



The Chambers, Penryn Street, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2SP

Tel No: 01209-210038 e-mail: admin@redruth-tc.gov.uk

Town Mayor: Cllr Ms D L Reeve

Town Clerk: P B Bennett

See Distribution

Our Reference:
RTC/420/3/Mtg
Date:
19th June 2019

Dear Councillor

Interim Planning Committee Meeting – Monday 24th June 2019

You are summoned to attend an Interim Meeting of the Redruth Town Council Planning Committee to be held in the Council Chamber, 1st Floor, The Chambers, Penryn Street on Monday 24th June 2019, commencing at **18:30**.

The Agenda and associated papers are enclosed for your reference and information.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'PB', with a horizontal line drawn through it.

Peter Bennett
Town Clerk

Enclosure:

1. Agenda and associated documentation

Distribution:

Cllr Mrs A Biscoe
Cllr H Biscoe
Cllr M Brown
Cllr Mrs B Ellenbroek
Cllr Ms L Eyre
Cllr Ms C Page
Cllr Ms D Reeve
Cllr J Tregunna

For Information:

All other Councillors
Cornwall Council Members
Press & Public

Redruth Town Council
Interim Planning Committee Meeting – 24th June 2019

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence.
2. Members to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or non-registerable interests (including details thereof) in respect of any item(s) on this Agenda.
3. *To suspend Standing Orders to allow the public to speak*
4. To allow the public to put questions to the Council
5. *To reinstate Standing Orders*
6. To consider planning applications [see schedule attached]
7. To receive correspondence:
 - 7.1 The Planning Inspectorate – Appeal Decision APP/D0840/W/19/3224493, Land at Ten Acre Farm, Wheal Montague, North Country TR16 4AD

REDRUTH TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

SUBMISSIONS FOR: Monday 24th June 2019

LIST 1 (FOR APPROVAL EN-BLOC)

Ser No	Planning App No (All PA19/ unless otherwise stated)	Details	Reply
1	04869	85 Fore Street Proposed change of use from bank to bakery/café/takeaway For WC Rowe (Falmouth) Ltd	Recommended for Approval
2	04870	85 Fore Street Advertising consent to new shop front and signage For WC Rowe (Falmouth) Ltd	Recommended for Approval
3	04300	Greenacre Farm Produce, 8 Cardrew Industrial Estate, Cardrew Way Proposed demolition of existing building and erection of new building for use as a warehouse incorporating an existing building used as a mess room, office, kitchen and toilets For Messrs H C and R E Curtis, Greenacre Farm Produce	Recommended for Approval

LIST 2

Ser No	Planning App No (All PA19/ unless otherwise stated)	Details	Reply
4	04091 (Cllr Ms Reeve)	<p>Land North of Wheal Peevor, Sinns Common</p> <p>Change of use of land for dog daycare facilities and the erection of an associated storage/shelter/accommodation building</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For Ms Kirsty Stevenson Trethel, Mount Carbis Road</p>	
5	11707 (PA18) (Cllr Page)	<p>Replacement of existing house with one pair of semi detached properties</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For Mr T Robinson</p>	
6	04444 (Cllr Biscoe)	<p>Land to the North of Drump Road</p> <p>The proposals are for the development of 52 no. homes of varying sizes/types. 9 no. dwellings are housed with an apartment block. 100% of which will be secured as affordable homes, delivered on a 50/50 split between shared ownership and affordable rent. Creation of access roads, car parking areas and landscaped public open space</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For Cornwall Council</p>	
7	04805 (Cllr Brown)	<p>Dumblederry Orchard, Mount Ambrose</p> <p>Reserved matter in relation to decision PA18/10551 dated 20/12/18 in regards to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For Spry & Rogers, JSR Developments Cornwall Ltd</p>	
8	04700 (Cllr Tregunna)	<p>Tolgus Vean Farmhouse, Tolgus</p> <p>Change of use from a two storey workshop to a three bedroom residential dwelling</p> <p style="text-align: center;">For Mr and Mrs Menear</p>	



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2019

by **Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/19/3224493

Land at Ten Acre Farm, Wheal Montague, North Country TR16 4AD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Elliss against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA18/09568, dated 9 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single dwellinghouse and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved, and I assessed the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide a suitable location for housing, having regard to local and national planning policy.

Reasons

4. Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies Document 2010 – 2030 (Local Plan) supports proportionate growth adjoining or within settlements subject to the settlement having acceptable access to services in the area, and the site meeting one of a number of specific criteria. This includes the infilling of a small gap in an otherwise continuous built frontage which does not physically extend a settlement into the open countryside, the rounding off of settlement or the development of previously developed land.
5. The appeal site is part of an enclosed field to the east of a small group of dwellings at Wheal Montague. Although the Avers Interchange is nearby to the east, undeveloped land is directly to the south, east and beyond the highway to the north. I also observed on my visit that open land to the west separates the site from the garden of Wheal Montague Cottage, where planning permission was granted for a new dwelling in 2018¹.
6. For these reasons, regardless of whether or not the nearby grouping of dwellings at Wheal Montague constitutes a definable settlement, the site is not within it nor does it immediately adjoin it. In addition, despite the proximity of the site to North Country, they are clearly separated by intervening open areas of countryside. As such, the site does not meet the criteria given within Policy 3.

¹ PA17/11157

7. Instead, the site is an integral component of the area's field network. The proposal therefore falls for consideration under Local Plan Policy 7, which seeks to protect the open countryside from inappropriate development and only supports new housing under certain special circumstances. There is no evidence that any of these circumstances would be met by the proposal.
8. Policy 21 of the CLP encourages the reuse of Previously Developed Land (PDL) and the appellant considers the site to fall within this definition. Despite its verdant appearance, there are remnants of buildings within the site and a photograph shows a blockwork structure. However, the buildings could have been used for agriculture, which is expressly excluded from the definition of PDL². As such, there is no substantive evidence before me upon which to conclude that the site is PDL.
9. With regard to its accessibility, I note the proximity of the site to the services available within Redruth and North Country. Although the track adjacent to the site has no refuge for pedestrians, it is lightly trafficked. The pavement on the main road would soon be reached, at which point it would provide a safe and achievable journey to bus stops and the various services nearby. I am therefore satisfied that the site would provide adequate access to services.
10. In terms of character and appearance, the site is well screened from the main road within an area of urban fringe close to the A30 and Redruth³. Despite this, it has an overtly rural, open character which is appreciable when viewed from the highway to the north. Although I acknowledge that the appellant's clearance of the site may have provided visual enhancement, it is fundamentally its undeveloped appearance which defines its positive contribution to its environment. Given the circumstances, its development would constitute a harmful incursion of built form into the countryside.
11. I have been provided with details of approvals in the area. Unlike this appeal, the scheme approved under reference PA17/11157 is located within PDL, albeit recently developed. With regard to the sites at Molly Park and the Hive, I note that they are closer to North Country and more directly integrated into the comparatively urbanised environment around the Avers Interchange. As such, these schemes are materially different to the appeal and have had limited weight in my assessment.
12. I therefore find that the proposed development would not provide a suitable location for housing, having regard to local planning policy. It would not accord with Policies 1, 3, 7 and 21 of the CLP (2017) which, amongst other things, promote sustainable development and only permit new homes in the countryside where there are special circumstances. As the site could not in my view be described as fully isolated, I have found no conflict with paragraph 79 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

13. The absence of flood risk and any objection from consultees with regard to the public rights of way network are neutral factors in my assessment. I also note the unanimous support of the Parish Council, but this does challenge the conflict I have found with the development plan.

² Page 70, National Planning Policy Framework

³ Within the Local Plan defined urban area of Camborne, Pool, Illogan and Redruth (CPIR)

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The Framework seeks to increase the supply of housing and the proposal would contribute to meeting the housing target identified within the Local Plan. However, a single house would provide a modest benefit in this regard. Although the location is adequately accessible to employment and services, development of the site would erode the rural quality of the area. I therefore find that the benefits of the proposal would be outweighed by the environmental harm and the conflict with the development plan that I have identified.
15. Taking all matters into account, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh the conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones

INSPECTOR