

**MEETING NO. 1127**  
**Minutes of FEOCK PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING held on**  
**Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> February 2016**  
**at the Methodist Church Hall, Carnon Downs at 3.30pm**

**Members Present:**

<b>WARDS</b>	<b>CARNON DOWNS</b>	<b>FEOCK</b>	<b>DEVORAN</b>
	B Richards	C Shefford	B Shankland
	I MacDonald		
	P Allen		
	M Kemp		

**In Attendance:** Debbie Searle, Assistant Clerk  
Cornwall Cllr S Chamberlain  
Mr & Mrs Horsfall  
Mr & Mrs Rutherford  
Mrs Bell  
Mrs Rogers

**PLANNING COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN: Councillor B Richards**

**1. WELCOME & APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr C Kemp and the Chairman thanked Cllr M Kemp for attending on her behalf and noted that he may need to leave before the end of the meeting.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were received.

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Mrs Horsfall spoke in respect of their application, yet to be accepted by Cornwall Council, for the lifting of the holiday use restriction at The Valley, Carnon Downs. She explained that they wanted to give some information on the benefits and impact that this would have to put people's worries at rest. They bought the site in 1996 and have been there for 20 years, operating it as a touring and static holiday park for 10 years which they then changed to cottages and are now in a position where something needs to change again as the competition in holiday letting has increased in the local area. Cornwall Council has approved lots of holiday complexes in many guises which has made their situation unviable. As they still own some properties they still need to pay 20% VAT on the tariff which makes them uncompetitive and the competition has increased dramatically for lettings. They wish to sell the remaining cottages but finance/mortgaging is difficult because of the holiday restriction on the lease and it is for those reasons that they need to get the holiday restriction lifted. Community benefits to them and locally is that they are supplying 46 properties to the local market, so there are 46 properties which no longer have a holiday occupancy restriction and there will be an affordable contribution paid on every sale. It is their wish to maintain it as a 5 star luxury resort for people to visit, obviously there will be some changes but they are anticipating that some people may use as a holiday home and some may use as a lock and go i.e. if they live abroad for 6 months it is somewhere that they can safely lock up and leave knowing that it is being looked after while they are away. Also there maybe people that are looking to downsize, but in the majority they expect it to still remain as a holiday location and they still intend to have a management company which they will run. In terms of the impact and the supply of properties, they don't have to build them as they are already built. The properties are very strictly controlled, sold leasehold

and sold only as the footprint and patio of the property, all other areas are owned by The Valley Limited and people pay service charges for the maintenance of the whole site. The lease restrictions are very strict (an information sheet giving the main points of the lease were provided to members) and include no sheds, no washing lines and no aerals. There is nothing that would sustain an estate with families and there is nothing that would have a detrimental impact on the community. They believe that the removal of the holiday occupancy restriction will do nothing to detract from the luxury and quality of the resort and are looking for the Parish Council's support. The Chairman asked members if they had any questions:

Cllr MacDonald asked if the restrictions within the lease were within their power to change. Mr Horsfall stated that their 106 agreement was much more strict than other agreements, it is not just within their control and that they would not be looking to change that.

Cllr Kemp questioned if the holiday restriction clause was lifted so that it could be permanent residential occupation what percentage might end up being residential. Mr Horsfall responded that it would be very low as it is not going to appeal to someone who wants a garage or wants to hang out washing etc. They expect residents to be aged 50 plus who are empty nesters and want to be able to live in a property for 6 months and then go on holiday secure in knowledge that the property was secure when they were away, for which there is a very large market. They think that 10/20% will go down that route and the vast majority will stay as holiday units. They have numerous enquiries from people that want a holiday home and to rent it out but the problem is that they can't get a mortgage.

The Chairman stated that it was not the most straight forward application, the application sent to Cornwall Council was found to be incorrect and returned. Mr Horsfall responded that their application was under question and gave details of another application to Cornwall Council on the same basis which had been accepted and granted, their application has been rejected on the grounds that Cornwall Council feel they should put in a full application for a full residential site and they are still in discussions with Cornwall Council as to how to proceed. The Chairman clarified that currently there isn't an application to discuss and Mr Horsfall confirmed that they were seeking the Parish Council's feedback. The Chairman stated that the Parish Council's feedback would have to be that we don't know enough about the application to give a binding opinion and will have to wait and see what the application says when it goes in. He will undertake to find out from Cornwall Council the correct information so that the Parish Council can establish what the difference is in the type of application to be made.

Cllr Allen asked how many of the 46 properties have been sold. Mr Horsfall replied that they still retain 17 and continued to say that the site had been built in one go and because of this they fell foul of VAT laws which said that you have to pay VAT on a holiday rental property and now due to Cornwall Council lifting the holiday restriction on Retallick and Gwel-an-Mor their business is no longer viable.

Cllr Shankland questioned that if their market were the over 50's then they wouldn't get a mortgage anyway. It was clarified that you can now get a mortgage up to the age of 70 but that the issue was that it was the holiday use restriction in the lease which meant people could not get suitable finance.

The Chairman concluded that there was not much else to advise at this stage and reiterated that he would speak to Cornwall Council and find out what sort of application it is to be.

Mr Rutherford spoke in support of his application PA16/00613. He explained that the existing dwelling is a dormer bungalow and they wish to rebuild a single storey dwelling with 2 bedrooms. He stated that if the existing property was built today it would not meet building regulations and it is more economical to demolish it and rebuild a new dwelling. The property doesn't overlook either of the neighbours to the east and west,

there are no neighbours to the rear and the neighbours to the front are across the road. They have discussed their plans with all the neighbours, the neighbours to the east (Mr & Mrs Bell) had no real objection but after discussion with them they agreed to move the property slightly and the other neighbours had no objection at all. There are no trees which will be affected and there is plenty of parking. He advised that he was here to answer any questions that members may have. The Chairman questioned if the proposal was smaller than the existing. Mr Rutherford explained that the footprint is a little larger as the building doesn't have the same mass as most of it is much lower than the existing. He commented that the dormer windows to the existing property do overlook. Cllr MacDonald questioned the three upstairs square windows which he felt may impact on The Fringle to the west. Mr Rutherford confirmed that there are no windows that will overlook them, Mrs Rutherford confirmed there are window lights 4m high to let light in and the two bathroom windows will have obscure glass.

Mrs Rogers spoke in support of her application PA16/00356/00357. She explained that they had moved in two years ago and carried out some work to the property. Now that they had a baby the bathroom in the old 1960's extension was mouldy and damp and not suitable for their young family. They are proposing to get rid of the current extension and in the new one house a modern kitchen downstairs and family bathroom above. All works are to the back and there will be no change to the front of St Johns Terrace. They have spoken with neighbours who seem happy with their proposal and stated that an extension had already been carried out to no.8 which takes up the same amount of space as theirs will. The Chairman stated that it is in Conservation Area and is listed and questioned if they have taken appropriate advice, Mrs Rogers confirmed that they had. Cllr Shankland asked how the neighbours have reacted and was it in line with neighbouring properties. Mrs Rogers confirmed that the extension mirrors no.8 and extends less than no.10. Cllr MacDonald questioned if there was concern by neighbours over access for construction. Mrs Rogers stated that they have access to the rear and there are high hedges to the sides and that both the neighbouring properties were holiday lets and were very rarely occupied. The Chairman advised that the neighbouring properties being holiday lets was not a material planning considerations as ownership may change.

The Chairman informed the meeting that it was now a closed session.

Mr & Mrs Horsfall left the meeting.

#### **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING MEETING**

RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed that the minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 were a true record of the meeting and be signed by the Chairman. This was seconded by Cllr MacDonald and the minutes were duly signed by the Chairman.

#### **5. STATUTORY CONSULTATION-PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following applications were considered and decided as detailed.

##### **875 Bay View, Mount George Road, Penelewey, Feock TR3 6QX PA16/00613**

The Chairman advised that there have been no comments for or against the application which have been notified to the Parish Council. Cllr Allen stated that he has no objections to the proposal. Cllr MacDonald stated that it looks like an improvement but his only slight concern is that its footprint is bigger than the existing. The Chairman advised that the only problem would be if it was taking up the vast majority of plot which it isn't and therefore there were no objections in respect of the draft NDP policies regarding overdevelopment of the plot. Cllr Blake commented that the proposal was an improvement, that it is in keeping with other properties on the road and has no hesitation in recommending it for approval.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council supports this application and can see no material planning considerations that would lead to a refusal. This was seconded by Cllr MacDonald and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

Mr & Mrs Rutherford left the meeting.

**874 9 St Johns Terrace, Devoran TR3 6NE PA16/00356 & 00357**

The Chairman summarised that they had heard from the applicant regarding their proposal to increase their family's accommodation and that the property was within the Conservation Area and similar proposals have been accepted on either side at no.8 and no.10 and the proposal doesn't appear to be over development of the site. Cllr Shankland commented that he can sympathise with having a house in Devoran with a mouldy extension, that as it should have minimal disruption and has the same foot print then he would like to propose no objection. Cllr MacDonald stated that his only slight concern is that it is a 3 storey extension and questioned if that had been done before or is that setting a precedent or makes a difference. Discussion followed in which it was agreed that the extension would not be coming above the ridge height of the existing dwelling, would therefore not be seen from the front and that there were no windows which would cause overlooking issues. The plans of the existing and proposed were viewed and discussion continued in regard to the height of the ceilings and best use of height. Cllr Allen stated that he was reassured by the fact that it is listed and in the Conservation Area and was sure that those Officers would ensure that they were happy with the proposal before any permission was granted. The Chairman stated that he would wish to ensure that the materials used would be in keeping with the Conservation Area.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: Subject to the agreement of the Conservation Officer and the materials used being in keeping with the conservation area the Parish Council can see no material planning considerations that should lead to a refusal. This was seconded by Cllr Blake and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

Mr & Mrs Rogers left the meeting

**872 3 Agar Meadows, Carnon Downs TR3 6NT PA16/00287**

The Chairman summarised the application and advised that two letters of objection had been received and read out the contents of both letters. He stated that the planning history of the site is relevant, that permission was granted several years ago for the sub division of the plot which was not followed through. Work done last year by the applicant onto Trelawne Close was subject of a complaint to the Parish Council which was passed to Planning Enforcement who deemed that no breach had been made by the work that had been carried out. In terms of the draft NDP it is well within the Carnon Downs settlement area and plot sub-division is something that we would possibly encourage over and above new development. Cllr Allen stated that there is a precedent and it would come within our policies, the issue is how it can be done with the minimum of overlooking to neighbours and questioned if this could be brought to the attention of the planning officer. The Chairman advised that the only window which would overlook would be a bathroom window and Trelawne close properties are far enough away that it would not be classed as an overlooking issue but that the Parish Council can ask that the window has obscured glazing. With regard to the height then yes Trelawne Close is mainly small bungalows but Agar Meadows is already 1 or 1 1/2 stories and the host dwelling is more than a single storey dwelling. It cannot be considered over dominant, it is not over development and provision has been made on the plans for parking and turning space.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: Subject to the consideration of obscure glazing to any windows facing onto Trelawne Close the Parish Council can see no**

**material planning considerations that would lead to a refusal. This was seconded by Cllr Allen and carried unanimously by the meeting.**

#### **870 Land at Carnon Downs PA15/11988**

The Chairman summarised the application. He stated that there had been a public meeting at which members were present and read out sections of the meeting notes. He felt that the application needed to be broken down into its constituent parts and looked at bit by bit, first of all to acknowledge that the Parish Council began informal discussions with the applicant in February 2015 which initially the applicant asked to be kept confidential. At that meeting we agreed that it would be appropriate as an exception site and it was felt that at that time our draft NDP limit of 15 properties was not strong enough to be upheld. We considered that we might be looking at a larger development. The Parish Council was not approached again until October 2015 at which time the applicant produced an outline plan showing approximately 30 dwellings with 5 non-residential units, the reaction was that it had some merit but members would like to see a few more issues addressed i.e. affordable housing and approaches to local businesses to try and take some of the non-residential units. It was then discussed at the Planning Committee meeting held on 23rd November as detailed in the minutes (the Chairman read out the resolution) after this the Parish Council received nothing further until receipt of the current application for 60 houses. From this it was proposed, seconded by Cllr M Kemp and carried unanimously by the full Parish Council meeting on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> January, that we write back to say that this application bore no resemblance to the discussions held previously, did not comply with our draft NDP and we could not support the application. Within a few days we received a revised plan which reduced the residential units by 6 and increased the non-residential units to 3 but that has never actually reached Cornwall Council so cannot be considered a formal amendment to the original plan. To the best of our knowledge no formal discussions have taken place between the applicant and the affordable housing team to get a view and it would appear that nothing has been done to try and split the development between affordable/open market although at one stage the applicant did say that it would be an affordable lead development. The Public Meeting we held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2016 showed that it was quite clear that there were a lot of objections in matters of principle and in matters of detail, at the moment there are 41 objections lodged on line and 3 comments in favour. The time for public comment has lapsed however the Parish Council have been given an extension of time to submit our consultee comment as we felt that we needed to have public input as it will have such a large effect on Carnon Downs and would increase the housing stock by well over 10%. Cllr Allen stated that nothing has changed from the previous meeting and he believes that we should send a response which shows our disagreement with this outline permission couched in terms of our draft plan policies, he still feels the site is not unreasonable as an exception site but the current proposal doesn't follow our plan policies at all. The critical thing is the principle of sustainability, you need certain facilities when looking at a development of this scale and we tried to point developers in the right direction but they have not provided a scheme that solves any problems. At this point the Chairman advised members that he had this morning received an email from the applicant's agents which he read out. Cllr Kemp commented that he thinks this illustrates that they have approached this by putting the cart before the horse, discussions with them agreed that this could be an acceptable exception site and they were advised that any such development needed to benefit the community and to follow through from those discussions with the proposal for 60 houses is incomprehensible. Cllr Shankland stated that it was an insensitive application in many ways, with regard to the business use it is meaningless and just a statement of intent, unless there is a signed contract it is not meaningful. The Chairman stated that it would seem from local hearsay that the dentist is unaware of any discussions that have taken place but these may be ongoing and be confidential at this stage. Cllr MacDonald stated that another point is about the access, the access to this site will cause massive problems, if they were talking about 30 dwellings that would be somewhat less of a problem. If you would put your potential dentist at the very top of the site with lots of parking this may cut some ice but the current plan doesn't show any additional parking than that which has already proved inadequate at the Dentist's current location. The Chairman summarised member's views and the following resolution was proposed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be:**

Whilst Feock Parish Council acknowledges that informal discussions have taken place relating to the possible development of this site, it must also state that this proposal as set out, bears little comparison to those discussions in terms of the number of dwellings and the principles and policies which, in our opinion, need to be considered by the developer before submitting an application for development.

In addition, the Parish Council has been made aware through online comments and a full consultation with the community, that there are other fundamental issues which need to be addressed before any application for the development of this site could be supported, even in outline form.

In general terms, these relate to its suitability for the area, its means of access to the site, land drainage issues and its compliance with local and national planning policy and guidance.

The application has attracted 44 online public comments which include 41 objections. These must be taken into consideration and the resulting relevant material planning considerations investigated before any decision is reached. A public meeting called by the Parish Council to discuss the proposal attracted over one hundred local residents, not only from the immediate vicinity of the proposed development site but also from a much wider area of the village and surrounding area. Only one person present showed their support for the scheme in a show of hands, and none spoke in favour of it at the meeting.

Comments made both in public and online have highlighted several major issues which need to be addressed before any development proposal for this site can be fairly considered. Among these are:

**Access:**

This outline application seeks to access this site from Quenchwell Road.

The Parish Council finds the comment made online by Cornwall Highways to be both inadequate and inaccurate. In simple terms, a speed and volume survey carried out as recently as September 2015 at the request of the Parish Council, revealed a total of around 70% of traffic flowing out of the village past this proposed site entrance to be travelling in excess of the prescribed 30mph limit with around 40% in excess of that limit in the incoming direction. This difference can be explained by the need to slow down for the one full width speed hump along this road which this proposal is seeking to remove with no specified plan or site for a replacement. The removal of this restricting hump is wholly unacceptable unless a fully surveyed, costed and accepted alternative arrangement is negotiated and installed before the commencement of any development. Failure to do so will result in an unacceptably high risk of even faster traffic and increased potential accident risk on this very busy road which is also a recognised HGV route from the A.39 across country to the Wheal Jane facility and the A.30 beyond. No suitable alternative HGV route exists in the local area.

Total vehicle movements along this road exceed 8,000 per week in each direction and the statement that this development will increase this volume by an estimated 38 trips at peak times is strongly disputed. If the number of new dwellings on the plan are built, and assuming that around two thirds are occupied as family homes, this will entail at least two traffic movements, per household, per day at both morning and evening peak times, assuming that as a minimum the only movement is one trip per household morning and afternoon to and from either employment or school. This in itself would create up to 80 traffic movements in each peak time, morning and evening on at least five days per week. An absolute minimum of 400 traffic movements per week. To this must be added considerable traffic movement during the day and evening off peak times for all residents, visitors and deliveries. The creation of commercial premises for a dental surgery or shop, particularly with the inadequate parking available on site as in the outline plan, would add considerably to these numbers and could lead to indiscriminate and dangerous overflow parking along Quenchwell Road itself. An estimate in

excess of 1,000 traffic movements per week to and from a development of this proposed size is an easily attainable figure.

**Land grade and drainage:**

The grade of this land in terms of its value as agricultural land has yet to be established. If it falls above grade 3B, it will fall within the definition of “best and most versatile” land as detailed in Agricultural Land Classification policy and as such will enjoy significant protection from development of any kind.

The natural geography and geology of this land must also be considered.

The land slopes downhill all the way from the top boundary of the proposed site to Quenchwell Road. Land on the other side of Quenchwell Road continues in a general downhill pattern.

Considerable concerns have been raised not only relating to the potential for excessive surface water run off from the site with consequent flood risk to Quenchwell Road and the area beyond.

It has also been noted that several natural springs occur within the proposed development area at times of heavy rain suggesting aquifers at or near the surface and a potentially unstable sub-strata of soil and rock. These matters need to be fully investigated and resolved before any consent is given for development of any kind.

This land also serves as a catchment area and aquifer for adjacent properties not served by mains water but relying on springs and wells for all their water needs. The potential for disturbance of this supply in terms of volume may be considerable but far worse is the potential for contamination of these supplies, given that residents of any new development may pollute the ground and soakaway facilities in a variety of ways, including spills from vehicles and chemicals used in such diverse ways as car washing and garden weed spraying. No development should be permitted until these possibilities have been fully investigated and possibly eliminated by actions taken by the developer to ensure a pure and uncontaminated water supply to affected households.

**Planning history:**

Residents’ comments suggest that access onto Quenchwell Road was refused in 1992/3 when a development proposal for this land came forward. The reasons given at that time were apparently related to road safety issues. The Parish Council has been unable to access specific detail from planning sources of the reasons for refusal but would accept that the documentary evidence shown to us by residents and other local knowledge of these events as detailed in some of the objections has good foundation and we would insist that these be fully investigated and considered again in the light of the considerable increases in traffic volume and speed in the intervening years.

**Housing stock and Affordable Housing:**

The proposal seeks to add over 10% to the housing stock of the village. This site only qualifies for development as an Exception Site because of its location adjacent to, but wholly outside the current settlement boundary of the village. This fact is recognised and accepted by the Parish Council.

It is apparent from the submission that no discussions have taken place relating to the development of this as an Exception Site, in particular the provision of affordable housing and sustainable community benefits.

The Parish need assessment for affordable housing is well recognised and well documented, the figures being readily available from Cornwall Council and the Parish Council fully accepts its duty and obligation to fulfil that need over time by the provision of suitable housing.

At present there is provision within an ongoing development to be known as Pengelly Meadows in the village for 16 affordable homes with provision for a further 7 in a development at Point Road to which the Parish Council has given its conditional support. Currently this leaves a very small number of affordable dwellings needed in the Parish to fulfil the current assessment list in Bands A-D under affordable homes legislation. Given that Cornwall Council's current policy and guidance on the provision of affordable homes must equate to at least 50% of the development, fulfilling our current remaining obligation would suggest a total of less than 10 dwellings overall on this or any other site to be a figure capable of meeting our obligation.

It is our stated policy within our Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan, which is backed by considerable evidence and input from Parishioners and guidance from Cornwall Council, that development of no more than 15 dwellings per site should be built to accommodate housing need within the Parish, to avoid overburdening any one location.

A development, backed by up to date housing requirement information of a figure not exceeding 15 total dwellings could be backed by the Parish Council for this site, subject to the satisfactory resolving of the other major issues noted above.

**Local Infrastructure:**

The Parish Council also recognises that local facilities from school places to NHS services and a wide variety of other local services will be overburdened by a development of this size and would press for mitigation of the effects of any development before accepting that the development proposal is valid.

**This was seconded by Cllr MacDonald and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

Cllr Kemp left the meeting. (16:40)

The Chairman adjourned the meeting for a short break.

The meeting reconvened. (16:56)

**871 Land North of Fir Cottage, Four Turnings, Feock TR3 6QR PA16/00065**

The Chairman summarised the application and discussion followed regarding it being outside of the settlement boundary but within a rural hamlet. Cllr Allen stated that on balance it does comply with Cornwall Council's latest infill policy. He felt that the new policy is quite reasonable and you could argue that there is a built up frontage all the way round Four Turnings so on balance it does comply. Discussion followed. Cllr Blake expressed concern over the vehicle access, it being very close to the dangerous crossing, with vehicles going a lot faster than they should do to catch the ferry. Discussion followed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: As a matter of principle the Parish Council has no concerns about the sub division of the plot but we do have considerable concerns about the access onto the highway and we would like to ensure that this is fully investigated before any permission is granted. This was seconded by Cllr Allen and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**873 24 Chychoose Parc, Point, Devoran TR3 6NT PA16/00215**

The Chairman summarised the application. Cllr MacDonald suggested that it was a considerable improvement to the previous proposal. Cllr Shankland made comment that there were a few properties within Chychoose



Park that stood out height wise above all others. Discussion followed in which it was stated that the Parish Council's previous objections to developments within Chychoose Parc had been rejected

**RESOLUTION: Cllr MacDonald proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council has no objection to the proposal as set out in the plans. This was seconded by Cllr Shankland and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**876** Trolver Old Farm, Trolver Hill, Feock TR3 6RP **PA16/00649**

The Chairman summarised the application and advised that no neighbour comments had been received. Discussion followed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council would like a condition placed on any permission that it be an agricultural building in perpetuity. This was seconded by Cllr Allen and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**877** Turbury, Goonpiper, Feock TR3 6RA **PA16/00557**

The Chairman stated that this application again falls into the criteria of plot sub division within a rural hamlet. The plan was viewed and discussion followed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Allen proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal. This was seconded by Cllr Blake and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**878** Ebenezer, Quenchwell, Carnon Downs TR3 6LA **PA16/00568**

The Chairman read out the details of the application and advised members that he had referred the application to Kea Parish Council as the site was within 50m of the Parish boundary and possible access may affect some residents in Kea Parish. He summarised the application and gave a brief history stating that the dwelling used to be a Quaker House but does not appear on the local heritage list. Discussion followed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council has no objection but would like consideration given to a construction management plan and any permission granted conditioned that the byway is returned to its present state when construction is completed. This was seconded by Cllr Allen and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**879** Church Hall Car Park, Churchtown, Feock TR3 6SD **PA16/00749**

The Chairman read out the application. Cllr Blake advised that the yellow notice from Cornwall Council had only appeared 2 days ago so local people have only just realised that the application has been made. He is aware that people will be writing to Cornwall Council with their comments. He gave a history of the lights in the car park, that the lights are quite bright and illuminate part of the lower car park and the lane. When they applied to enlarge the car park and go into the Orchard people were very concerned about light pollution and there was a condition placed on the permission that there was no lighting. The Church paths which are much more hazardous are not illuminated so it is questioned why the carpark, which has a much better surface, should be. They now want to put in 10 lights at 1.8m above surface level which will be 2.8m at the top level (which is 1m above the lower parking area). The current lights are on a timer at present and come on every evening although the hall is used only rarely in the evenings. The Chairman read out the details of the application and the sketch plan was viewed. The Chairman also read out the planning condition that they were seeking to have lifted. Discussion followed in which Cllr Shefford questioned if this could be a condition of their insurance. Members commented that when visiting the hall in the evening recently it was very dark and members agreed that there was an element of sympathy with those seeking to give some lighting. The

Chairman suggested that it may be a better solution to respond and ask why the current form of lighting is not working. Cllr Blake stated that he could not see why the proposed lighting needs to be at 1.8m high and discussion followed.

The Chairman suggested that the Parish Council could not support the application in its present form and would like to see the possibility of lower posts investigated and the current lights being investigated for repair before consideration is given to new posts and lights. Cllr Allen stated that he would like to see this prefaced that the Council are concerned about light pollution in this area. Cllr MacDonald stated that for him you had to balance up the safety and well-being of people using the carpark at night against what he feels would be fairly minimal impact a few times a month. Cllr Blake questioned the amount of time that the lights would be on and the Chairman read again details of the application which states that the lights will only be in use when the hall is being used and stated that if subsequently we find out that they are on all the time it is a matter which we can take up at that time. Discussion followed. Cllr Allen suggested that it needed to be stated that we would only be in agreement to the application if it were conditioned that the lights were only on when the hall was in use as it is wholly reasonable that if the hall is in use and it is dark then lighting is required, but it is not reasonable to have them on a timer which means that 365 days of the year the lights are on every evening. Cllr Blake stated that the lane should be lit but he did not see why the carpark needed to be lit. Discussion followed.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council is concerned about light pollution in this sensitive area however we would be in favour of a form of lighting being provided in the car park subject to a firm undertaking that it is only used on occasions when the hall is occupied in hours of darkness. We would also like consideration given to reducing the height of the posts to reduce the overall impact and effect of light emitted. This was seconded by Cllr MacDonald and carried by the meeting with four in favour, one against (Cllr Blake) and one abstention (Cllr Shankland).**

**880** Ashleigh, Tregye Road, Carnon Downs TR3 6SD **PA16/00526**

The Chairman summarised the application.

**RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed the consultee comment to Cornwall Council be: The Parish Council has no objection in principle to the application as set out. This was seconded by Cllr Allen and unanimously carried by the meeting.**

**881** Cliff Cottage, Pill Creek, Feock TR3 6SD **PA16/01083**

**RESOLUTION: At meeting no.1119 held on Monday 23rd November 2015 the Planning Committee resolved, proposed by Cllr Allen, seconded by Cllr Richards and carried unanimously by the meeting that the Parish Council's consultee comment for all tree applications within the Parish as: The Parish Council is happy to accept the professional advice of Cornwall Council's Tree Officer for this application.**

## **6. PLANNING DECISIONS**

The following applications, decided by Cornwall Council since the last meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2016, were reviewed.

### **Approved:**

- 789 Chy-An-Vre, Feock TR3 6RG PA15/06072
- 848 Moonrakers, Pill Lane, Feock TR3 6PQ PA15/10538
- 859 Gullivers, Restronguet Point, Feock TR3 6RB PA15/11297

- 860 Fernleigh, Trolver Croft, Feock TR3 6RT PA15/11326  
861 The Nurseries, Carnon Crease, Bissoe Road, Carnon Downs TR3 6LJ PA15/11224  
862 Wyngates, Forth Coth, Carnon Downs TR3 6JY PA15/11406

**Refused:**

- 787 Tregytreat, Restronguet Point, Feock TR3 6RB PA15/05921

The Chairman advised that in addition to those applications detailed on the agenda application PA15/11812 had also been refused.

**7. PLANNING APPEALS AND ENFORCEMENTS**

The Chairman updated members on enforcement cases EN15/01034, EN15/01262, EN15/01823 and EN15/02279

**8. PLANNING COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR**

The Chairman advised that he had not received a response to his email to Cllr C Kemp asking if she would consider taking the role as Vice Chair and would not wish to propose her without her attendance at the meeting. It was agreed to carry the item over to the next meeting.

**9. PLANNING PRE-APPLICATIONS**

RESOLUTION: Cllr Richards proposed that he draft a response to the applicant from the Pre-Application meeting, held on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> January, which would be on the basis that the Parish Council would like to see a plan that falls in line with our NDP policies and that we have concerns over potential flood risk and increased traffic leading onto Quenchwell Road. He will circulate the draft by email for members to agree before being sent. This was seconded by Cllr Shankland and carried unanimously by the meeting.

The Chairman advised that there had been a further request for a Pre-Application meeting on Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> February. Cllr Allen stated that he would not be able to make the meeting but the remaining members advised that they would be in attendance. Cllr MacDonald requested that the applicant be asked for a location plan prior to the meeting.

**10. MATTERS ARISING**

Cllr Allen gave a summary of his telephone conversations with the Highways Officer and Planning Officer relating to PA15/11578 and it was noted that the Parish Council is still looking into the highways issue and hoping to come up with a satisfactory resolution.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the date of the next meeting will be Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2016 at 3.30pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 5.45pm.

**Signed : .....**  
**Chairman, Feock Parish Council Planning Committee**  
**14<sup>th</sup> March 2016**