

# Mabe Parish Council Planning Committee

## Minutes – 16 May 2024

**Minutes of Mabe Parish Council** held on Thursday 16 May 24 at 1800 hrs, Mabe Parish and WI Hall, Antron Hill, Mabe.

**Councillors present:** Councillors: P Tisdale (Chair), T Tindle, B Galke, K West.

**Officer support:** Clerk/RFO

Minute no:	Agenda Items
PC.24.25.001	<b>Apologies for absence</b> – None
PC.24.25.002	<b>Members' Declarations of Interests</b> – Councillor West regarding PA24/03030.
PC.24.25.003	<b>To approve written requests for dispensation</b> – None
PC.24.25.004	<p><b>Public speaking –</b></p> <p>Mr Russell Winn addressed the Planning Committee on behalf of local residents 7 of which were present at the meeting regarding PA24/02329. He stated that as the application is a Permission in Principle (PIP) the key consideration is whether it is a suitable location for housing development in principle. The scope of PIP is limited to location, land use and amount of development.</p> <p>He continued that the local residents objected to the application for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal will introduce up to two new substantial homes, and their associated hard surfacing, excavations, new boundary treatments and residential paraphernalia, onto an undeveloped field in the countryside. In the absence of any special circumstances to justify residential development in this context, the proposal does not represent sustainable development and the proposal fails to meet the aims and intentions of NDP Policies 14, 15, and 17. Local Plan Policies 3, 7, and 21 in relation to the suitable location for housing development, or policy AL1 and TC5 of the Climate Emergency DPD.</p> <p>Any dwellings will rely on a private motor vehicle, the nearest bus stop is a significant walk away, along busy country lanes without street lighting or pavements. Access to schools, services, shopping, employment opportunities and transport links will require a vehicle which goes against the long term strategy to reduce the need to travel, contrary to Policy C1 and T11.</p> <p>The site represents a large gap between the urban edge of a settlement and other isolated dwellings and is therefore not appropriate for infill development.</p> <p>The proposal is not rounding off due to its location within the countryside, the pattern of adjacent development and lack of enclosing features.</p> <p>David Dickinson stated the proposed site access was across his driveway. Currently access to the field is allowed for agricultural vehicles only across his driveway. The field itself being biodiverse for both wildlife and plants.</p>

	<p>Mr Andrew Hockey expressed concern that the area is used by bats, but he was unable to comment on whether the site was registered.</p> <p>Mr Andrew Vizzard stated that the planning was not for affordable homes and would result in the loss of agricultural land. He also raised the issue of potential flooding risk due to further hard standing.</p> <p>Mr Jody Jeffrey spoke on behalf of the development. He stated that the site was acceptable as is was just rounding off an area of building. The area is not agricultural land. He said that should PIP be approved he would consult with local residents on how the proposed buildings would look.</p> <p>Mr Alan Stokes stated that as far he was aware the land was protected and not for development.</p>
PC.24.25.005	<p><b>Planning applications:</b></p> <p>Councillor West Put the following motion to the Planning Committee. It is proposed that having reviewed the various planning documents and reports submitted to the meeting in relation to the planning applications referenced:</p> <p>PA24/02792  PA24/02555  PA24/02864  PA24/20920  PA24/03125  PA24/03030  PA24/02977</p> <p>That the Clerk be instructed to provide comment to Cornwall Council Planning Department, as agreed at the meeting and directed by the Chair/Vice Chair of the Mabe Parish Planning Committee.</p> <p>If was further proposed that in regard to application PA23/05117 the Clerk is instructed to make a complaint or not, as agreed at the meeting and directed by the Chair/Vice Chair of Mabe Council Planning Committee.</p> <p>It was further proposed that in regard to planning application PA21/04825, Appeal Hearing relating to that application, a member of Mabe Parish Council Planning Committee attend to put forward the objections of the Parish Council.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – That the motion as stated be agreed.</p>
	<p>a <b>PA24/02792</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – To agree with the proposal in principle, however, the Parish Council would like a caveat that the properties cannot be sold until the site is 90% complete.</p>
	<p>b <b>PA24/02555</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – To agree with the application in principle providing the drawings provided were part of the original application PA10/05299</p>

c	<p><b>PA23/05117</b> – Councillor West stated that the planning officer had completely ignored the NDP and the Parish Council who asked for the application to go to committee, and just approved the planning application.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – To write a letter of complaint to the head of Cornwall Council Planning Department.,</p>
d	<p><b>PA21/04825</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – That Councillor West represent the Parish Council at the meeting.</p>
e	<p><b>PA24/02864</b> – Following a discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – Not supported. W2/82/00981/0 should remain in force.</p>
f	<p><b>PA24/02920</b> – Following a discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – Not supported. W2/82/00981/0 should remain in force.</p>
g	<p><b>PA24/03125</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – Not supported. The application fails to provide substantive evidence that the trees are in any way diseased or dangerous.</p>
h	<p>Councillor West leaves the room</p> <p><b>PA24/03030</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> - Supported, however the balcony should not be approved as this will overlook into surrounding properties leading to loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. Prior applications in the area have previously been refused for this reason.</p> <p>Councillor West re-enters the room.</p>
i	<p><b>PA24/02329</b> – It was discussed whether the application fell within the development boundary, whether it was rounding off or intruding into green areas. The application says the proposed development site is surrounded on three sides by other developments and will enhance the area. The developer says the site is not scenic.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – Not supported. The site is outside of the NDP Development Boundary and is not rounding off. The proposed development will detract from the local area.</p>
j	<p><b>PA24/02977</b> – Following a short discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – Supported.</p>
k	<p><b>PA24/00672</b> – Following a discussion.</p> <p><b>Resolved</b> – That Councillor West draft a response to the Principle Development Officer.</p>
<p>There being no further business to discuss the meeting closed at 1945 hrs</p>	

	Signed by Chair
--	-----------------