

MEETING No.1284
Minutes of the meeting of Feock Parish Council Planning Committee held on
Tuesday 11th January 2022 at 4pm
at the Parish Council Office, Market Street, Devoran TR3 6QA

Members present: Cllr Colin Blake, Feock Ward, Chair
Cllr Cathy Kemp, Carnon Downs Ward
Cllr Sue Cooper, Devoran Ward
Cllr Kate Gason, Carnon Downs Ward
Cllr Phil Allen, Carnon Downs Ward

In attendance: Debbie Searle, Assistant Parish Clerk

Public present: Paul Bateman, Influence Planning
Jeremy Bradley, CAD Architects
14 members of the public

1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed those present. Apologies were received from Cornwall Cllr Martyn Alvey.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING MEETING

RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 14th December 2021 as a true record of the meeting and be signed by the Chair. This was seconded by Cllr Kemp and carried by the meeting.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

4. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Paul Bateman (PB) of Influence Planning, spoke in support of PA21/12595 giving details of the proposed extension to Higher Tresithick Barn. He stated that the applicants were seeking to provide a high-quality dwelling suitable for sustainable future living with better accommodation, supported by increased insulation and a number of energy seeking features. He stated that the proposal will have no impact on the neighbouring, or any other, property and gave planning policy information relevant to property extensions and replacement buildings. Cllr Blake asked for confirmation that neighbours had been notified of the application and that notification had been published on the outside of the building. PB gave information detailing Cornwall Council's (CC) policy for notification of planning applications. He advised that CC had not sent him a notice to display however the Planning Officer may have carried out an early site visit and displayed it themselves. Cllr Kemp commented that before the meeting she had received a telephone call from a neighbour advising that she had only found out about the application the previous evening.

Jeremy Dainton (JD) spoke regarding PA21/12595 to state that he was a neighbour and had received a letter from Cornwall Council dated 21st December 2021 however they had been away on holiday. No notices had been put up in the area and he had established that no other neighbours were aware of the application. He advised that he owned the lane on the South and the land to the North, and the land on the East of the application site. PB responded to state that the responsibility for neighbour notification lies with CC, and not the applicant, and that CC had fulfilled the statutory duty by writing to them on 21st December 2021. Regarding the protection of neighbour amenity, he stated that the extensions were to the West and away from their property on the East. JD stated that there is a very high window facing East and that it is a huge extension, he commented on the nature of the area stating that the proposal was out of keeping. PB stated that the applicant had a right to extend his home, make it more sustainable and replace it if he wished.

Katie Dainton (KD) spoke regarding PA21/12595 stating that she was a neighbour, and the proposal was out of proportion with what you would expect. She had just spoken with the Planning Officer who had granted an additional few days to allow neighbours to comment who had only just been made aware of the application. PB

stated that CC will consider all correspondence up until the date of determination of the application. Cllr Kemp stated that it was important that they were in receipt of neighbour comments. Cllr Allen commented that it was usually the Parish Council where the comments of neighbours were aired. KD answered that the Planning Officer had indicated that the application wouldn't be decided until the week of 14th February 2022.

Joe Brumwell (JB) spoke regarding PA21/12584 stating that the proposal was for an enormous building squeezed into a small plot. He stated that he had a Land Registry plan which questioned the accuracy of the plan submitted with the application showing ownership and it was a matter which needed to be addressed. He gave information relating to the ownership of the quay situated below the property.

Paul Bateman (PB) of Influence Planning spoke in support of PA21/12584 stating that the application site was taken directly from the Land Registry plan so should be accurate. In respect of public access to the beach there is a public footpath immediately adjacent to the vehicular access which takes you down to the beach and he did not see the relevance of the ownership of the quay. He understands that there is local resistance to extensions to traditional properties at Pill Creek however last year a Planning Inspector found that this AONB could be enhanced by the construction of a contemporary single dwelling house. He gave details of the history of the application site and also stated the Creek was famous for having two listed buildings, Creek Vein and Pill Wood which were high level contemporary designs of their time and more recently built were Gillinglaze and Sylvania which had both received architectural awards. The current application site has been subject to 6 historical applications, the first of which was submitted by Mr Brumwell for 19 dwellings and was refused. The other 5 applications were all for detached single dwellings on the site of the current application site and were all approved. The layout, form and scale of the current proposal provides a policy compliant dwelling which provides a positive contribution in both visual terms and for the use of future users. He summarised the supportive comments received and the objections which showed a resistance to development; however this was not a conservation area but was a settlement. Cllr Blake stated that he had received comments over the last few days that people were unaware of the application. PB stated that a comprehensive public consultation exercise had been carried out as part of the application and was within the planning statement showing all the properties that the applicant contacted directly prior to submission and who had been presented with, or offered, a consultation document which forms part of the submitted application. Cllr Blake asked for clarification and stated that he was on the list and didn't receive anything.

JB stated that he had been unable to hear most of PB's statement however regarding neighbour consultations he had received an A4 document giving barely any details. He stated that regarding the 5 historical applications mentioned they were all for replacing Appensleigh with another house and not for an additional house. PB disagreed with that statement and gave further details of the historical applications. JB further commented that no objector has been able to get hold of the dimensions of the building, that the building would block off any view of the creek for users of the path, that it is very close to the boundary and is very tall, dark and oppressive in that location.

JD stated that a common theme seemed to be a lack of notice and people did not seem to be aware of what was going on. PB responded that it was unfortunate that CC had sent them the letter on 21st December and that they had been away over the Christmas period.

Cllr Allen commented that it was unsatisfactory if local people did not have the opportunity to have their say.

Wayne Brown (WB) the Regional Manager for the Southwest Caravan and Motorhome Club, spoke in objection to PA21/11725 stating that they had recently bought the Carnon Downs Caravan and Camping Site. He advised that it was a not-for-profit members organisation representing over a million members throughout the UK. The application site is right on the boundary of their site, the pitch is less than 6m from their caravan pitches. The proposed floodlights are going to be less than 3m from their site, which will probably make it unusable as a caravan and camping site. It is far too close to their site and amenities, there is only a small hedge, and the proposal is not in keeping with the area. They are new to the area having bought the site in April but intend to invest locally and believe this proposal will ruin the site and put that side of the site in jeopardy of continued use and therefore they could potentially lose the use of 50 or 60 pitches. They have received no correspondence or notification from CC advising of them of the application, despite having an adjoining boundary. They have now employed a Planning Agent to comment on their behalf which will be submitted to CC within the next 7 days.

Jeremy Bradley of CAD Architects spoke regarding PA21/11725 stating that they were the agents for the application. He gave explanation as to why the address had been stated as Gig Lane (the garages next to the entrance are 7-10 Gig Lane). They have been waiting for some time for the Bat floodlight impact assessment document which they have only just received and been able to submit to CC which was now on the portal. They have worked with the Ecologist regarding the lighting to establish how much the football club would require the use of the floodlights and this has been calculated as up to 40hrs per year (5 or 6 evening games in the winter and only 6 or 7 afternoon games).

Jenny Bladon spoke regarding PA21/11725 stating that they (her and her husband) were volunteers for Truro City Reserves Football Team and having read some of the comments on CC's online planning portal they wished to allay some of the concerns raised. She stated that most people would be aware of Truro Football Club's involvement with the new sports stadium at Langarth. At present the First Teams matches are played in Plymouth as they have to comply with requirements as set out by the Football Association and Truro's First team will continue to play in Plymouth until the new stadium in Truro is built. Truro City's First team will not be playing matches at Tregye either now or in the future. This application is made by Truro City for the Reserves team which was formed in the summer of 2021 to provide footballing opportunities for youngsters. The purpose of this application is to improve the existing facilities for all users of the playing field which is in the ownership of Truro and Penwith College. Rugby and Football pitches have been at the ground for many years, and it has been in constant use, more recently there has been a modular building providing a classroom. The current facilities do just meet the requirements of the league in which the reserves team are playing, however they have applied for promotion into the next tier of football in Cornwall and cannot be considered for this move up without the improvements set out in the application. The floodlights, the stands and the modular building are being repurposed from Treyew Road, greatly reducing the cost of the ground improvements, and making very expensive enhancements feasible. There is a requirement for refreshments for spectators and they wish to have an area where people can be invited inside, the unit proposed would also have plumbed in toilets negating the need for the portaloos and its weekly servicing. A fixed barrier surrounding the pitch is another requirement and a covered spectator viewing area for a minimum of 50. They would like to ensure there is access for disabled users and a modular building would allow this, even though this is not currently a requirement. There is no intention to increase the number of vehicles entering the ground and current parking is adequate, the application seeks to create additional permeable hardstand to allow the vehicles to not have to park on grass. Match day traffic does not create fast moving traffic due to the entrance being close to the crossroads and there will be no buses/coaches. Marshalls oversee parking and traffic cones are put out on the road to discourage parking. There is no intention to fell trees or widen the access. The application for 150 seats is the total of the combined stands that are available for relocation from Treyew Road, they recognise that this is more seating than would currently be utilised however as the seating is available, they see this as an opportunity to future proof. The light spill from the required floodlights will only illuminate the playing surface and there would be a planning condition for a maximum of 45 hours use per year. The lights would not be in operation after 10pm or before 8am. In summary this is not an application for a new football pitch and facilities, nor is it a precursor for future use by Truro City's First Team, the application has been submitted to improve areas of the playing field that is already in use for regular football matches and the intention is to make the facilities nice and comply with the requirements of the Football Association to allow the reserves team to move up to the next level of grass roots football in Cornwall. Cllr Cooper asked if they were aware of the Sport England consultee comment which expressed concern over the size of the facility and the ability to house the buildings proposed. Dale Bladon stated that Sport England had responded on the basis of a new site not realising that it was an existing facility. Jeremy Bradley advised that the modular buildings are Eliot huts taken from Treyew Road and they had submitted a plan showing how they would be situated.

WB commented that with regards to the submitted plans, the top end of the site is showing that the end of the pitch is right on their boundary in the hedge, however Sport England's comment mentions a 3m runoff. Jeremy Bradley stated that the plans had been amended and re-submitted which moved the boundary 1m East.

Martyn Sanders (MS) spoke regarding PA21/11725 stating that he was a resident of Tregye Road. He stated that the site hasn't been used as a busy playing field and has only been used very occasionally by the College and most of the time the gate is mainly locked. The issue they wish to raise is that there is a small dirt track on a single lane road opposite their house, the road is on a blind bend only a few hundred yards away. They have all raised issues

regarding the danger for college students walking and horses. The college bus fills the lane, it isn't a two-way carriageway, it is very restricted, and the traffic is too fast which has been complained about. Again, there has been no notification of the application. Tregye Road cannot support 50 to 60 cars accessing the site, whether it is marshalled or not. It is the transit run for the King Harry Ferry straight the way through to the bypass and the cars are in high volumes. Any restrictions in that road will cause chaos. Regarding the track, it is a natural habitat with trees that have been protected by Tree Preservation Orders and we cannot afford to destroy any of this natural habitat where they are surrounded by Bats, Owls and Woodpeckers. The field is a very small restrictive field, it is a college playing field and it is not built for high, or reasonable, level football. They propose to serve refreshments and there has already been enough trouble from anti-social behaviour as people can't control their drinking habits.

Jenny Bladon responded stating that there will be no increase in traffic, the site has been utilised on Saturdays and the use will be at the same level as it is now. The football season runs from the middle of August through to the end of April and the proposal will not cause increase in holiday traffic. The desire is to create a permeable gravel hard stand for the same level of parking as existing so there isn't any mud being brought out onto the road from parking on grass. The pitch is in use and will continue be used at its current level. MS stated that the reality is very different from the proposal. Jeremy Dainton asked if they trained elsewhere, and Jenny Bladon confirmed that they did.

Martin Hughes spoke regarding PA21/11529 expressing concern that the details shown on the location and block plan include the hedge to Staggy Lane and intrudes into an area that isn't owned by the applicant. There are few dimensions given and this means that it is difficult to assess how the proposal will fit into the site. He quoted a discrepancy from the application stating that it was quite difficult to assess what is proposed. The proximity to boundaries also requires clarification. It sits directly on the boundary and there is no margin to move the building away from the boundary. The fence on site does not mark the boundary, it is inside the boundary. In the SW corner there is an attractive group of trees, and the proposal will have significant impact on these trees. The area where cars would park at the front of the building has already been identified as creating an extremely hazardous pedestrian walk through Carnon Downs.

5. STATUTORY CONSULTATION – PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTEE COMMENT

The following planning applications were considered, and the consultee comments agreed as follows

PA21/12595 (123) - Higher Tresithick Barn Carnon Downs TR3 6JW

RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed the consultee comment for the application as:

The Parish Council object to this application in its current form. The design of this proposal does not meet with NDP Policy D1 which states that the design of all development should respect and reflect local character and identity through sensitive siting, design, scale and use of materials. It should also follow design guidance set out in county wide and other relevant local design guides. This is a small traditional hamlet and the proposed design and scale do not reflect local character. The proposal is not subservient to the existing building, it overshadows and overwhelms it and is out of character with the dwelling. The Parish Council would prefer to see a more sympathetic design.

The site lies within the vicinity of Lower Tresithick Farmhouse, which is a Pre1800 farmhouse on the Local Heritage List, and therefore consider that this proposal is also contrary to NDP Policy HE1 that seeks to safeguard and conserve the historic environment.

This is a rural area with a lot of semi-natural habitat and this design with large areas of glass causing light spill will interfere with this semi-natural habitat. The proposal is therefore impacting on wildlife and is contrary to NDP Policy BIO3.

We would ask the Planning Officer to allow time for the Parish Council to consider the application further after reviewing comments from neighbours, which we understand will be submitted within the next few days and submit a further comment if considered necessary.

This was seconded by Cllr Blake and carried by the meeting.

PA21/12584 (124) - Appensleigh Pill Creek Feock TR3 6SD

RESOLUTION: Cllr Blake proposed the consultee comment for the application as:

This site is clearly visible from many public vantage points on land and from the Creek, and the Parish Council consider that this proposal is contrary to NDP Policy D1 as it does not respect and reflect local character and identity through sensitive siting, design, scale and use of materials. We acknowledge that there are parts of Pill Creek that have modern striking buildings, however the juxtaposition of this site with the neighbouring Grade II listed Ferncliffe, whose curtilage we understand includes the lane, and adjoining mid 18th century Shipwright's cottages, which have a very distinctive character and design and are situated in a very unspoilt stretch of Pill Creek, should be the main consideration. The proposal must therefore also be considered contrary to NDP Policy HE1 which seeks to safeguard and conserve the historic environment and sites of national and local importance.

The site lies within the AONB where development must enhance and conserve the AONB status of the area and where precedent should not be used as a reason for allowing development. The side of the creek in which this site lies has retained its historic character. The modern buildings with high levels of glazing on the other side of the creek should not be allowed to influence the decision for this application.

The proposal also conflicts with NDP Policy BIO1 which seeks to safeguard and enhance the natural environment, Policy LS1 which seeks to protect and enhance the seascape and LS2 which seeks to protect and enhance the landscape.

We also have concerns over the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring Church Hall.

For the reasons stated the Parish Council must therefore object to this application.

We ask the Planning Officer to allow time for the Parish Council to consider the application further following receipt of the AONB Officer's consultee comment, not yet submitted, and after reviewing comments from neighbours, which we understand will be submitted within the next few days and submit a further comment if considered necessary.

This was seconded by Cllr Cooper and carried by the meeting.

PA21/11725 (118) - Truro City Football Club Playing Fields Gig Lane Killicourt Carnon Downs TR3 6JS

Cllr Allen stated that he was a member of the Caravan and Camping Club, and at the start of the meeting he had not realised that there would be representation made by them regarding this application (which was made during agenda item no.4 public participation) and felt that he should now declare an interest and confirm that he would not comment on this aspect (the effect of the proposal on their site) of the application.

RESOLUTION: Cllr Blake proposed the consultee comment for the application as:

The Parish Council question the suitability and sustainability of the proposal in this location and cannot support this application at this stage without further information, and explanation and answers to the following.

We are told that the reason for the application is to enable Truro City Reserves Football team to move up a level in their league and the proposals wouldn't incur any additional footfall to what, we are told, is currently occurring. We have been told that the spectator capacity seating requirement for this is 50, however this application seeks to provide a seating capacity of 150. This raises concerns over future use as the capacity for parking onsite would not accommodate a crowd of 150. A traffic management plan would be required for this larger increase in capacity and the Highways Officer would also need to be consulted.

We have concerns over the proposed flood lighting and would like further information regarding light spill.

We also have concerns over the detrimental impact that the proposal may have on the neighbouring caravan and camping site.

The Tree Officer has asked for additional information which we would like to see.

We would also like answers to the queries raised in the consultee comment submitted by Sport England.

This was seconded by Cllr Cooper and carried by the meeting.

PA21/11529 (116) - Land South of Edgefield Old Carnon Hill Carnon Downs

RESOLUTION: Cllr Kemp proposed the consultee comment for this application as:

The Parish Council object to this application which is in breach of policies D1, HE1, H1, BI01, BI02, BI03, GA2 and GA3 of the Feock Neighbourhood Development Plan.

We do not consider this a viable proposal due to the small size of the plot and its position. The land at the front of the existing building does not belong to the property and is part of the highway. The proposed building would encourage parking, even short term by delivery vehicles and, in consequence, force pedestrians into the road causing an unacceptable increase in danger to pedestrians, wheelchair users and mobility scooters forcing them into the path of traffic. The problems associated with getting vehicle access from Staggy Lane to the side of the proposed building have not been fully addressed. We object to the removal of the hedge. We note that development extends to the boundary.

The impact of the development on the trees has not been addressed and we would also comment that we are disappointed with the lack of clarity of the plans. We understand that the application area may not all be in the ownership of the applicant, and we would like reassurance that the owner of the land has been notified of this application.

This was seconded by Cllr Blake and carried by the meeting.

Standing orders were suspended to allow Cllr Gason to ask Mr and Mrs Hughes a question.

PA21/11938 (122) - 1 Old Tram Road Carnon Mine Devoran TR3 6NG

RESOLUTION: Cllr Gason proposed the consultee comment for the application as:

The Parish Council accepts the comments of neighbours and the Restronguet Creek Society and feel that development in the back gardens of these properties does not protect and enhance the historic character of the area and is therefore against NDP Policy HE1.

The proposed design is contrary to NDP policy D1 as it does not respect and reflect local character through sensitive siting, design, scale and use of materials.

A development that has a more direct association with the existing building may be acceptable.

This was seconded by Cllr Blake and carried by the meeting.

6. SUBMITTED CONSULTEE COMMENTS

RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed the following consultee comments submitted to Cornwall Council, as agreed via email between Committee members, since the last planning meeting be formally ratified. This was seconded by Cllr Kemp and carried by the meeting.

PA21/10780 (119) - The Beeches Restronguet Point Feock TR3 6RB

The Parish Council have considered the Tree Officer's comment and raise no objection to this application.

Proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Kemp and agreed by Cllr Robson. Cllr Cooper objected. Submitted to the online planning register on Thursday 6th January 2022.

PA21/12413 (120) - 21 St Johns Terrace Devoran TR3 6NE

The Parish Council has no objection.

Proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Kemp and agreed by Cllr Cooper and Cllr Robson. Submitted to the online planning register on Thursday 6th January 2022.

PA21/11869 (121) - Grasshoppers Penelewey Feock TR3 6QY

The Parish Council has no objection.

Proposed by Cllr Blake, seconded by Cllr Kemp and agreed by Cllr Cooper and Cllr Robson. Submitted to the online planning register on Thursday 6th January 2022.

PA21/11455 (113) - Lapworth 16 Mount Agar Road Carnon Downs TR3 6HR

The Parish Council has no objection to this application.

Proposed by Cllr Kemp, seconded by Cllr Blake and agreed by Cllr Cooper and Cllr Robson. Submitted to the online planning register on Tuesday 21st December 2021.

PA21/11370 (114) - Boswellin Harcourt Feock TR3 6SQ

The Parish Council has no objection to this application subject to the Tree Officer being satisfied that the construction works will cause no harm to the group of trees in the garden of Boswellin protected by the 2006 TPO reference C1/CK417.

Proposed by Cllr Kemp, seconded by Cllr Blake and agreed by Cllr Cooper and Cllr Robson. Submitted to the online planning register on Tuesday 21st December 2021.

PA21/11993 (115) - Pipers Lea Four Turnings Feock TR3 6QR

The Parish Council has no objection to this application.

Proposed by Cllr Kemp, seconded by Cllr Blake and agreed by Cllr Cooper and Cllr Robson. Submitted to the online planning register on Tuesday 21st December 2021.

7. MATTERS TO REPORT

Discussion took place regarding 'green roofs' and that it was necessary to ensure that a 'green living roof' was stated on plans, a recent enforcement issue regarding this was mentioned.

Cllr Gason initiated discussion regarding concern over in-person meetings and the current level of Covid cases. It was agreed that as many applications as possible should be dealt with via email to reduce the number of in-person meetings.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Considering the previous discussion, no date for the next planning meeting was set.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.30pm.

Signed:

Planning Committee Chair, Feock Parish Council

15th February 2022