

CORNWALL COUNCIL

CENTRAL SUB-AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES of a Meeting of the Central Sub-Area Planning Committee held in the : - County Hall on Monday 22 November 2021 commencing at 10.00 am.

Present:- Councillors: Jewell (Chairman)
(None)

Arthur, Bunney, Crabtree (for McLening), Ewert, Fitter, Harvey,
J Thomas, Weedon and Williams.

Also in Councillors: Alvey, German and Guest.

attendance:-

Apologies for Councillors: McLening and Tilbey.

absence:-

Officers:- E Coad – Democratic Officer
L Commons – Senior Lawyer
G Smith – Development Management Group Leader
M Stephenson – Development Management Group Leader
M Woodley – Principal Development Officer

EMERGENCY EVACUATION AND DOMESTIC PROCEDURES

(Agenda No. 1)

CPL/50

he Democratic Officer advised of the emergency evacuation and domestic procedures.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Agenda No. 3)

CPL/51

There were no declarations of interest.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 25 OCTOBER 2021

(Agenda No. 4)

CPL/52

It was moved by Councillor Fitter, seconded by Councillor Ewert, and

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Central Sub-Area Planning Committee held on 25 October 2021 were correctly recorded and that they be signed by the Chairman.

PA21/01046: MR T VIGUS - LITTLE INSIDE FARM, FEOCK, TRURO, CORNWALL, TR3 6RU

(Agenda No. 5.1)

CPL/53

The Principal Development Officer (MW) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Principal Development Officer (MW) recommended that Application No. PA21/01046 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Blake of Feock Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. The speaker responded to a question put to him by the speaker.

Councillor Alvey (Electoral Division Member) made the following points in relation to the application, details of which were summarised below:

1. There was no public support for the application; there had been a number of objections to the proposal details of which were outlined in the report;
2. The site was located in the open countryside, close to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
3. It was acknowledged that screening was proposed, however, the application would have a harmful impact on the character of the area and set a precedent for further development;
4. The proposal was contrary to Policy 5 of the Cornwall Local Plan and ECON1 of the Feock Neighbourhood Development Plan;
5. Access to the bus stop was a lengthy walk along a busy road with no pavement to access an infrequent rural bus service to Truro;
6. Given the location of the site there would be a reliance on a motor vehicle;
7. He referred to data from Feock 'Speed Watch' showing the levels of speeding along the road;
8. He referred to an Inspectors decision dismissing an Appeal for a similar scheme at Rosudgeon;

9. He commented that the impact of the scheme did not outweigh the benefits of the modest development and therefore should be refused.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. Confirmation that the grade of agricultural land was split between Grade 2 and Grade 3A;
2. Confirmation that the provision of one car parking space per pod was considered acceptable given the scale of the pods;
3. The site was located between a smallholding and a cluster of residential dwellings on the opposite side of the B3289; the site was considered to be well integrated;
4. Confirmation that the application had been assessed against Policy 5 of the Cornwall Local Plan – Business and Tourism and ECON1 of the Feock Neighbourhood Plan – Protection and Enhancement of existing employment land/sites and creation of new employment opportunities;
5. Officers were of the view that it was not appropriate to restrict the length of occupancy; a condition had been recommended and could be enforced to ensure the pods were used for holiday accommodation only and that they should not be occupied as a person's sole or main place of residence;
6. Officers acknowledged that given the location of the site there would be a reliance on a motor vehicle, however, there was a bus stop near the site providing a service until 6.00pm.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. Concern that this was development in the open countryside and that there would be a reliance on the motor vehicle;
2. Reference was made to imposing an occupancy restriction to limit the length of stay and number of letting months to minimise the concerns regarding highway safety and residential occupation;
3. Concern was expressed that the application was contrary to Policy 5 of the Cornwall Local Plan by virtue of the site being in the open countryside and in an unsustainable location;
4. Concern was expressed regarding the loss of Grade 2 and Grade 3A agricultural land;

5. The proposal would adversely impact the character of the area and no specific justification had been provided for the development in this location.

In response to comments raised in debate, the Development Management Group Leader (MS) advised that it was inappropriate to restrict the length of occupation of the pods. A condition had been recommended to ensure the development was used as holiday accommodation and not a person's sole or main residence and seasonal restrictions were no longer considered appropriate. Officers were confident that Condition 5 was enforceable should the need arise and that the proposal complied with Policy 5 of the Cornwall Local Plan when read as a whole, the development would provide high quality development in a sustainable location. Officers acknowledged that there would be a loss of a small pocket of green field, however, the land was not currently used productively.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Thomas, and on a vote of 9 votes in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA21/01046 be refused.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to refuse the application were that

The proposed development of the site for three holiday letting pod units, by reason of the location of the site in the open countryside, divorced from nearby services, facilities and amenities with poor accessibility by a range of transport modes, would represent unsustainable new residential development for which no special justification has been adequately demonstrated. The proposal represents an unsustainable form of development that would be harmful to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and landscape character of the locality. The development would also result in the loss of Best and Most Versatile Land. The development is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 21 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, Policies LS2, D1 and H1 of the Feock Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2030 and paragraphs 8, 130 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

PA21/05451: MATTHEW CREED - SLIPWAYS, ROAD FROM MARBLE HEAD COTTAGE TO THE OLD BARN, RESTRONGUET POINT, FEOCK, TR3 6RB
(Agenda No. 5.2)

CPL/54

The Principal Development Officer (MW) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Principal Development Officer (MW) recommended that Application No. PA21/05451 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Blake of Feock Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

David Scott (Agent) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke in support of the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Councillor Alvey (Electoral Division Member) made the following points in relation to the application, details of which were summarised below:

1. He referred to the objections raised by the Parish Council and the continued objections from AONB Officer, along with the concerns of the Friends of Restronguet Point;
2. He highlighted that the AONB Action Plan emphasised 'cumulative impact' as taking precedent over past precedent;
3. The proposal would require significant alterations and extensions to the existing dwelling; the dwelling would appear as a new dwelling of unrelated appearance;
4. Concern was expressed regarding the level of glazing on the eastern elevation; the development would lead to an unwelcome light spill particularly at night and in the winter months;
5. Concern was expressed regarding the cumulative impact of this development with the other recent substantial properties along the eastern side of Restronguet Point;
6. The appearance from Carrick Road would be markedly changed and further intensification of dwellings in this location should not be allowed;
7. He referred to the comments of the AONB Officer details of which were provided within the Officer report;

8. The proposal would adversely impact the AONB which enjoyed a high level of environmental protection; the proposal failed to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the area and therefore the application should be refused.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. Confirmation that the replacement dwelling 'Saqqara' had been a delegated decision;
2. Confirmation that there was a high band of trees along the eastern elevation; due to the number of trees there would only be glimpses of the dwelling from the foreshore and Carrick Roads;
3. Confirmation that the development was a Householder application; the reason for Committee decision was due to the level of local concerns, objections from the Parish Council, Electoral Division Member and AONB Unit;
4. The glazing fronting Carrick Roads was indicated as standard plain glazing.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. Concern was expressed regarding the cumulative impact this proposal would have on the AONB in particular due to the massing and the lighting spill during the night and winter; the AONB was important and should be protected;
2. The development would provide a dwelling that would contribute to the climate change emergency;
3. It was commented that the development was the conversion and extension of an existing dwelling; it was not a replacement dwelling;
4. The current dwelling had no distinctive style;
5. The trees on the eastern elevation would provide some screening;
6. The development would integrate well amongst the neighbouring dwellings;
7. The level of glazing had been reduced; it was commented that tinted glazing particularly on the eastern elevation would reduce any glare when viewed from the foreshore.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Thomas, seconded by Councillor Fitter, and on a vote of 7 votes in favour, 3 against and 0 abstentions, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA21/05451 be approved subject to the conditions set out on in the report.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to approve the application were that

1. The proposed extensions, which are to be sited over the existing ground floor accommodation which would also be remodelled, were considered to be acceptable in terms of scale, massing, form, design and materials within the sensitive waterside setting that was part of a designated landscape but taking into account the varied context of the houses in the locality. The proposal adopts a distinctly contemporary design concept with the introduction of principal flat roofed elements reflective of the recently completed replacement dwelling on the adjacent site to the north.
2. The proposed development would integrate well within the group of properties along the point and the wider AONB setting due to the appropriate scale and proposed materials. The scheme, following revisions to the overall height and scale in relation to the side boundaries with immediate neighbours, would not have a material impact upon residential amenity and therefore the proposal complies with policies set out within the Cornwall Local Plan, the Feock Neighbourhood Development Plan and the NPPF. The scheme would enable the property to be modernised and provide additional accommodation which was considered a benefit of the scheme.
3. The proposal was considered, on balance, to be in accordance with the relevant identified adopted planning policies of the Council including the policies of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and the Feock NDP. Taking these factors into account the social and economic benefits of the proposed development are considered to outweigh any limited environmental harm that has been identified and the proposal was acceptable on balance subject to the recommended conditions.

NOTED THAT the meeting adjourned for a comfort break from 11.22am-11.34am.

PA21/05209: INITIAL PARKING LTD - PORTHOLLAND WEST CAR PARK, WEST PORTHOLLAND, PORTLOE, TRURO, CORNWALL, TR2 5PU
(Agenda No. 5.3)

CPL/55

The Principal Development Officer (MW) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Principal Development Officer (MW) recommended that Application No. PA21/05209 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

April Bennett (Objector) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. The speaker responded to a question put to her by the Committee.

Councillor Trounce of Veryan Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Councillor German (Electoral Division Member) made the following points in relation to the application, details of which were summarised below:

1. Concern was expressed that proposal would adversely impact the AONB due to the visual appearance of the structures; the proposal conflicted with the aims of the AONB Management Plan and Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan;
2. He commented that the introduction of parking charges could have a harmful impact on residential amenities due to visitors parking along the road to avoid parking charges, this could create congested roads;
3. This was a tranquil sensitive location in the AONB;
4. He referred to the comments expressed by the AONB Partnership regarding the negative impact the development would have in this location;
5. He urged the Committee to refuse the application; if minded to approve the application the conditions recommended in the Officer report should be imposed;
6. In response to questions from the Committee he confirmed that the introduction of parking charges could lead to congested roads; there was potential for conflicts between parked vehicles and pedestrians on the coastal footpath between East and West Portholland; the

introduction of cameras, ticket machine and signage would visually impact the AONB; the structures would adversely impact the Listed Building; he was unaware of people currently parking along the lanes.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. The development proposed the erection of a single pole with an ANPR camera and two CCTV cameras and a solar powered ticketing machine;
2. A separate application had been submitted for the erection of signs associated with the car park;
3. Details of the parking capacity had been taken from aerial images of the site;
4. Confirmation that there had been issues with vandalism following the erection of the cameras;
5. Parking charges would be based on an hourly rate;
6. Confirmation that the car parks at East Portholland and Caerhays had a similar type of parking arrangement;
7. Confirmation that a notice had been posted on site advertising this application;
8. Confirmation that delegated decisions had been made on the applications for similar structures at East Portholland and Caerhays; the level of concern had not been as great for those two applications; concerns had been raised by the AONB partnership, however, an improved scheme had been negotiated;
9. Confirmation that the car parks at East Portholland and Caerhays were larger in capacity;
10. Officers were of the view that the current proposal was acceptable in terms of location and height;
11. The car parks at East Portholland and Caerhays were in the same ownership as the application site.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. Concern was expressed that the location of the structures would have an adverse impact on a Listed Building;
2. The strong concerns of the Parish Council and AONB Partnership were acknowledged; this was a unique setting forming part of the Heritage Coast which had not been altered by modern development;
3. The proposal would adversely impact the natural and historic environment, and the Heritage Coast by introducing alien features

which would fail to conserve or enhance the landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Bunney, seconded by Councillor Thomas, and on a unanimous vote, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA21/05209 be refused.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to refuse the application were that

The proposed parking meter infrastructure, in combination with the adjoining ANPR camera and support post, would represent alien and visually intrusive man-made features which would fail to conserve or enhance the landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB in which the site lies or the setting of the adjoining listed historic lime kiln structure due to their design and scale, in conflict with policies LA1, LA2, CV2, GP1 and CD1 of the Roseland Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015-2030, Policies 12, 23 and 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan 2016, Policies MD9 and SCC9.02 of the AONB Management Plan 2016-2021 and paragraphs 8, 130, 174, 176 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

PA20/11299: JOHNSON - PORTHOLLAND CHAPEL, WEST PORTHOLLAND, PORTLOE, TRURO, CORNWALL, TR2 5PU
(Agenda No. 5.4)

CPL/56

The Principal Development Officer (MW) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Principal Development Officer (MW) recommended that Application No. PA20/11299 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

April Bennett (Objector) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Councillor Trounce of Veryan Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Councillor German (Electoral Division Member) made the following points in relation to the application, details of which were summarised below:

1. He referred to the relationship between this application and the previous application (PA21/05209) advising that comments expressed in relation to that application applied to this application as well;
2. He confirmed that this was a special site that should be protected;
3. He referred to the comments expressed by the AONB Partnership as detailed in the Officer report.

There were no questions of Officers.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. The current application was related to the previous application (PA21/05209);
2. The location of the signs would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and failed to recognise the unique heritage setting and adversely impact the Listed Building;
3. The proposal would lead to the introduction of paraphernalia that was out of keeping with the character of the area;
4. Given the decision taken in respect of Application No. PA21/05209 there was no justification for the erection of the signage;
5. Reference was made to the lack of engagement with the community and Parish Council regarding the proposal.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Bunney, seconded by Councillor Thomas, and on a unanimous vote, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA20/11299 be refused.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to refuse the application were that

The proposed signage scheme, by reason of the number of signs and their siting, would have an unacceptable and harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area, including the landscape character and scenic beauty of the AONB in which the site lies and the setting of the adjacent listed historic lime kiln structure. The proposed advertisements are therefore in conflict with Policies LA1, LA2, CV2, GP1 and CD1 of the Roseland Neighbourhood Development

Plan 2015-2030, Policies 12, 23 and 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, Policies MD9 and SCC9.02 of the AONB Management Plan 2016-2021 and paragraphs 8, 130, 174, 176 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

PA21/04051: SOPHIE FABER - MIDDLE PARK, TREGOSS ROAD, TREGOSS, ROCHE, CORNWALL

(Agenda No. 5.5)

CPL/57

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) recommended that Application No. PA21/04051 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Guest (Electoral Division Member) made the following points in relation to the application, details of which were summarised below:

1. He referred to the objections raised by the Parish Council which had been detailed in full in the Officer report;
2. He expressed concern regarding the impact the proposal would have on the character of the area;
3. He commented regarding the large number of Gypsy and Traveller sites within his division; he questioned the need for any further pitches particularly his area;
4. He agreed with the objections raised by the Parish Council;
5. In response to questions raised by the Committee he confirmed that the site was approximately half a mile from the community and that the Neighbourhood Plan had been adopted in 2016; the units had been sited recently, and that there had been no reports of anti-social behaviour from the site.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. Confirmation that the Roche Neighbourhood Development Plan could be given full weight in the determination of the application;
2. The reason for the configuration of the boundaries at the northern end of the field was unknown;

3. The nearest community with meaningful services and facilities was 1.6 miles away from the site in Roche;
4. Paragraph 32 of the Officer report provided details of the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; the proposal would provide six permanent pitches to meet the outstanding need;
5. There was no Policy requirement to disperse Gypsy and Traveller sites across the County; an Appeal Inspector had criticised the Local Planning Authority in the past regarding a decision to refuse an application based the number of sites in one area;
6. Confirmation that the application would meet the identified shortfall in Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in accordance with Policy 2a of the Cornwall Local Plan.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. It was commented that the proposal was acceptable and would not have an overbearing impact on Roche;
2. The site was in a rural area close to a community with facilities.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Fitter, seconded by Councillor Ewert, and on a vote of 8 votes in favour, 2 against and 0 abstentions, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA21/04051 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to approve the application were that

1. The proposal would help to meet an identified need in Cornwall for additional Gypsy and Traveller pitches, was of appropriate size and proportionate scale to nearby settlements and was located within a reasonable distance to services and facilities. This weighed in favour of approving the application.
2. The proposal would also result in visual harm to the distinctive character of the area by introducing the development onto a previously undeveloped site. The extent of harm was tempered due to the limited scale of the proposal and as the site itself was not prominent to views in the wider landscape. This harm was localised and weighs against the application.

3. Designated space had not been provided for the future occupiers of the proposed 6 units to work outside of the caravans on-site. Planning permission would be required for any material change of use as a result of any working on-site in the normal way, which was a separate matter to the current proposal.
4. The proposed development site was considered to be of low ecological value. No impact to protected species.
5. The harm to the character of the area was limited to a localised level and outweighed by the benefits associated with the provision of 6 Gypsy and Traveller Pitches where there was an identified lack of provision.

NOTED THAT :-

1. At the conclusion of the above item the meeting adjourned for a lunch break from 12.57 – 13.36;
2. Councillor Weedon left the meeting at the conclusion of the above item.

PA21/05993: MR A WREFORD - LAND SOUTH EAST OF CHYVOUNDER, TRENANCE, MAWGAN PORTH, CORNWALL, TR8 4BT
(Agenda No. 5.6)

CPL/58

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) recommended that Application No. PA21/05993 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Councillor Corbett of Mawgan in Pydar Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. The speaker responded to questions put to him by the Committee.

Ivan Tomlin (Agent) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke in support of the application. The speaker responded to a question put to him by the Committee.

Councillor Wills (Electoral Division Member) was unable to attend the meeting. A statement was read to the Committee on his behalf in support of the application.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. Officers were of the view that the site did not visually extend into the open countryside; the site was substantially enclosed, it was surrounded by the built form of the settlement on northern boundary and road on the western boundary;
2. Reference was made to the Chief Officer Note regarding 'rounding off' and the Officer response as detailed in paragraph 22 of the Officer report;
3. Reference was made to paragraph 20 of the Officer report regarding the use of the site as a garden for Chyvounder. It had been concluded, for the reasons outlined in paragraph 20, that a certificate of lawfulness was not required in this instance;
4. Officers were of the view that the grant of planning consent to develop the application site would not set a precedent for further development. Any applications in the future would need to be determined in accordance with their merits at such time.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. Reference was made to the dwellings on land to the east of the B3276; three of the dwellings had been in existence for a number of years, and included in the development envelope under the Restormel Plan; the fourth dwelling had been granted consent more recently due to the site being an established garden;
2. It was commented that the application site was open countryside, on the edge of a settlement;
3. Concern was expressed regarding the loss of a large section of hedgerow and ecology impact arising from the removal;
4. The site was located close to a busy junction for the Bedruthan Hotel and Trenance Estate;
5. The site could adversely impact a pedestrian footpath;
6. Concern that this could be a creeping form of development on the northern side of the B3276 in the open countryside;
7. The proposal would harm the character of the area;

8. The views of the Parish Council should be supported and the application refused.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Fitter, seconded by Councillor Bunney, and on a unanimous vote, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA21/05993 be refused.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to refuse the application were that

The application site is in the countryside, separated from the nearby settlement by the B3276. The proposed introduction of a new home onto the application site, by reasons of its access (with associated loss of hedgerow), character and inevitable massing, would harm the distinctive character and beauty of the site and surrounding area. In the absence of special circumstances to justify a new home in this rural location, the application is not sustainable development and is contrary to policies 2, 3, 7, 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan and paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTED THAT at the conclusion of the above item Councillor Crabtree left the meeting.

PA20/09930: MR & MRS HARRINGTON - THE COTTAGE, TREVARRIAN, NEWQUAY, CORNWALL, TR8 4AH

(Agenda No. 5.7)

CPL/59

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) outlined the application, including the showing of plans and photographs to the Committee and summarised the key issues.

The Development Management Group Leader (GS) recommended that Application No. PA20/09930 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Nick Plant (Objector) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. The speaker responded to questions put to him by the Committee.

Councillor Corbett of Mawgan in Pydar Parish Council attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke against the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Simon Longworth-Riggs (Agent) attended the meeting, was permitted to speak and spoke in support of the application. There were no questions of the speaker.

Councillor Wills (Electoral Division Member) was unable to attend the meeting. A statement was read to the Committee on his behalf in objection to the application.

Following the presentations, Officers responded to Members' questions regarding:-

1. Officers acknowledged that judgement needs to be made regarding neighbouring impact; however, it was concluded that the application was acceptable.

A full and detailed debate ensued, the main points of which were noted as follows:-

1. Concern that this was cramped form of development which would adversely impact the neighbouring property;
2. The proposal would overshadow and have an overbearing impact on the neighbour; the health and age of the occupant of the neighbouring house should be a material planning consideration;
3. The proposal was contrary to Policy 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan and should be refused.

Arising from consideration of the report and debate it was moved by Councillor Fitter, seconded by Councillor Arthur, and on a unanimous vote, it was:-

RESOLVED that Application No. PA20/09930 be refused.

The reasons given by the Proposer for wishing to refuse the application were that

The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its siting, massing and scale, would introduce harmful overbearing impacts to the occupier(s) of the

neighbouring dwelling Goose Cottage. The application is, therefore, contrary to Policy 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan.

ITEM FOR INFORMATION - APPEALS REPORT

(Agenda No. 6)

CPL/60

The information relating to Appeals was noted.

The meeting ended at 2.44 pm.

Although the minutes, once agreed and signed, are the formal record of the meeting, a video recording of the meeting can be viewed at the following link:

Link 1:

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_NGU4MWUyMDQtN2I2ZS00NjZILWFmN2MtYWI1YjA1ZmQ5ZWQw%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%22efaa16aa-d1de-4d58-ba2e-2833fdfdd29f%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22d02a65f9-d5f1-409c-bbb4-3d67c0546be6%22%2c%22IsBroadcastMeeting%22%3atrue%7d&btype=a&role=a

Link 2:

https://teams.microsoft.com/l/meetup-join/19%3ameeting_MzQ1MWRjYzctYmM2MC00NjU3LTkzMWQtNWZjMjA0ZjI3NjYx%40thread.v2/0?context=%7b%22Tid%22%3a%22efaa16aa-d1de-4d58-ba2e-2833fdfdd29f%22%2c%22Oid%22%3a%22d02a65f9-d5f1-409c-bbb4-3d67c0546be6%22%2c%22IsBroadcastMeeting%22%3atrue%7d&btype=a&role=a