

From:Woodley Martin
Sent:27 Apr 2020 16:04:40 +0100
To:Cornwall Planning
Subject:FW: Comments for Planning Application PA20/00164
Attachments:PA20_00164 Cuby Parish Meeting Plans.pdf

Information Classification: CONTROLLED

Good Afternoon.

Can the comments referred to be separated into the Parish response and neighbour comments. They seem to have been confused?

Kind regards

Martin Woodley MRTPI IHBC Dip Arch Cons.
Principal Development Officer (Area Team 4)
Planning & Sustainable Development Service
Economic Growth and Development Directorate
Cornwall Council
Pydar House
Pydar Street
Truro
TR1 1XU
Tel: 01872 224688
Email: mwoodley@cornwall.gov.uk

Have you used one of our **Planning Services** lately? We would love to hear your feedback to gain a better understanding of how we are performing as a service. Check out our survey below:

<https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-survey-2019/>

To keep up to date with changes in the Planning & Sustainable Development Service, please check “What’s new in Planning” on the [cornwall.gov.uk](http://www.cornwall.gov.uk) website

Important Notice that may affect your planning application: From 1 January 2019, Cornwall Council will be a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Authority, and any new development could be liable to pay a CIL. Visit www.cornwall.gov.uk/cil now to find out how CIL may affect your development.

The Planning & Sustainable Development Service has had to change its procedures with regards to Planning Committees, site notices, visiting our offices and on the availability of information by hard copy. Please refer to the FAQs on our [Covid-19 impact on planning processes](#) page on our website for further details on revised processes implemented by the Service.

From: David & Mhairi Attwater <attwaters@btinternet.com>

Sent: 27 April 2020 15:32

To: Woodley Martin <Martin.Woodley@cornwall.gov.uk>

Cc: Richard Heywood <gargonauts@btinternet.com>

Subject: Comments for Planning Application PA20/00164

Dear Mr Woodley,

You will see below comments on PA20/00164 I submitted on behalf of Cuby Parish Meeting of which I am chairman; these are comments consolidated from email consultations between members of Cuby Parish Meeting; these also includes some concerns expressed by those immediate neighbours for whom the applicant is also their landlord. I previously separately submitted comments in my personal capacity as I am a neighbour and can see the proposed development site from my property (Goviley Major Farmhouse); as such these are personal comments that are entirely separate from the Cuby Parish Meeting Comments. I note that the online system seems to have conflated both sets under a

single entry as a Public Comment (I use the same web access for both purposes); while I believe that while my personal comments are as such, the Cuby Parish Meeting comments should show up under Consultee Comments? Grateful if you could please resolve.

May I take up the opportunity to urge that, should you be minded to provide consent, you carry out a site visit (or equivalent if technology permits some form of directed remote viewing) before doing so.

I would be happy to provide any clarification, further information or assist in any way that I am able.

I am copying this to our Clerk, Mr Richard Heywood for the Cuby Parish Meeting records.

Regards,

David Attwater

David Attwater

Chairman Cuby Parish Meeting

Govilety Major Farmhouse

Tregony

Truro

TR2 5TT

T:01872 530599

M:07501 728366

From: planning@cornwall.gov.uk [<mailto:planning@cornwall.gov.uk>]
Sent: 27 April 2020 13:29
To: attwaters@btinternet.com
Subject: Comments for Planning Application PA20/00164

Mr David Attwater,

You have been sent this email because you or somebody else has submitted a comment on a Planning Application to your local authority using your email address. A summary of your comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 1:29 PM on 27 Apr 2020 from Mr David Attwater.

Application Summary

Address: The Barn Goviley Major Farm Tregony Cornwall TR2 5TT
Proposal: Conversion and linking of two redundant rural barns to form a single dwellinghouse
Case Officer: Martin Woodley
[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr David Attwater
Email: attwaters@btinternet.com
Address: Goviley Major Farmhouse, Tregony TR2 5TT

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Parish/Town Council
Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:
- Residential Amenity
- Traffic or Highways
Comments: Cuby Parish Meeting has substantial concerns with this application. It is light on detail on some aspects and silent on others. There are a number of questions and concerns that need to be resolved before we could support the

application.

From a purely visual impact point of view the proposal to remove the Calves Shed and replace it with a clean structure is positive. The development of the derelict building would also be welcomed in terms of improved visual impact. However, we note the the applicant has had an existing consent (PA06/2330/05/R) to replace the Calves Shed with car parking and develop the building into office accommodation. Although this consent was granted in 2006, the other elements of this development have since been completed and, therefore as the development has started then the consent relating to the Calves Shed and building should therefore remain extant. The application is silent on these existing planning aspects which must be directly relevant, particularly with regard to the access and parking considerations that follow. Returning to the visual aspects, the applicant has in any case been in a position to make improvements for some years now. We question whether the description used of 'redundant agricultural buildings' is a correct technical description in relation to their planning status.

The position regarding access and parking is unclear. There is a single access for a number of residences to which this development would be added. The proposed development includes provision for access and parking for yet a further 2 vehicles. However, what the existing provision for access and parking for the immediate local area is unclear; The Granary (Unit 2 as consented to under PA06/2330/05/R), The Barn and Victory Barn (consented to under PA06/0181/08/R) all share common access from the highway and none have any designated parking. As already mentioned, the proposed development removes the provision for 2 parking spaces for The Granary but which has not (yet) been implemented. The situation is further complicated by the fact that The Granary has since been configured as 2 single bedroom rental properties with, currently, up to 4 vehicles associated with the tenants. We are unsighted as to any permissions or consents for this conversion; we note, however, that the Granary has been assessed as Band A for Council Tax which implies that it has been assessed as a single bedroom property rather than the 3 bedroom property as developed in accordance with PA06/2330/05/R. What is locally known as The Upper Granary or Mortain, does not appear to have been registered for Council Tax. Consequently it is unclear as to what has, or has not, been approved by the Council and, therefore, what the Council accepts as the current residential status of The Granary and, so, what the provision of vehicle access and parking should be (for 2,3 or 4 vehicles?). The plans for the

consented development for the Barn and Victory Barn included provision for 2 parking spaces for each (total of 4 spaces) but these were never implemented. While the Barn also has tenants, we note that Victory Barn is currently unoccupied and, indeed, has been so for some time. The status of Victory Barn is unclear; it was subject to a S106 planning obligation to be configured as a low cost local housing needs dwelling. It was developed and occupied for a short period of time (although it was unclear whether this was under the terms of the S106 agreement) and it may well be that the Council has since decided not to enforce the S106 agreement (and, indeed, that fact that it not registered for Council Tax may be consistent with such a decision) but, if that is indeed the case, then the residential status of Victory Barn needs to be clarified and, accordingly, whether it needs to be considered as part of the overall access and parking provisions. Access and parking for existing residents and properties may therefore be for 8 vehicles for which the applicant has failed to date to make any of the provisions as planned for in existing consented to developments. We believe that this development is likely to result in access difficulties and unsustainable parking provision for the existing local rental properties (but which are all owned by the applicant); this consideration should include the ability for delivery vehicles, which can include oil tankers and similar large vehicles to safely manoeuvre. We strongly recommend that the Council establishes a clear position on the residential status of all the properties served by the single access and invites the applicant to submit plans that provide a safe access and parking for all vehicles that use and service the local properties.

While existing stone work will be retained on the derelict building, the proposal is to use rendered block work elsewhere. We believe that, should the Planning Officer be minded to grant consent, then a condition should be imposed such that the external South facing wall of the kitchen/lounge should reflect lime pointed stonework to match the stonework in other local buildings (The Granary, Goviley Major Farmhouse, The Old Mill, Cart Barn, The Old Parlour etc.) although it has to be observed that the applicant's treatment of the stone work for The Barn is not in keeping contrary to Condition 7 of the consent for that development.

The residential part of the development is very close to the track providing farm vehicle access to the silage pits, yard and farm outbuildings from the public highway and, so, subject to frequent trafficking by tractors and other heavy farm machinery; the track level is around 1metre (visual estimation only) above the proposed floor level and so the

noise and vibration effects would be exacerbated. There is also a very small risk of accident involving tractors and heavy machinery, yet the impact of such a risk would be substantial and so should be taken into account. We invite the Planning Officer to consider what planning policies might be relevant in this respect.

The application is unclear as to drainage and electricity supplies. It is unclear how foul and grey waste would be handled; nor where any soakaways would be sited, which may be relevant to the issue of access and parking. There is local concern regarding the capacity of the local supply into Goviley. We ask that any consent includes a condition that requires confirmation from Western Power that the local supply would have the necessary capacity or, if not, that the supply is upgraded before any development starts.

It should be noted that the area for development includes land to which the applicant does not have title; indeed it includes part of the Council maintained highway! This is relevant as the applicant has stated, as part of the application, that he owns all of the land stated in the application; this is patently incorrect.

The application shows an element of the Registered Woodland as part of the development. The application is silent on exactly what the intent is for this land. The implication is that it would be fenced off and remain as Registered Woodland. However, as the only green space linked to the residential part of the development there is a suspicion that in time this area may be developed, possibly leading to removal of trees and conversion to horticultural use. The applicant's intent for this space should be clarified and, if necessary, change of use applied for accordingly. We also note that access to this area is not indicated; currently this is from across land owned by Goviley Farm for which no easement formally exists to do so. The applicant should also be invited to clarify his intent for this access.

Some other details in the application need to be clarified:

- o Section 1 - The site address is The Granary and not The Barn. For ease of reference the Land Registry title number for The Granary is CL237652 and for The Barn it is CL116043. The residential element is wholly within the title plan of The Granary, only the Registered Woodland element is part of the title plan of The Barn.
- o Section 4 - Site area needs to be adjusted (see comment that site includes part of the public highway).
- o Section 5 - Description may need to be changed if change is deemed necessary to reflect current consented

purpose.

- o Section 6 - As for Section 5, existing use may need to be corrected.
- o Section 8 - Needs to be consistent with the access and parking issues identified.
- o Section 10 - States that no trees and/or hedges are involved yet the development includes Registered Woodland!
- o Section 22 - The site is only partially visible from the public highway (although the form makes no provision for this as such).

We have separately prepared our own map and extracts of plans to graphically visualise some of the issues set out above. We would be happy to make these available should that be helpful.

In summary, Cuby Parish Meeting has substantial concerns regarding this application. Pending resolution of these concerns, we are not in a position to support this application and must therefore, regrettably, register an objection.

This e-mail and attachments are intended for above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please e-mail us immediately at enquiries@cornwall.gov.uk. Please note that this e-mail may be subject to recording and/or monitoring in accordance with the relevant legislation and may need to be disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004. Security Warning: It is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that this e-mail and any attachments are virus free. The Authority will not accept liability for any damage caused by a virus.