

**Minutes of an Extraordinary meeting of Landulph Parish Council Virtual Meeting
held on Monday 22nd February 2021 at 7.30pm**

PRESENT: Councillors M. Worth (Chairman), A. Butcher, P. Braund, G. Braund, R. Cradick, M. Dennis, M Holmes.

Also present: Cornwall Councillor Sam Tamlin (who is standing as a candidate for the Cornwall Saltash-Trematon-Landulph division in the forthcoming election); Clerk to the Council.

Public Forum

151-20 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE – Cllr Jesse Foot.

152-20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA - Cllr M Holmes declared an interest in minute number 154-20 as he is a close neighbour.

“To receive disclosures of personal and prejudicial interests from Councillors on matters to be considered at the meeting. The disclosure must include the nature of the interest. If you become aware, during the course of a meeting, of an interest that has not been disclosed under this item you must immediately disclose it. You may remain in the meeting and take part fully in discussion and voting unless the interest is prejudicial. A personal interest is prejudicial if a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard it as so significant that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest and it relates to a financial or regulatory matter.”

153-20 DISPENSATIONS RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA – none.

In certain circumstances Councillors may be granted a dispensation which enables them to take part in Council business where this would otherwise be prohibited because they have a Disclosable or Non Registerable Pecuniary Interest. Provided Councillors act within the terms of their dispensation there is deemed to be no breach of the Code of Conduct of the law.

Section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011 states that dispensations may allow the Councillor:

- a. to participate, or participate further, in any discussion of the matter at the meeting(s); and/or
- b. to participate in any vote, or further vote, taken on the matter at the meeting(s).

If a dispensation is granted, the Councillor may remain in the room where the meeting considering the business is being held and if the dispensation allows may also vote.

No dispensations were received.

Cllr M Holmes left the meeting at this point.

154-20 Planning – to consider planning applications:

Appeal lodged [PA20/02791 | Construction of 29 dwellings \(15 Affordable and 14 Open Market\), Shop & Flat \(A1\) and Associated works | Rosehill Nurseries Landulph Saltash Cornwall PL12 6NF](#)

Cllr Worth referred to the letter received from Cornwall Council, in reference to this planning application, advising the Parish Council this application has now gone to an appeal.

The Parish Council objected to and made a comment on the original planning application PA20/0279, and Parish Councillors were asked to discuss whether they wanted to add to these comments, modify these comments, or withdraw these comments.

Comment Date: Fri 22 May 2020

Landulph Parish Council objects to this application.

There are several inaccuracies in the Design and Access Statement, including the statement that many people in the parish are in agreement with this development ' the Parish Council would dispute this statement. The Parish Council wishes to support affordable housing in the parish, however demand for affordable housing is low, and the scale and number of properties proposed in this development goes against the adopted Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan, which states a maximum number of 5 properties in any one development, and 20 properties over the period of 2018-2030.

Cllr Butcher asked whether it is new agents that have submitted the appeal compared to the original planning application – Cllr Worth advised the agent is Westcountry Land and Developments - Stokes Morgan Planning, from Portishead in Bristol, with an orange logo, so assumes this is a new company. Cllr Butcher said this is what he expected, and they have made a number of statements throughout their appeal which needs challenging for accuracy, but feels that the comments made originally by the Parish Council is still valid. Cllr G Braund said that if the original comment still stands, then we should add extra comments.

It was proposed by Cllr Worth, seconded by Cllr P Braund and it was **RESOLVED** to keep the existing comments, and also add new comments.

Cllr Worth said there is a huge amount of documentation on this, but there is an Executive Summary which summarises the whole appeal (which Cllr Worth read out at this point).

Cllr Butcher advised that Rosehill Nurseries have never been within the Settlement Boundaries of the Village of Cargreen – so 1.2 is incorrect, and this incorrect statement has also been used at a later stage to justify another policy which is also incorrect. The rules regarding the numbers of affordable housing may be correct, but what is incorrect is the landtake for that housing. The developers themselves have admitted that 3 of the houses (5,6,7) don't have sufficient amenity land at the back for gardens etc, and they also state the landtake is below Cornwall Council's recommended limit, in other words, big houses/big gardens, small affordable housing with small sub-standard sized gardens - according to Cornwall Council.

Cllr Butcher also mentioned the Rural Exception Basis – interesting in the Cornwall Council planning documents. Rural Exception can include a stand-alone house – which would have well-water, wind turbine, allotment, almost portable house. One of the important things in this appeal is that the appellants claim to have done a housing needs survey, which they were invited to do by Cornwall Council as they disagreed with Cornwall Council's survey, and the appellant found there were 14 additional people who qualified for affordable housing in the parish. Sadly, as part of the process, those 14 people were contacted and none of them replied to the contact to verify their application. So when they try and use this data, it is rubbish data, and shouldn't be applied to this appeal, and they have used this in several parts of the appeal but it's not valid.

Cllr P Braund said the he agreed with Cllr Butcher – in his comments about the affordable needs survey undertaken by the developer. Cornwall Council asked for these applicants to complete a form and register for affordable housing, but none of them did. Part of the evidence that the developer is using is the survey based on a Facebook survey, and this doesn't seem to be a credible evidence for a need for affordable housing in the parish.

Cllr G Braund agreed with these comments about the housing need survey – at the time we, as a Parish Council, publicised and asked parishioners to come forward, to apply and register for affordable housing,

but no one did. We specifically asked for this to be done, so that we could back up this survey, but no one came forward. Cllr G Braund also agrees that a Facebook survey is not credible evidence.

Cllr Worth reiterated that, as a Parish Council, we have publicised on Landulph Innit and the Parish Council website, to encourage people to register using the correct procedure. Cllr G Braund stated that we did this as a result of this planning application. Cllr P Braund stated that surely the developer should be basing their appeal on the numbers that are recorded with Cornwall Council, which is the formal record to be used.

Cllr Cradick agrees with the previous comments.

Cllr Dennis commented that this isn't suitable for a rural exception site, as the scale of the development and the low housing need. Local Plan Policy 9 requires the development to be an appropriate scale proportionate to the local housing need. Regarding the AONB, which is designated in the national interest (not just for Cornwall or this village), and unless there is over-riding justification for a major development in an AONB, then it shouldn't happen.

Cllr Worth recalls a figure showing that 29 properties is a 12% addition to the parish.

Cllr Dennis this which would lead to a greater urbanisation and a massing of scale.

Cllr Dennis also commented that this development doesn't comply with the Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Cllr Butcher commented in the case for the appellant in 3.12 it states the proposal would not constitute a major development, and yet in the questionnaire tick box they've ticked to say it is not a major development.

Cllr Worth explained that the Parish has developed a Climate Change Statement in response to Cornwall Council's Climate Change Emergency, and a group of Councillors and parishioners have come together as the Landulph Parish Climate Action Group, and have prepared a statement to for the Parish Council to consider, as follows:

Since the application was originally reviewed, the Cornwall Emergency Development Plan Document had been developed and would like to draw the inspector's attention to this document with regard to this application. With particular reference to the following:-

Transport: Emissions from private vehicles as no public transport or safe alternative provision.

Building Standards: Minimum building standards with no mention of energy efficiency or heating from heat pumps, air or ground source, no mention of energy generation from solar.

Water Efficiency: No mention of water conservation, black or grey water systems.

Light Pollution: As recommended in Landulph Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Biodiversity - Net gain 10%

See link:

<https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/adopted-plans/development-plan-documents/climate-change-development-plan-document/#:~:text=stage%20of%20consultation,-.What%20is%20the%20document%20all%20about%3F,Council%20and%20everyone%20in%20Cornwall>

Cllr Butcher and Cllr Dennis confirmed this was the document submitted by the LPCAG.

Cllr Worth stated that the deadline for comments to the Planning Inspectorate is 11th March.

Cllr P Braund commented that he felt it would be a good idea to include this, but feels that several of these items would be dealt with in the reserved matters of the planning application, but there's no harm including this in the Parish Council's statement.

Cllr Butcher commented that at section 3.17 there is an aerial view of the village – yet the site has never been part of the village. It also states there are houses to the west – and yet there are only fields to the west. Cllr Butcher stated there are many inaccuracies within the appeal document, that will take considerable time to highlight.

Cllr Worth stated there have been some opposing views, and other factors have been mentioned. For example, Landulph School and Landulph Under Fives are under capacity, and over a period of time we could see a significant change in the educational shape of this parish that could result from the reshaping of 1000 houses at Treledden – and the impacts of where children move to and choose to go, as not all children in our parish live in our parish.

People have also mentioned that the parish has no shop, and it's been pointed out of the success of the St Dominick shop.

Also climate change – encouraging more walking. The pandemic has resulted in a reduction of car use and more walking, so to have a group of houses closer to the school which could encourage more walking. Our current educational establishments are critical to our parish.

Cllr Butcher stated this is interesting – as they have been sending children by bus out from Saltash to Landulph. The infrastructure planning – 500 houses at Carkeel, the school won't be built for a number of years, so Landulph should have additional capacity coming from there.

100 houses development at St Mellion – planners stated this is not appropriate to site such a large development there – transport, private journeys, etc.

Cllr Dennis commented that it is this particular application that the Council is objecting to. With a different application – different number and type of houses, proper storage space, car parking, etc, it may be very acceptable, but this application at this time is not appropriate for the village.

Cllr P Braund expressed concerns about the scale of the development.

Cllr Worth stated the Parish Council has discussed affordable housing for the last year, and the Council wishes to support affordable housing, and here we have a development which provides 15. We haven't seen one built as yet.

It was RESOLVED that the Parish Council would object to the appeal statement, and comment on a considerable number of inaccuracies within the appeal documents. It was also RESOLVED that an additional Extraordinary meeting will be held on Monday 1st March at 7.30pm, for the Parish Council to make a decision on the comments that it wishes to submit.

Councillor Holmes rejoined the meeting at this point.

155-20 COMMUNITY BROADBAND PROPOSAL UPDATE

Cllr Worth provided an update that since last Thursday, the online form went live (compliments and thanks to Clare Tagg for creating this), an extra newsletter was delivered to all parish properties (thanks to the newsletter team for this). We have achieved raising £209,000 already, which is staggering! But we have not yet reached the £270,000 for the 30% uplift. We need everyone who wishes to sign up, to

complete the online form, or send the completed form in the post, by Thursday 4th March, and would appeal to parishioners to discuss with other parishioners (socially distanced) whilst on their walks, and contact a Parish Councillor if anyone has any questions.

Just to clarify that 01579 numbers are not included – only 01752 numbers.

Cllr Cradick asked if you have a voucher and connect up – do you have to change internet provider straight away. Cllr Worth advised that once Openreach has built the system then you can choose your internet provider.

156-20 CHAIRMAN’S URGENT BUSINESS / ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a) Cllr Worth reported that, as a Councillor Advocate for the Devon and Cornwall Police and Crime Commissioner, he’s been invited to the Community Speedwatch meetings on 15th and 16th March, representing parishes.

157-20 Date of Next Meeting: Monday 1st March 2021 at 7.30pm – Extraordinary meeting

Dates for 2021: 15th March, 19th April, 17th May, 21st June, 19th July, 20th September, 18th October, 15th November, 20th December

Meeting closed at 20.35.....Chairman