

St Pinnock Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of St Pinnock Parish Council held on Wednesday, 29th January 2020 in the Connon Chapel Room at 7.30pm.

Present. Miss C Spear (Chairman), D Mills (Vice Chairman), H Knapman, Mrs J Philp, G Crabb,

Also attending. Mrs J Hoskin (Parish Clerk) and Cllr P Seeva (Cornwall Council).

1... Public Session. There were no members of the public present, so Councillors used this time to hold a discussion with Cllr Phil Seeva on the planning application PA19/10263, asking for his support to call the application to committee should Option 3 be the decision of the Parish Council under Item 4 of this meeting. Cllr P Seeva was unable to commit to this but stated he would have a conversation with the planning officers. Cllr P Seeva told the meeting he was disappointed how this application had been dealt with at County level.

2. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr D Stevens.

3. Members Declarations of Interest. None declared at this stage of the meeting.

4. Planning Applications – to report on the following application.

a) **PA19/10263 Mr W and O Hoskin, Land south of Delmere Farm, Trelveford – Construction of five detached dwellings, the formation of a new vehicular access and the provision of an internal road. (Resubmission of Application No. PA19/00652 dated 12/04/2019).**

To consider information from the Cornwall Council Planning Officer and resolve to send a response based on the three options given in line with the 5 day protocol.

1. To agree with the Officer's recommendation.
2. To agree to disagree.
3. To maintain the Parish Councils previous support for this proposal, against the recommendation of the planning officer and request that the application is determined by the Cornwall Council Planning Committee.

The Council resolved to select Option 3 and request the application is considered by the Cornwall Council Planning Committee. It was decided to submit additional comments to justify the reason for this decision. Proposed Cllr J Philp. Seconded by Cllr C Spear and unanimously agreed.

The Clerk stated that this decision needed the support of Cllr P Seeva to move it to a planning committee decision.

Additional comments:-

1. Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan provides for: infill schemes that fill a small gap in an otherwise continuous built frontage and do not physically extend the settlement into the open countryside. Proposals should consider the significance or importance that large gaps can make to the setting of settlements and ensure that this would not be diminished; a. The latest development in the village at Little Park has a road frontage of approx. 72 M (The Officer report refers to 'Saved policy HO6 permits development in the form of infilling up to two dwellings ...') and an approved but as yet un-built development on the opposite side of the road is 38M on the road frontage and 60M behind (this proposal was designated as 'rounding off' in the Officer Report). Recent developments to the north of the application site at Poppy Cottage and Meadow View have a combined frontage of approx. 45.5M. The Delmere Farm proposal at 64M is therefore by no means excessive and clearly

falls into the category of infill. b. Far from this proposed development representing an “undesirable intrusion of the settlement into the countryside”, it is the exact opposite: the application site is already bounded to its full depth on both sides by residential properties and has a high hedge to the front. It is therefore a small pocket of land which is annexed from the character of the village and divides it into two halves by a short ‘causeway’. Once again, this qualifies the proposed development as ‘infill’ and does not conflict with Policy 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan in that it would not detract from the distinctiveness and character of the village.

2. Policy 8 of the Cornwall Local Plan requires that all new housing schemes in main towns and settlements which have more than 10 dwellings must contribute towards meeting affordable housing need. This is a modest development of just 5 houses which, whilst it does not meet the requirement to directly contribute to affordable housing, it will indirectly augment the housing supply chain and, with upward mobility, release affordable housing elsewhere. It therefore additionally meets the requirements of Policy 2 – and certainly contributes towards Policy 2a, of the Cornwall Local Plan. It also meets the requirements of Policy 12 in that it is a modest development of houses which are sympathetic in design with existing properties within the village

3. Taking all of the above factors into consideration, this application therefore does not conflict with paragraphs 8, 124, 127 and 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

4. The Planning Officer’s comments in the pre-app refers to “In addition this proposal seeks to artificially divide this field, and thus there is no physical barrier which would prevent further development to the north”. In the recently refused planning application it refers to “The site does not extend to a natural boundary on its northeast side and instead is an arbitrary line in the open field”. You now consider the recently constructed bund: “as a contrived approach for the purposes of seeking to influence the planning balance” and that “I note that the bund has been created but this would not stop the further expansion of the application site into the northern part of this field (where the barn is proposed to go)”. You wanted a physical boundary, now there is one and you are still not satisfied. What would appease you on this aspect?

Notwithstanding the above however, your remarks regarding development beyond the Northern boundary are considered by the Parish Council as being outside of your remit as these comments are purely speculative and should therefore be retracted. The planning application must be considered in relation to the area delineated in red ONLY and in the unlikely event of the applicants wishing to extend this site in the future, it would (as in every case) have to be the subject of a fresh planning application that would be decided on its merits at that time – NOT NOW!

We are obviously at an impasse regarding this application as you seem to be applying rules relating to infill and site boundary and adding hypothetical scenarios to this application which have not been applied to others within the village nor in the wider community, it should therefore be decided by the Planning Committee where all parties can make their views known to their elected representatives.

5. To close the Meeting . There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.25pm.

Dated. 17th February 2020

Signed.