

# Mabe Parish Council

C/o The Parish Office, MS Electrical, The Square, Mawnan Smith, Cornwall TR11 5EP

## Minutes of the meeting of Mabe Parish Council held on Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2018 at the Mabe WI Hall, at 7.30pm

**Present:** Parish Councillors P Tisdale(chair), C Cole, J Frost, T Kingsley, K Phillips, R Phillips, T Tindle & M Wilkinson. L Clements (Parish Clerk) & 23+ members of the public

251.18 **Safety Procedures** – the chairman noted this

252.18 **Apologies for absence** - Cllr Thomas

253.18 **Declarations of interest in Agenda Items** – none noted

254.18 **Planning Applications - Public participation relating to each application will be allowed prior to that application being discussed by members. The time allowed for each application will be at the discretion of the Chair.**

Public discussion on both the applications for Century House and Land off Antron Way were received at length, prior to the council going into closed session to make its deliberations.

a **PA18/03098 Century House 28 Parkengue Penryn TR10 9EP**  
**Demolition of existing buildings and erection of mixed use development comprising purpose built student accommodation and flexible working space, health centre, retail space, and associated infrastructure and landscaping.**

Public representations received from Francis Miller; Cllr Wilkinson made a report on the planning application site visit.

Members discussed the application and voted to **object** but would like the following comments included: Whilst we understand that this site has been included within the draft DPD as mixed industrial/residential this document has yet to be ratified and should not be given such weight as if adopted. This development would remove much needed industrial capacity in the local area, despite the promises of the developers. Residential and Industrial do not mix – the addition of residential units on this site would eventually lead to the curtailment and reduction of industrial works and cut any potential growth, strangling the site for any future industrial use; contrary to the ethos of Policy 1 in the Cornwall Local Plan for sustainable development.

Kernick is, and remains, a working industrial area and needs the space it has available. It is one of the truly industrial parks that we have – many being replaced with “clean businesses” as it appears this development is looking towards since the only current tenants offered new space are a web design company of ex-university students. Other current tenants have expressed concerns that they will not be able to find alternative comparable premises with 2223m<sup>2</sup> of industrial space being lost, contrary to Policy 5 of the Local Plan. Kernow Coatings, directly opposite this development, works 24 hours making paper and security coatings for national and international companies which would no doubt at some future point be the subject of not only noise complaints but complaints based on the chemical smells from these works - actively contrary to Policy 16 on Health & Wellbeing. A residential development on Kernick Industrial Estate is effectively pulling the plug for all manufacturing on the site as it is simply incompatible.

The height of the structure is out of keeping with the surrounding buildings (the highest at present on Kernick being 2.5 stories) and would set a precedent for taller buildings on and around this site, going against Policies 2 & 12 in the Local Plan – significantly higher buildings in this area would provide no aesthetic understanding of the area and impact on the rural character & biodiversity of the surrounding area. Residential homes along Trevance & Treverbryn Rise are in the majority single storey bungalows. The site itself, along with the majority of Kernick Industrial Estate is prone to flooding, being sited at the foot of a natural stream bed which is diverted underground in sections already and is direly under the development site in question. Settling ponds have had to be put in at both B&Q & Asda to try to stop this

– anyone going to B&Q in the wet knows the issue with standing water across their carpark. Historically we are aware that buildings on this site were often built on floats/ pilings to try to ensure sufficient drainage.

Despite promises by the university accommodations management team we do not feel that it would be possible to police student parking on an around the whole of Kernick Estate and foresee problems with cars being parked for access onto the university site from yet another unregulated point as a means to avoid parking charges. It will also encourage pedestrian use through the busy estate where there are already conflicts with heavy goods vehicles, fork –lift trucks and students. The Transport Assessment included with this application states “The proposed development is essentially a new gateway to campus rather than a standalone structure” a problem for us since the application for access to this site via Kernick is only for 4 years as stated on PA17/02645. There is no direct public transport to the proposed site, rather residents will either access bus services through the university campus, which will need an access point. Traffic out onto the small section of feeder road onto the A39 proper is already at /above capacity and regularly grinds to a halt during term-time morning and evenings, simply with the addition of school traffic. This is before the addition of traffic for building works and then the additional ongoing vehicles needed service the accommodations themselves once completed and their residents.

We request that this application is not dealt with under delegated powers and would prefer that it be passed to committee for deliberation.

**Proposed:** Cllr Tisdale **Seconded:** Cllr Cole

**c PA18/04092 Land Off Antron Way Antron Way Mabe TR10 9HS**

**Proposed residential development of 27 dwellings including access, estate roads and landscaping**

Public representations received from Dave Matthews, Heather Luton, Francis Miller, Danny Tomms, Keith West, Russell Winn, Paul ? & Tim Marsh; Cllr Wilkinson made a report on the planning application site visit.

Members discussed the application and voted to **object** but would like the following comments included: *Firstly we would like it noted that the previous (withdrawn) application PA16/04068 made in November 2017 along with all of the public comments (80+ almost all objecting to the development) has been removed from the Cornwall Council planning portal well within the 1 year period stated by them and does not appear to be noted on any history for this site.*

*Mabe Parish Council objects strongly to the proposal due to the following summarised reasons:*

- *No need shown for additional housing – affordable or otherwise.*
- *Not an housing allocation site as listed in the DPD*
- *No visible public consultation*
- *Impact on adjacent quarry & industrial facilities*
- *The development does not constitute infill or rounding off and the development is seen to be in the countryside*
- *Highways issues / visibility / parking - Concerns over services and infrastructure*
- *Mabe is not part of Penryn, it is a distinct rural Parish*

*We are once again dumbfounded by the continued inaccuracies in the conclusions and statements provided by the developer on this application. There has been no consultation with the parish council or parishioners at large – other than through the comments made relating to the previous planning application (withdrawn).*

*Carnsew Quarry is definitely not disused – it is an extremely active quarry and is one of the few in the region still supplying hand cut granite as can be seen by the recent publicity with regards to the St Piran’s Statue both within county and nationally. This area comes under the Minerals Safeguarding Development Plan (Maps A3/B35) and is shown nowhere on the DPD (Site Allocations Plan) and the development itself still falls within the designated blasting zone of the quarry. The assumption that the quarry would allow*

*access through its site (where regular blasting takes place) as well as the impact this would have on the industrial businesses situated within its environs already is beyond comprehension and would create unnecessary Health & Safety implications for the operators.*

*Current affordable housing numbers provided directly by Cornwall Council show the predominant need by & for residents listing Mabe as a primary connection is for 1 and 2 bed properties none of which has been factored into the makeup of this development in the slightest (total need for Mabe parish 38: 1 bed = 16; 2 bed = 16). Given the issues with finding local, affordable tenants for the recent Kingston Way development it is extremely unlikely the majority Band D & E local residents would get a look into houses within this new development in any instance.*

*This development would also place more housing on the opposite side of the village from all services (shops, school, community centre). Other community infrastructure is already stretched – the primary school alone is already working at 107% of capacity. We do not need to increase the size of the parish through unrestrained large development within the village environs – this development would constitute almost a 4% increase in the total housing stocks of the PARISH. This surely goes against the ethos of the NPPF (2018 consultation) paragraph 49 (Sustainability) any therefore also conflicts directly with Policies 1, 2, 3, 6, 8 and 9 of the Local Plan, as well as paragraphs 79-80 (rural housing) of the NPPF – there would be no environmental gain from this development; there is no evidence of an economic need for housing in this location and the accessibility to local services when you cannot get across the main road safely is definitely limited! Section 8 of the NPPF, paragraphs 92-96, only support our stance on the suitability of this development. Given that the parish has already absorbed a large development of 90 dwellings less than 5 years ago the local parish need for homes has surely been met and any further increase in housing stocks without accompanying employment sites is simply unsustainable.*

*The parish council would not consider this a development to warrant its support as an exclusion site as it fulfils none of the criteria this would require (referencing Policy 9 of the Local Plan).*

*Mabe is already suffering with traffic problems which would be exacerbated with any additional development – especially one leading out to the confusing and dangerous ‘lozenge’ junction between Church Road and Antron Hill. Recent data shows that traffic numbers for an 8 day period in December 2017 at 21,468 journeys on the road up through the village to Longdowns and 21,699 down to Asda – the rough calculations then show a potential for another 100+ per day at least simply from homeowners in this development – before factoring in all associated delivery/supply services. The Mabe bus route is down to single figures per day through the village, with the bus stop being on the opposite side of the worst traffic problems we have from this proposed development, with no provision for any means to mitigate this within the proposals (going against Policy 27 of the Local Plan & Paragraphs 103 & 105 of the NPPF).*

*The plans for this development show no actual proposal for financial contributions, rather they give an unconsulted and vague list of “envisaged ... Section 106 Terms” for educational provision; open space provision; and, as they stand, would give no enhancement to the village or parish in any way – the MYCP is already receiving close to £100,000 in S106 monies for play provision upgrades and is only a small venue with limited needs. Mabe is not part of the Fal & Helford Special Area of Conservation and we do not see why a development with Mabe should finance recreation within this area.*

*In conclusion this development is neither deemed necessary or required by the Parish Council and, as can be seen by the number of objections lodged by the parishioners of Mabe on the planning website (81 as of 12.6.18) they also feel the same way.*

*We request that this application is not dealt with under delegated powers and would prefer that it be passed to committee for deliberation.*

**Proposed:** Cllr Cole **Seconded:** Cllr K Phillips

It was agreed that the clerk & chair meet to confirm the comments to be made on the planning portal on Wednesday next week to ensure all comments for this , and PA18/03098, include references to the NPPF & Cornwall Local Plan as well as covering all points raised by the public .

**b PA18/04059 Land To The Rear Of The New Inn Church Road Mabe TR10 9HN  
Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) in respect of PA14/09321 dated 10.02.15 - residential development (2 new dwellings) on land to the rear of The New Inn, Mabe Burnthouse**

Members discussed the application and voted to support and would like the following comments included:

*However we would like to see a condition removing permitted development rights on the now attached garage on Plot 2 from any possibility of change of use to residential. We are concerned that with the change of layout there is the possibility that the garage may be converted to a livable area adjacent to the kitchen and parking may be moved into "spare" space on the plot.*

**Proposed:** Cllr K Phillips **Seconded:** Cllr Kingsley

**d PA18/04438 Lower Spargo Farm Rose Valley Mabe Burnthouse TR10 9JF  
Engineering operations to facilitate the construction of a sand school and the levelling and regrading of the land**

(Cllr Wilkinson & Tindle left the meeting)

Members discussed the application and voted to object and would like the following comments included:

*Although this application stats to be for "engineering operations" there appears to be no documentation provided to show what these are. Works to the site are visible from across the reservoir yet do not appear to have any engineering backup. We have concerns on the lack of pilings or reinforcement used to sure up the large amount of material used to make up/level the site and how a slip would affect both the site itself, the land below it and the reservoir.*

*There is concern about the "fill" used in the leveling of this site, given it appears to have been unspecified waste from other areas including building demolition waste and that fact that it extends well beyond the site proposed for the sand school. There has been no report on contaminated waste provided at any stage of this development, a necessity surely given the proximity to Argal Reservoir and the NVZ & Critical Drainage Zone status it holds.*

*We have serious concerns about the processing of waste & foul water already being produced from the works on this site, as can be referenced on enforcement complaint EN17/01999 from January this year when a large discharge of contaminated orange water was made into Argal Reservoir.*

*We would ask that a full engineering specification and a contaminated land report be requested before any consideration be given to this application.*

**Proposed:** Cllr Tisdale **Seconded:** Cllr Cole

(Cllr Wilkinson & Tindle returned the meeting)

Meeting finished at 9.15pm

Note: change in recording format is due to the size of comments being made.