

**PA23/05369, 13 Burns View Crafhole, 2 New Dwellings.**

**SheviocK Parish Council meeting, Monday the 11<sup>th</sup> of December.**

**Public participation was opened-up for free-flowing questions and discussion, with both the Applicant/Planning advisor, Cornwall Councillor K Ewert, SheviocK Parish Councillors and Members of the Public. The following is a general summary of issues raised by parishioners directly to SPC, or via online submissions to Cornwall Council, together with questions posed to the Applicant/Planning Advisor during Public Participation and their response. Please note this is not verbatim or in specific order.**

**Reasoning for the Size and scale of new housing?** Applicant: *The site is large and could easily accommodate. Matched the size of existing home.*

**20 Public comments had been submitted onto the Parish website in objection to the application.** *The applicant noted that some of the comments have the same objections, as opposed to 20 different objections.*

**To Note Policy 4 Rame NDP General development (Infrastructure and Facilities page 17 please note for the following concerns.**

**Travel Plan Inaccuracies:** *Planning advisor acknowledged that it was outdated in parts, as was written in 2021. Since writing, there has been a loss in services, inclusive of loss of Post Office and cut to bus service.*

*“Not reliant on car.”* Members of the Public and councillors disagreed, as there are no health/public services/supermarket and only a vastly reduced - and at times an unreliable - bus service. The few that do not have a car are either too old to drive anymore, too young to drive or have family/friends who drive them. *Planner advised that there are people who live in Parish without a car, so a car was not essential.*

**Congestion at end of cul-de-sac/lack of room for delivery of materials.** Why had this not been factored in? Planning advisor: *A site works delivery access plan would be required as a condition of planning approval, not prior.*

**Driveway Access/site plan inaccuracies.** *Mr Bateman stated that the site plan must include the land up to the Highway.* Clerk advised that the correct ownership land registry certificate needs to be submitted to show actual ownership of land, as currently the only site plan includes land which is owned by number 12 Burns View. Planning advisor: *stated that this had been rectified with the planning officer/in hand.* Although it was noted that there was no evidence within the online documents on the planning register, at the time of the meeting. Also noted: the northside of driveway/site plan infringes by 1 meter onto land owned by 1 Dawney Terrace.

**Congested location/cul-de-sac/already issue with limited parking.** Mr Redshaw noted that he had previously run a business from the site with up to 60 cars per week visiting his property on site, with no issues. He has since relocated his business. It had been questioned if 2 parking spaces per dwelling would allow for the home owners plus visitors, due to the limited parking available, as a result of building two additional dwellings.

Dr Blackmore, Number 12 Burns View, noted that the current **permissive access agreement** did not account for this change, and he was unhappy with this change/no new agreement reached. *The applicant noted that they would repair any damage.*

**Utilities:** Concern for overload on all utilities. Current issue with old sewerage system in village and current disruption to existing services i.e. electricity. An onsite treatment plant was discussed. Placement of **Bins** on collection day still to be resolved.

**General Concerns: Privacy issues and overlooking of neighbouring properties from balconies/upstairs living. Overshadowing of garden, number 12 Burns View.** The planning advisor stated that the dwellings met planning policies and were the permitted distance.

**Rame NDP Policy 1 Principal residence would need to be applied.** *The planning advisor agreed.*

**Please also note:** Rame NDP Page 14 to note 7.3.1. Refers to high housing prices and low incomes.

**Argument that this does not provide sustainable housing for local people** as the Market Value potential is + £500,000 per home. Argument that this is out of reach of the average wage earnings, which are lower in Cornwall/the Parish. Not alleviating housing crisis. The planning advisor said that: *The development had to be financially viable, also that it would release housing elsewhere /cascade system. Mr Medway stated that it would put a further strain onto Public Services by being purchased by people outside of the county and would not provide housing for local people.*

**Policy 14 Rame NDP point c) states: Sheviok Parish. Housing development will only be permitted in Sheviok where: It is infill development within the existing built-up area of the village of Craithole (fig 10) and where this provides for, or Contributes to, new informal recreational opportunities (e.g. areas of Open Space) including at the site of the proposed play park/Open Space.** *The Planning advisor, advised at the meeting, that no contribution was necessary unless there is a supplementary planning document to advise what the contributions should be. Also that this project would already be contributing via the CIL. This was met with disapproval from the PC. Stating not in the spirit of the Rame NDP.*

## **CONSULTATION/ TIME-FRAME**

**Consultation with Antony Estate required in deeds.** Applicant stated that this has been done and verbally agreed on phone with letter of approval to follow.

**Lack of prior consultation with community/neighbours and short consultation time from receiving letter to deadline to submit comment.** *The applicant had stated that he had supported the Rame NDP when it went through. They had taken time on the design and did not think that it would be an issue as the site fell within the permitted infill development area of the village, see fig 10 Rame NDP. The Applicant was advised not to consult with neighbours/community, as the plans had been deemed considerate and met with planning policies. The planning advisor stated that he did not find it necessary to consult if less than 5 properties. Unfortunately, this has caused severe upset, offence, and anger from many of the 10 neighbouring properties, who feel pressurised/rushed and their concerns not considered/ mitigated or listened to. The applicant has a young family and wants to continue to live peacefully within the community he loves. He apologised for not consulting sooner.*

Cornwall Councillor Kate Ewert said she would call for a site visit with the planning Officer to assess the issues, due to the concerns raised and the number of people that had filed objections with her. This would however delay the time frame/require an extension. *The Applicant agreed and welcomed this site visit. The Planning adviser asked to be invited also. He stated that he had not appreciated the depth of feeling that this had or would cause.* The Vice Chair noted that Communication is key.

**Sheviok Parish Council unanimously objected to this application.** Due to the amount and depth of opposition from parishioners submitted directly to the Parish Council and/or via the Cornwall Planning register.