the by-pass in its own right and also in terms of its impact on project viability.
- Possibility of linking the Redruth Road to the new distributor road.
- Buffer/screen of landscape to the lane.
- There is no 'heart' to the adjoining housing development, so incorporating 'community' facilities (health, community centre, MUGA) would support the local area.
- Open space – to the south west, shared with (existing) community.
- Retain Cornish hedges where of value and practical to layout, and create new hedges.
- Include small scale employment uses?
- Use storey heights positively to enclose spaces and give containment.
- Mixture of house types and heights – good variety of garden sizes.

- Flood control crucial.
- Sewage capacity in existing sewage system needs to be checked.
- Attraction Gateway to direct people to town centre.
- Geothermal energy using mine shaft?

3.2 Drop-in 1

3.2.1 This took place at the Guildhall, Helston on the afternoon and evening of 7th March 2014 and during Saturday 8th March. The main aims of this event were to:

- seek further insights into the team's work on Constraints and Opportunities,
- confirm and extend the list of key issues to address,
- seek ideas about appropriate design character and
- test some very initial overall layout principles.

3.2.2 The event was not intended as an opportunity to discuss the principle of development as this site had already been determined as a suitable location for development by Cornwall Council. The constraints, issues and layout ideas drew directly from, and built upon, the results of the Scoping Workshop.

3.2.3 The event was advertised very widely through local newspapers, posters, a press release, messages to key organisations (including all those on the list for the Scoping Workshop) and some individuals (eg. ITEM 4). With the absence of any group for the neighbouring areas (but see 3.2.7 below), personal letters were delivered to adjacent residents, mostly those living along or near the potential site boundary.

3.2.4 158 people signed in but, as a few others may well have slipped through, the total was probably close to 170. Through use of dots on a map we were able to see that around 50% were from the neighbourhood next to the proposed site. Several project team and Partnership members and some from Place Studio and PPS were present at all times.

3.2.5 Many people spent nearly an hour contributing and/or talking to the project team. It is also important to note that, although many living close to the site came to object in principle, many also contributed ideas for how to ensure a good development, were that to happen. All comments were recorded, including objections about development in principle.

3.2.6 A Full Report, including every comment made, was produced (ITEM 5 in the Appendix) and this was made available to anybody who wished to see it. It was also placed on the website. A two page Summary Report was also produced and sent to all those who signed in legibly (this is included within the Full Report, ITEM 5). What follows below are the key results as noted in the Summary Report.

Environment and Landscape:

- The most common issue highlighted was flooding and the need to not just to avoid it in any development but also to reduce current levels/frequency.
- Retaining hedgerows and creating good landscaping were seen as important, as was sensitivity in design to views in and out of the site.
- Creating space for wildlife was also seen as important.
- Light pollution is a concern and should be avoided.

Design:

- Following from 'Environment' above, people felt strongly that there should be good amounts of open space within any development.
- There should also be easy, clear pedestrian routes throughout, and out into the countryside.

- There should be a variety of different character areas, not just one, design should reflect the best of Helston's character and most of the development should be of two storeys.
- Use good quality local materials and varied design styles.

Access and Movement:

- Better pedestrian links to facilities and better public transport were clear priorities.
- Walking and cycling opportunities were seen as important, as was full disability access.
- There were mixed views about having only one main road access to the development.
- There was a very strong feeling from nearby residents that there should not be any vehicle access through their area, certainly no potential rat-runs.

Possible improved Lizard link road by-passing Trewennack:

- The issue that attracted by far the largest number of comments on the early plan was the potential by-pass.
- Comments varied from basic objection to any by-pass to support for one, from queries about the suggested route to suggestions for alternative routes.
- The only other common point seemed to be about keeping any by-pass and development away from houses.
- Thoughts in favour of the by-pass were balanced with concerns about increased traffic and its likely environmental impact.

Homes and Community:

- Providing affordable homes (and not in 'ghettoes') was a priority for some but less so for immediate neighbours.
- The core concern within this was that local people should be the ones who actually get those homes.
- This also seemed to be related to a concern about preventing people using properties as holiday homes.
- Good parking standards was a concern for some.
- Good sized gardens and decent environmental standards (eg. on energy) were valued.
- Providing some local health services was far and away the highest priority for those in North East Helston, ie. not just for any new development.
- A possible new primary school was mentioned by many, if with cautions about whether there would be enough demand from one new development.
- There was some concern about where any new residents would work.
- Neighbours immediately adjacent to the site were pleased to see the distance between themselves and the proposed new homes and also the use of single storey homes rather than two storey homes in that location.

Constraints and Opportunities: (this was a map on which people could add local detail)

- The key additions were about flooding issues along the stream at the bottom of the site.
- People also contributed valuable detail about hedgerows, paths and wildlife.
- There may be more old mine shafts than current studies have identified.

3.2.7 This was also the first occasion where the team came across the 'Friends of North East Helston', via a copy of a leaflet (ITEM 6 in the Appendix) given out in advance of the Drop-in across (as we gathered) parts of the Gwealdues area. As stated earlier (2.4.8), there was no name on the leaflet or contact details. Some responses do however suggest that either the leaflet content or personal networking led to some common points made, even phrasing used.

3.3 Final Exhibition/Drop-in 2

3.3.1 Because of the shift in emphasis in the programme (see 2.4.3 to 2.4.6) this was planned more as an exhibition of the (almost) final proposals to be in the planning application than as a consultation event. At the same time it was felt appropriate to offer

some opportunity to those attending to add comments which might highlight key outstanding points to be amended or highlight points to explain and justify more fully. Also because of this shift in emphasis, the event was prepared managed and reported on by PPS as the communications team rather than by Place Studio as the engagement team.

3.3.2 The event took place at the Guildhall, Helston on the afternoon and evening of 9th July 2014. As above, the main aim of this event was to give consultees an opportunity to see how the design team had responded to all the input from all previous events and meetings and included (or not) those responses in the design soon to be submitted. Once again, the event was not intended as an opportunity to discuss the principle of development of the site.

3.3.3 The event was advertised very widely – as a Drop-in – through:

- adverts in local newspapers,
- mention on the website
- posters,
- press release,
- personal invitations to key organisations/people
- personal invitations to all who had signed in previously and
- a mailshot to 760 households neighbouring the site.

3.3.4 Specific invitees were given an opportunity to come for a 'preview' session from 12.30 to 14.00 after which the event was open to all until 20.00. In total, 93 people signed in (though there may have been some who attended but did not sign in). 37 of these had attended Drop-in 1. Representatives of the Partnership, the project team, PPS and (for most of the time) Place Studio were present to assist people.

3.2.5 Once again, some attendees passed across information about the event sent out from the so-called Friends of North East Helston (see 2.4.8) apparently mainly to people in the Gwealdues area (though again we could not be sure of this).

3.2.5 As before many people spent a considerable time studying the exhibition material and talking to the team. Those who wished to leave written comments were able to do so on a very simple response form. 21 people chose to do so.

3.2.6 A Full Report, including every comment made, was produced (ITEM 7 in the Appendix) and this was made available to anybody who wished to see it by placing it on the website. Because this was more an information-giving event, and given the small number of response forms, no short summary was sent out to those signing in (though their details have been kept). The key points summarised in the full report follow below:

- Traffic: Almost half of the responses commented on traffic. A couple of people raised concerns about the potential use of Rowe's Lane as 'rat run' while some worried that the development would add to the existing traffic levels on the A394. Although one respondent welcomed the potential for a bypass, two respondents queried the need for a bypass and another commented on its design and length. Comments were also made about access to the site with concern about its impact on the A394. One person believed the inclusion of an emergency access road to be positive for those living close to the site.
- Flooding: Flooding was another key issue. While a couple of people commented positively on the drainage measures introduced for HX1, a few others doubted whether the proposed soakaways could cope with the flood events such as that experienced last winter.
- Environment : While some acknowledged the environmental measures that had been taken into consideration in developing the preferred masterplan - such as the retention of the wetland and hedgerows and tree-lined walks - there were requests for more tree-planting to screen existing houses from the new development. There was also a concern

about the maintenance of the proposed green area and a request from another for the green area to be expanded.

- Housing: Some concern was expressed about the number of houses proposed for the site, although one person was pleased the number of houses had been reduced since the original proposal at Stage 1. Affordable housing incited a mixed reaction and while most comments on this were positive and welcomed the inclusion of affordable housing, some people were concerned about the integration of in-comers into the local community.
- Infrastructure: There was concern about the lack of local infrastructure to cope with the proposed development. This included secondary school, medical facilities, employment opportunities and public transport and there were requests to consider providing these / working with bus operators to ensure adequate provision. However, one respondent suggested creating better transport links to encourage people to use existing facilities rather than developing new ones.
- Other Issues: Other issues raised included concern about visual impact on properties that neighbour the site, the inability of local sewers to cope with the extra houses and the need for housing.

3.4. Website

3.4.1 A project website was put in place virtually from the start of the engagement/consultation process. This was designed and managed by PPS with input from Place Studio.

3.4.2 In addition to an introductory Home page, the website had pages as follows:

- About the Site: some basic background information.
- What's Proposed: This was about the process – consultation, issues, constraints etc.
- Public Consultation: An outline of the process, advance warning of events and all reports available for downloading.
- Contact Us: This offered an email address, a Freepost address and a contact telephone number for the project team.
- Links: To Cornwall Council, Helston Town Council and Wendron Parish Council.

The main page and the consultation page are in the Appendix as examples, as ITEM 8 and ITEM 9.

3.5 Media Coverage

3.5.1 Initial contacts suggested caution about media coverage because of an assumed editorial bias against development. This was however addressed head on through initial contacts with key local journalists. An example of an early press release is in the Appendix as ITEM 10.

3.5.2 The result was several well balanced articles at all stages about the potential development, very useful as additional publicity for the public events (eg. ITEM 11). This coverage, and the events themselves, triggered a few (but not many) letters of protest, apparently from people living near the site.

4. FINAL AUDIT OF PROPOSALS AGAINST RESULTS

4.1 Although the fuller engagement work was curtailed, the Scoping Workshop and Drop-in 1 provided an extensive list of issues that local people and stakeholders felt that the project should address. As above, it was also clear from those attending the final exhibition that these were the key issues (none were added) and that these had been addressed in some way. This final section is the Place Studio team's own response to these issues, highlighting where and how the issues raised in the engagement have or have not been picked up in the illustrative application scheme. This is divided into three sections,

4.2 Issues Addressed

4.2.1 Drawing mainly from the results of the Workshop and Drop-in 1 there are a number of issues of common concern to a good number of the consultees (ie. not points raised by just one person) that have, in our view, clearly been addressed in some way in the final proposals. Whether or not they have been addressed fully or satisfactorily is for others to decide during the application process. All will also require further detail at subsequent stages. The issues addressed are:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Flooding | Good sized gardens |
| • Sewage | Reflective of Helston's character |
| • Hedgerow and tree retention | Varied house types, sizes, tenures |
| • Public open space | Good parking standards and arrangements |
| • MUGA | Health provision – also for neighbours |
| • Pedestrian routes/links | Meeting place(s)- also for neighbours |
| • Better public transport | Some employment provision |
| • Appropriate road access | Views in from around the site |
| • No rat-running to/from adjacent areas | Views in from the adjacent communities |
| • Trewennack by-pass option included* | Strong green boundary |
| • Protect new/old housing from by-pass | Wildlife areas/corridors (aspects of)** |
| • Affordable homes, not in 'ghettoes' | Clear arrival point/gateway |
| • Mainly 2/3 stories | Legible routes throughout |

* This also appears in the next section because the current proposals only include part of the by-pass.

** This too also appears in the next section because further work will be needed at later stages.

4.3 Issues for Later

4.3.1 There are some issues that were raised that would not normally be detailed at this stage in project development, at least to the level of detail requested by consultees, so there would be no requirement to show that they have (yet) been addressed. They are:

- Light pollution
- Detail of wildlife/corridors
- Varied character areas and styles
- Materials
- High environmental standards
- Home Zone/shared space principles
- Affordable homes to be for local people
- Geothermal energy

4.3.2 There were also occasional comments about issues such as the current poor condition of the nearby secondary school. There was no suggestion that such issues would be dealt

with directly in the proposal but they would typically be covered in any Section 106 agreement.

4.5 Issues not Addressed

4.5.1 There were two issues raised by consultees to which the application scheme has not responded in some way. They are, with comments on why they have not been addressed:

- Preventing houses becoming holiday/second homes. This is not a planning or design or even house sales issue.
- Providing a new Primary School. Conversations were held with Education representatives and planning officers but there was no clear agreement on whether a new school, though needed in general towards the North of Helston, would be appropriate to include in this particular location and this development.