**LANREATH PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of an Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting held 24th August 2021

Commencing 19.30

**Present:** Mr P Seaman – Chair, Mrs E Lee, Mr J Williams, Mr A J Gundry, Mr D Heard, Miss J Tamblyn, Mr P Bartram, Mrs R Warren (Clerk)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting and outlined the order of business according to the Agenda

1. **Apologies –** none
2. **Members of the public** – none
3. **Interests to disclose** - none
4. **Planning PA21/06062 Woodlay Farm Road from Tremabe Lane to Polpover, Herodsfoot, PL4 4RB – Proposed replacement dwelling and garage**

Chairman outlined for the meeting the application proposal for the demolition of a 1930s bungalow and three car garage, and the construction of a two storey dwelling with a garage with parking for two vehicles.

For the assistance of the meeting Chairman projected onto a screen and went through in some detail Cornwall Council Local Plan policy 7 - guidance for consideration of such applications. The policy stated that the proposed replacement property should be “broadly comparable” with the existing buildings, and no harm done to the location (with specific reference to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or Great Landscape Value). The Policy guidance made it clear that the size, and scale of the proposed replacement dwelling should be taken into account, but that “broadly comparable” was not to be narrowly interpreted.

As for the Lanreath Neighbourhood Plan, policies H2(i) – (iv), EH1, and EE1(c) are all applicable, and the proposed development would seem to be within the parameters. In the view of the Chairman in some aspects it positively contributes to the stated aims of the local plan, with particular reference to a low carbon footprint.

Next the Chairman took the meeting through the planning documentation, commencing with detail of what is currently on site, including an aerial photo, site plan showing building footprints, and elevations. The plans for the new buildings detailed a substantial two storey green oak framed three bedroom house, and a 1.5 storey garage with car port for two vehicles, external stair case, and upper floor area. A separate report identified five trees that it was proposed to remove, all leylandii over 10 years old, and an environmental report raised concern regarding a roost found on the site for a pipistrel bat – but this had been addressed in the application and it was proposed that there should be a bat box in the garage.

The proposed developer had also submitted a detailed report, some of which did not appear to refer to this application, and may have been cut and pasted from another document, but it provided information on the construction method, and levels of insulation. There will be a ground source heat pump, and foul water will go to a septic tank – although the developer’s report refers to a new water treatment plant, but this was not in the application for this site.

In all the proposed development is stated to have a footprint some 30% larger than the existing dwelling. The Chairman has noted that there is a discrepancy between the block plan and the floor plans in that the block plan appears to show that the new dwelling and garage will not exactly fit in the place of the existing footprint, but the floor plans show that it does. This needs to be brought to the attention of the planning officer.

Each document was gone through in detail, and councillors made comments and asked questions regarding the roof height, which will be 1.5m approximately higher than the existing dwelling, whether the 30% increase figure was a misrepresentation of how much larger this new dwelling would be in terms of living area, how the property would look from the road (some found the western elevation unappealing), whether the garage roof height was desirable, or necessary as it may lend itself to living space in the future, and if the existing hedge would sufficiently screen the buildings.

The Councillors were canvased in turn for their views, and Mr P Bartram felt that the proposed new buildings were far larger than the existing dwelling, and not therefore “broadly comparable” with the what was being replaced.

On taking a vote, by a majority of 6 to 1, it was decided to submit consultees comments as follows:

“In principal Lanreath Parish Council supports the application however the Councillors have concerns regarding the height impact of the garage, and call for the planning officer to address the discrepancy between the site plans submitted, clarity is required as to the proposed position of the replacement dwelling and garage. Lanreath Parish Council support the proposal that the applicant/developer will work with Natural England to protect the environment of the site.”

1. **Any Other business** - Clerk to put on the next agenda details of replacement signs for the village toilets.
2. **Public Participation -** none

Chairman thanked everyone for attending.

The meeting closed at 20.30