

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of South Hill Parish Council held in the Parish Hall, Golberdon on Tuesday, 23rd August 2018 at 7.30pm.

1.. Present. Cllrs. D Skelton (Chairman), D Smith (Vice Chairman), T Brewer, D Brent, Mrs L Moir, A Budd, J Gale, D Hicks.

Also attending: Mrs J Hoskin (Parish Clerk)
Fourteen members of the public

2. Public Session – to allocated time of 30 minutes for public comments.

Members of the public expressed their views and objection to the planning application PA18/06549 highlighting their history on the site and the changes that had been made.

The Chairman extended the public session until 8.15pm to allow members of the public to address the Council.

3. Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs. Mrs W Trewin, N Easton.

4. Members declarations of Interest on items on the Agenda. None declared at this stage of the meeting.

5. Planning Application:-

PA18/06549 Mrs Helen Darby, land South West of Trevigro Bungalow, Trevigro – retention of agricultural storage barn and provision of hardcore access track.

The Parish Council object to this retrospective application for the following reasons:

The description of the proposal in the planning application states that the new ‘agricultural storage barn’ is smaller than the building that has been replaced. This is not accurate, as the dimensions of the new building have not taken into account the area of the composting toilet which has been added to the floor plans. It also does not state that the new building is in a different location to the shed that it has replaced.

The application also covers the partial hardcore track that has been laid, but it does not mention the new double-fronted, wood-panelled domestic gate that has been installed. This has replaced a metal five-barred farm gate and the entrance has been widened.

The pre-application advice given (PA17/02763/PREAPP) states: “The original wooden replacement was too “chalet-like” and had too great an impact on the land”. The building that the planning application covers is the exact same “chalet-like” building and therefore not an agricultural storage barn. All that has happened is that the chalet has been painted green and the windows have been shuttered.

Section 6 of the application states that no new or altered vehicle access has been proposed. This goes against the application itself as part of the application is for the new hardcore track that has been laid down and as stated previously the gateway has also been altered.

In Section 9 there is confirmation that the ‘Vehicle Access and Hard Standing’ will be made from hardcore, yet in Section 10 there is no proposal for any parking. This would seem to contradict itself. We assume that the members of staff referred to in Section 19 would need somewhere to park. In Section 11 it has been stated that there will be “No Foul Sewage” but as the plans include a composting toilet again this would be contradictory.

Although the field is not in a flood risk area as confirmed in Section 12, it has been seen over the time since the engineering work has been carried out on the site, which has terraced what was a gently sloping field, that the lower, south-west end of the field has been under water on a number of occasions as the previous natural drainage has been disrupted.

The applicant has ticked 'No' to all questions under Section 13, but as no Ecological or Environmental Surveys have been undertaken this cannot be stated categorically. The site is known to have had badgers on it and also any redundant farm buildings, such as the one being replaced is likely to have been a haven for bats and owls, and a possible roosting site. With the amount of engineering work that has already taken place there is bound to have been some environmental impact which should now be assessed retrospectively.

There are a number of trees on the field and in adjacent fields that could potentially affect the viability of the building and without a professional Arboriculture Survey it would be impossible to state that they would not be important to the development as has been said in Section 14

The building will be as part of a 'willow' business, employing two part-time members of staff; as it is being used for agricultural purposes it would need to comply with BS5502, which it does not. There is no reference in the application or supporting documentation of any health and safety checks on site as to the suitability of the building as a place of employment. Following on from this, the site should also have been subject to a Contamination Report, as the previous shed had an asbestos roof that was initially buried on-site and subsequently partially removed. There are no services to the building at present, which would not be conducive to running any part of a business. There is also no business plan and so it has not been made clear how a viable willow business could be run on such a small acreage of land.

Finally, the proposal does not meet the criteria set out in Policy B1: Business Development of the South Hill Neighbourhood Development Plan because no evidence has been submitted to show that it is not possible to convert an existing building or build on a brownfield site.

EN17/0230 The Council agreed to draft a letter to the Chief Executive at Cornwall Council expressing disappointment in the lack of enforcement action being taken at this site in Trevigro and question why enforcement had not continued whilst pending a decision for the planning application for the honeybee farm and this latest application. Copies will also be sent to various Officers and Cornwall Councillors.

6. Date of next Meeting. Tuesday, 18th September 2018.

7. To close the Meeting. There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.04pm

Dated: 18th September 2018

Signed: