

Ponsanooth Parish Council

CLERK. Mary Gosling. 3 Cliff Terrace, Portreath, TR16 4LE.

Tel 07907842937 email ponsanoothpc@gmail.com

Website: ponsanoothparishcouncil.co.uk

Parish Meeting Minutes 26th September 2022

Ponsanooth Parish Council held an extraordinary Parish meeting of the Council at Ponsanooth Hall, on 26th September at 7pm and there were Present: Chairman Cllr M Ferris, Cllr D Willcocks, Cllr C Daly, Cllr D Udy, Cllr M Beckett, Cllr L Jackson, Cllr I Robson, Cllr S Carlyon, Cornwall Cllr P Williams, 2 representatives from Verto (developer), Councillors M Wilkinson and K West from Mabe Parish Council three members of the public and (note taker) Mrs. A Pentecost.

		Action
226/22	The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
227/22	Declarations of interest – none	
228/22	There were no apologies	
229/22	It was decided that public participation would take place after a presentation from the developers	
230/22	<p>Presentation from developer – Verto Homes – regarding planning application Planning Penvose Student Village PA21/04825 Proposal Reserved matters application for appearance, landscaping, layout and scale following Outline Approval PA16/11983 dated 26.09.2018 for proposed development of a student village, new highway access, landscaping and associated infrastructure. Location Land At Penvose Farm Roskrow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline planning consent already granted for up to 2K student bed spaces, reserved matters now being re-submitted • After comments had been picked up, alterations had been made to the ecological standards and bus routing • Entrance – add additional tree planting to soften visual impact. • Bus service – existing layby to be used originally, now amended, a bus loop in off the layby which would add 2 minutes and 47 seconds to journey • Additional planting – rotation of football pitch and tennis courts so hedgerow can be retained. • Buildings – move away from woodland buffer and hedgerow, ponds to create wetland habitat, gravity fed by run off/rain, creating a 36% gain in habitat provision • 5m hedgerow buffer – CC satisfied that was ok • Southern area – removed bus using layby so don't need a secondary access. Now shared cycle/foot way. 400m road therefore being removed from scheme. <p>MW – footpath/cycle – how will that react with existing business? V - Path will go around that and run alongside the layby. DU – S278 documentation does not mention it V – Highways are in the ownership of CC which the 2016 document makes clear and it is for CC to provide the details MW – how much S106 funding? V – 1.6m which was index linked so not a fixed sum MW – that figure set on the cost of the building work as it was in 2016? V- yes, that is why it is index linked MW – concerned that there will not be safe access for pedestrians and cyclists and that the S106 funding will not be sufficient V – not yet in a position to know that CD – footway – students will be expected to use the main road, do you mean that they will be using the footway and what was the width V – yes, width approx. 4.75m CD – know that CC don't need planning permission for it, is there sufficient Highways width to achieve that V – a matter for Highways CD – on the S278 documentation it shows partial streetlights and it is proposed to bring the speed down to 40mph, but only for part of it, the rest would still be 60mph, would it all become 40? V – lighting limited to that shown, that is in the remit of CC although common sense would say it should be all the way CD – in light of the index linking to the S106 agreement, would a new S106 be required?</p>	

Ponsanooth Parish Council

	<p>V – normally it just runs across, wouldn't want to renege on that</p> <p>CD – would like to think that you could offer a contribution for our parish as a crossing had already been provided but not from S106 funds</p> <p>V – if changes like the crossing which are already paid for, then could add something else instead</p> <p>KW – the Highways and Community infrastructure works has very little detail and does not appear to be the same document that you are referring to. You will appreciate that it makes it very difficult for us when we don't have the same information.</p> <p>MB – when student accommodation is built, who owns it?</p> <p>V – could be sold/leased, there are various options</p> <p>MB – what are they basing the occupancy requirement on?</p> <p>V – identified need for over 2900 bed spaces, that was the need calculated at the beginning Building on Local Plan evidence on need. If you think the numbers are wrong it would be a matter for CC. Covid/Brexit had an impact, university are expecting between 6.5K and 8.5K students. The university mission statement says to increase numbers</p> <p>KW - that is not what the university is saying, moving towards more online courses</p> <p>V – we sit in meetings with them and get told X and Y</p> <p>MB – what happens if the units are not sold?</p> <p>V – it will be done in stages, could be stopped or revised. The S106 has trigger points throughout and you can only deliver X number of units before you have to deliver other things such as football pitches</p> <p>PW – have you had a recent meeting with the university?</p> <p>V – we have had about 6 over the last two years</p> <p>PW – are you aware that they don't support this application?</p> <p>V – not what we have been told, it provides options for students, the university accommodation team struggle with offering a range of options</p> <p>PW – do you intend to employ Cormac to build the new roundabout?</p> <p>V – can't answer that. It is our intention to construct in full, everything that triggers in S106 has to be fully operational before it sets that trigger</p> <p>DU – how many car movements will there be per day?</p> <p>V – based on 340 spaces, can't give you the numbers .A zero carbon student village will encourage people not to bring cars – have been instructed to bring the number down to 340.</p> <p>SC – students will dump their cars wherever, all over Penryn already</p> <p>V – additional spaces will help to solve that</p> <p>SC – the layby will be full of cars</p> <p>V – it might involve a change in the S106 to include a Traffic Regulation Order</p> <p>CD – is the car number including the park and change?</p> <p>V – 370 would include park and change and other car parking next to it, like hotel parking</p> <p>DU – students live on site for the first year, then have to go out?</p> <p>V – no, it is multi year accommodation, no more than 30% occupancy by 1st year students</p> <p>DU – how many businesses?</p> <p>V – 25 but depends on the business and how many units they need</p> <p>DU – then there would be a lot more cars, will the bus be free?</p> <p>V – S106 requires the bus service to be subsidised</p> <p>DU – what happens if the university doesn't want the accommodation?</p> <p>V - - there are other organisations</p> <p>DU – but it must be student accommodation?</p> <p>MW – when we met on line at a meeting called by CC, we discussed alternative uses for the site,</p> <p>What would you support?</p> <p>V - CC wrote to us and we said that we have no intention of flipping the site</p> <p>MW – can you not go back to CC to address the concerns</p> <p>V - don't think CC has the finances for it</p> <p>MW – the S106 agreement could be amended to “Concerns about student's across the site”, you</p> <p>could get the cycling and footpath in before proceeding further</p> <p>V - You can make representations to Peter Bainbridge and express your concerns to him</p> <p>MW – make site safe and functioning before the rest starts</p> <p>V - there will be certain things they say are not within their remit</p> <p>MW – my biggest concern is that we do not overlook peoples' safety, I am not prepared to have that on my head</p>	
--	--	--

Ponsanooth Parish Council

	<p>V - cannot force CC to do anything, you are the voice of your parish/town council. I am happy to attend a meeting</p> <p>MW - electric charging points – need to be near accommodation so can be used by disabled</p> <p>DU – how big will the roundabout be?</p> <p>V - Size etc has been fixed by CC and approved in full. A number of designs were considered and the roundabout was deemed to be the best option</p> <p>DU - think it will cause a huge tailback in traffic, are there any plans to upgrade the roads?</p> <p>V - That is down to CC and Central Government. A roundabout has been shown to cause the least holdups</p> <p>DU - Where will the sewage go?</p> <p>V - Existing system is deemed to be able to cope</p> <p>KW - application says that it is part of a critical drainage area</p> <p>V - that is ongoing</p> <p>KW - says permission not yet given by SWW for connection to the sewers</p> <p>V - not until development agreed</p> <p>KW - run off at present goes into neighbouring properties, so SWW could say no. What would you do then?</p> <p>V - It is a 6 phased application, we are at phase 5. If recommended for approval then it goes to SWW who have not said whether they have or do not have capacity</p> <p>CD - Has SWW commented on the application?</p> <p>V - Yes, as has the EA</p> <p>DU - Are there any proposals for upgrades?</p> <p>V - Cannot speak for SWW</p> <p>MB - How can you make anything zero carbon?</p> <p>V - Units are operationally zero carbon, also to off set the embodied carbon, has been calculated for a baseline of carbon debt. If we are successful that will be drilled out into assumptions on the amount of carbon and how much in debt</p> <p>CU - Generate own electricity?</p> <p>V - Yes</p> <p>LJ - Police still concerned about the CCTV strategy</p> <p>V - Looking into that now, cannot provide a scheme that is perfect for everyone, a balance had to be struck. Achieve better light throw and protect flight paths for birds and bats.</p> <p>KW - Road Safety Audit was conducted during Covid and at a quiet time of the day. All these reports allow the bits you don't want us to see to be buried in the stuff we don't need to see.</p> <p>V - The Road Safety Audit 2 is to identify such things as street furniture. The safety part was in Audit 1. All road safety audits have to be completely independent as they deal with road safety.</p> <p>MW - The recent tragedy makes it essential that for Mabe and Ponsanooth, we make sure we have done everything we can to make it safe from day one.</p> <p>V - I will contact Peter Bainbridge and see if a meeting can be set up and whether it should include Penryn and Falmouth town councils.</p> <p>MW - Someone from the university to attend as well.</p> <p>It was agreed that the draft response from Ponsanooth re the Penvose application would be sent to Mabe Parish Council before being submitted to Cornwall Council</p>	
231/22	<p>Public participation</p> <p>JT – I am next to the proposed development land, the sports area would be just over the hedge from my caravan site and there would be considerable noise especially at night.. It would destroy the peaceful environment required by my campers and should be sited as far away as possible. The narrowest point is 2m, my land is right alongside. Recent tragedy has made it even more imperative. If I am a student which way will I go, students will use the path</p>	

Ponsanooth Parish Council

	<p>down to the university. Student accommodation – permission was granted in very different circumstances, it should never be used for affordable homes/second homes. We have a right to openness, you have spend millions on this development and yet everything seems to be down to CC. Treliever Lane can't be used as there are too many cars parked there. The proposed walkway down the lane will not have enough room for 2000 students and it will not be lit. There is not enough information regarding drainage, for a lot of the time there is a ford which gets worse every year and is often impassable. Need an assurance that permission will be gained from the land adjoining before making the gap in the hedge. This is some of the best agricultural land in the area</p>	
232/22	<p>Planning Appeal PA21/12144 Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for construction of bungalow and associated works. The Toll House The Barns Lower Treluswell Penryn Cornwall</p> <p>Firstly, in terms of the Neighbourhood Development Plan, within the Appeal Statement it is said that there is nothing which suggests there is an advanced stage of a Plan on our website. The NDP has not yet reached a full draft stage ready for public consultation; we anticipate that to be reached towards the end of this year, and on this basis we would accept that legally the NDP would currently attract at most only limited weight in any decision making. Notwithstanding this the NDP Group have gathered local evidence in preparation of the Plan which we do believe to be relevant, which includes an analysis of housing need, and we have developed a strategy for the location of new housing distribution in the Parish. I have set this out below.</p> <p>The vision for the Plan confirms the main settlement in our Parish is Ponsanooth and nearby community of Cosawes residential park. This area is intended to be the main focus of housing growth during the Plan as well as amenity and service provision.</p> <p>In terms of the locational strategy for new housing in our Parish the Group have resolved to follow the overarching strategy for housing growth that is set out in the Cornwall Local Plan. At our Parish level this means focusing new housing growth in and adjacent to the main settlement of Ponsanooth, and outside Ponsanooth new housing would be restricted and only considered potentially acceptable on windfall sites, brownfield sites or previously developed land, or those that meet the CLP Policy 7 criteria (not repeated here).</p> <p>The necessity to identify a settlement is therefore both a Cornwall Local Plan and Ponsanooth Parish Council objective. This is relevant to prevent otherwise unplanned housing in the countryside which would give rise to unsustainable forms of development.</p> <p>In terms of housing need, our NDP evidence confirms that there is an unmet need for housing in our Parish, particularly for single bedroom sized accommodation, and therefore it is important that new housing is provided in the right place and to meet this need in a way which can support the facilities in the main settlement of Ponsanooth.</p> <p>It is accepted that Lower Treluswell has a spatial form to it, however at best this is considered to be a 'low density straggle', to use the vocabulary in the Cornwall Local Plan. Historically there has been very little new housing here, and any housing since the post war period has tended to be located at or around the historic buildings of the Brewery, Smithy and the Barns at Lower Treluswell Farm, some of which have been converted as windfall sites and which have all long since changed from their original use. What is very relevant though is that there are no community services or public amenities, nor any cohesive 'core' in Lower Treluswell that you would associate with a settlement. In terms of transport links there are no bus stops on the B3292 (notwithstanding the map used by the appellant as a site visit would clearly show there are no bus stops</p>	

Ponsanooth Parish Council

	<p>here) meaning public transport access to Penryn or Ponsanooth is very difficult or not possible at all. The nearest grocery shop is a small forecourt shop at the 'Fourcross' petrol filling station which is nearly half a mile away and requires crossing the busy B3292. The key functional and social characteristics that make a settlement are not exhibited here. For these reasons the Group does not consider Lower Treluswell to comprise a settlement.</p> <p>The appellant's Statement on infilling and rounding off has been considered however it does not alter our findings. It is clear from an examination of the location plan of the appeal site that the house in the far corner of what appears to be garden type area would incrementally extend development further away from Lower Treluswell and into the countryside. While there is an argument that the garden area could be considered 'previously developed land', which does lend some potential policy support for new housing, this should not infer that that whole curtilage of the garden is suitable for development, and in the appeal scheme is not functionally part of Lower Treluswell. The urbanising impacts caused by the formation of a driveway along the garden edge, as well as the loss of parts of an existing mature hedge to provide an access from the public highway would be unacceptable and further exacerbate the expand expansion into the countryside. We feel the appeal site has a clearer affinity to the countryside than the built environment.</p> <p>It is for these reasons that the Parish Council maintains its objection and requests that the appeal be dismissed.</p> <p>Cllr C Daly gave the above draft response, it was proposed by Cllr M Ferris, seconded by M Beckett, and agreed that this should be the response submitted re the appeal with the parish council maintaining its objection.</p>	
233/22	Cllr Peter Williams asked if he should continue with the planting at Treluswell and this was agreed.	
234/22	It was agreed that the draft response from Ponsanooth re the Penvose application would be sent to Mabe Parish Council before being submitted to Cornwall Council.	

End 9.21pm