



# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

**The Regular Parish Council Meeting to be held on Wednesday 14th April 2025**

*Item 5: Minutes of the previous meeting:*

<https://www.gwennap-pc.gov.uk/2025/04/09/draft-minutes-parish-council-meeting-and-annual-parish-meeting-8th-april-2025/>

*Item 8:*

*email received.*

*Dear Richard and John*

*Firstly may I congratulate you John on another term representing the people of Gwennap Parish. I hope you will both be able to help with an issue that a number of us on the 'top road' here in Frogpool are currently experiencing and are extremely concerned about.*

*Since Perranwell Station implemented a 20mph limit through their village, and the Norway road installed average speed cameras at 30mph, we are experiencing the fall out from that. We have cars using our road as a 'rat run' speeding through our village at all times of day and night. We are concerned that (being so close to the play park) we may see a child, horse rider, dog walker, cyclist or pets injured or killed on this road. It is currently a 30mph but a significant number of motorists ignore this and tear through our village putting anyone using this road at risk, including other motorists.*

*We have always experienced inconsiderate and dangerous drivers on this road, but since the changes to our adjoining village of Perranwell Station, the problem is significantly worse.*

*When I was a Parish Councillor (before becoming Chairman and before Covid, so a good while ago now) we arranged for the Council to monitor the speeds along this stretch of the road. Unfortunately, those sent to install the monitoring equipment didn't really think this through and put the equipment outside my house, where the residents up and down this road negatively affected the average speeds because we all slow to almost a stop to pull into our drives. As a consequence, the Council deemed that the average speeds were within their acceptable tolerances. Since then, the problem is significantly worse, and we feel that there really does need to be some intervention from our Cornwall Councillor and Parish Council to help us keep safe on this road.*

*Please can we request that this issue be formally discussed at the next Parish Council meeting and a plan of action agreed. Ideally a 20mph limit along this road may help in two ways.*

- 1) To deter the rat runners from using this road to speed through avoiding the restrictions in Perranwell Station*
- 2) To help to keep our parishioners, be it walkers, cyclists, horse riders, children, pets and other motorists safer on our village roads.*

*Please can you confirm receipt of this e-mail and confirm that the Parish Council and our Cornwall Councillor will both work together to help resolve this problem before someone loses their life on this road.*

*Many thanks for your help and support*

*Kindest regards*

*#####*



# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

*reply from Cllr John Thomas MBE*

*Hi #####,*

*Many thanks for your kind remarks only to say I will endeavour to fulfil my role as Divisional Member for Lanner, Stithians and Gwennap to the best of my ability, I am and have been working closely with a resident in Church Town, Gwennap to install a 20mph zone in this small hamlet which at present is 40mph which is a ridiculous speed limit for such narrow and winding roads, I have put that scheme on my list whilst discussing the matter and talking to Chief Highways officers, I have studied the area that you have raised generally and could see possible hotspots for concern, I previously raised the deletion of as you put it "Top Road" from the original 20mph Rollout Programme complaining that exactly what is happening now was inevitable given motorists perception of making up time on their journeys, I am more than happy to push for this area to be included in any future Speed Limit Reduction throughout our villages. Hope this helps allay any concerns that the location in question raised by yourself will not be considered in future, highways safety is paramount in all situations, why should "Top Road " be any different.*

*Kind regards*

*John T*

*Cornwall Councillor John Thomas MBE*

# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

## Item 14: Planning applications

### Planning Appeal:

PA24/01611 - Construction of dwelling - Land at Little Beside, St Day - Appeal Dismissed.

### Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025 by S Harrington MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/24/3352910 Land At Little Beside, St Day TR16 5PZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
- The appeal is made by Mr Terry Evans against the decision of Cornwall Council.
- The application Ref is PA24/01611.
- The development proposed is erection of a single dwelling.

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. Planning Practice Guidance advises that permission in principle is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or 'permission in principle' stage) (PIP) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle, and the second ('technical details consent' stage) (TDC) is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these 2 stages.

3. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent TDC application if PIP is granted.

4. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. The main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of this change and no parties will have been prejudiced by my having regard to the latest version in reaching my decision.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use, and the amount of development.

### Reasons

6. The appeal site is a field near to St.Day and Crofthandy, however it is located outside of any development boundaries as outlined within the Gwennap Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2030 (NP).

7. The appeal site is also within the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS) and within the Cornwall Character Area CCA15: Carnon Valley (CCA) and exhibits a number of the described CCA characteristics of the area. These include a post-medieval mixed farming landscape, with features

of the mining industry strongly influencing the areas rural landscape character with semi-natural habitats.

# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

8. The local settlement strategy is set out within policies 2 and 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (LP). The strategy seeks to maintain the dispersed development pattern of Cornwall, and provide housing based on the role and function of each place. In locations outside of main towns such as the appeal site, LP Policy 3 provides that housing growth is to be delivered through, amongst other criteria, rounding off of settlements.

9. LP Para 1.68 defines rounding off as "development on land that is substantially enclosed, but outside of the urban form of a settlement" and "it should not visually extend building into the open countryside". LP para 2.33 states that 'open countryside is defined as the area outside of the physical boundaries of existing settlements (where they have a clear form and shape)'.

10. Although there is built form in the locality of the appeal site, due to its sporadic nature and low density, it lacks a clear settlement form or shape and is not seen as being part of the settlement form of St Day or Crofthandy. Rather, given the separation distance and spatial relationship of the appeal site to the nearby development, it is seen as part of the surrounding historic countryside landscape, clear views of which are appreciated from the adjacent highway.

11. Furthermore, I observed that Crofthandy contains minimal services or facilities required for day to day living. Whilst St Day and public transport links are in feasible walking distance, future occupiers would be required to walk partly along a highway with no pavements or street lighting and cross the B3298 which I observed to be a relatively busy highway. As such, walking from the site, particularly in the dark, would be unattractive to most future occupiers. Consequently, I find that future occupiers would be likely to rely on the use of private vehicles to access services and facilities that are reasonably required for day-to-day living.

12. In terms of the WHS, the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025 (WHSMP) describes the WHS as a series of ten areas comprising the distinctive patterns of buildings, monuments and sites which together form the coherent series of distinctive cultural landscapes created by the industrialisation of hard-rock mining processes in the period 1700 to 1914.

13. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) outlines that the remains of mines, engine houses, smallholdings, ports, harbours, canals, railways, tramroads, and industries allied to mining, along with new towns and villages reflect an extended period of industrial expansion and prolific innovation. Mining settlements and social infrastructure is identified as one of seven attributes through which the OUV of the WHS is expressed.

14. The appeal site lies within the Gwennap Mining District, which is one of the principal mining districts of Cornwall. The WHS Office have outlined that the appeal site is located within a former rural-industrial landscape which combined metalliferous mining and subsistence farming in close proximity. The route of the former Poldice Plateway is located in close proximity, and the former Wheal Unity adjoining to the north. Furthermore, the WHS Office state that historic mapping indicates that the site and adjacent land comprised smallholding plots, although dividing boundaries have since been lost. Nevertheless, I observed that the surrounding area contains numerous remnant elements of its mining past, and the appeal site, whilst not exhibiting above ground remnants, is seen as an intrinsic part of the relict landscape.

15. The proposal would be seen with a backdrop of nearby residential built form from certain viewpoints from the adjacent highway. However, it would nonetheless introduce an additional domestic structure and paraphernalia into a site, which are visually divorced from the defined settlement form and shape of St. Day or Crofthandy.

16. The proposal would result in a noticeable change in character of the appeal site and further proliferation of residential development into the rural historic landscape. Whilst the impact would be minimal relative to the overall extent of the WHS, it would nevertheless result in a reduction in the positive contribution that the appeal site makes as part of the historic landscape.

17. As a result, there would be some harm to the OUV of the WHS. In view of the localised impact of the proposal, this harm would be less than substantial. Whilst less than substantial, the Framework sets out great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and notes that less than substantial harm should be weighed against any public benefits associated with the development.

18. The dwelling would contribute towards the areas housing supply. There would also be short term economic benefit due to employment during construction, and an ongoing benefit from future occupants supporting local businesses and services. However, due to the modest scope and scale of the proposal, these benefits in combination attract only modest weight and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the WHS.

19. Planning permissions PA21/10662 and PA19/06179 have been brought to my attention. Whilst limited information has been provided to allow me to clearly ascertain any material similarities, extracts from the officer report indicates that the first site benefits from a continuous pedestrian footway to St Day, whilst it is stated that the second site was situated in a cluster of cottages and commercial and

# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

industrial buildings. As such the spatial relationship and contexts of these other permissions differ from the appeal site before me.

20. For the above reasons, I conclude that the site is not suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use, and the amount of development. The proposal would conflict with LP policies 1, 2, 3, 7, 12, 21, 23 and 24, NP policies H2, H3, H4, GQD1, GQD2 and LL4, and Policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023. These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development does not harm the character of the countryside; promotes sustainable patterns of development and locate development so that the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised; and to ensure that proposals respond to and are demonstrably informed by the historic landscape character and avoid harm to the authenticity and integrity of the OUV of the WHS. The proposal would also conflict with Policy C9 of the WHSMP, which seeks to maintain the historic character and distinctiveness of the WHS.

## Other Matters

21. The Council are unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply of deliverable housing sites and have stated that their supply is circa 3.8 years. Where the development plan is considered to be out of date for the policies most relevant to the determination, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework requires that presumption in favour of sustainable development is applied unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. For the purposes of paragraph 11 of the Framework, the WHS is an asset of particular importance as denoted by footnote 7.

22. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the WHS, and the application of the policies in Section 16 of the Framework provide a strong reason for refusing the proposed development. Consequently, the provisions of paragraph 11d(ii) of the Framework are not engaged in this instance.

23. Nevertheless, the proposal's benefits include the provision of a new dwelling to the housing supply, short term economic benefits due to employment during construction, and an ongoing benefit from future occupants supporting local businesses, services, and the community. Notwithstanding, given the scale of the development, I find the benefits would be modest.

24. The appeal site is within the zone of influence of the Penhale Dunes Special Area of Conservation (PDSAC) and the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation (FHSAC) (the SACs). Designated features of the PDSAC include shifting dunes along the shoreline with *Ammophila Arenaria*, dunes with *Salix repens* ssp. *argentea*, humid dune slacks, fixed dunes with herbaceous vegetation, *Rumex rupestris*, *Gentianella anglica* and *Petalophyllum ralfsii*.

25. Designated features of the FHSAC include saltmarsh, intertidal mudflats, subtidal sandbanks, large shallow inlets and bays, estuaries and reefs. Within the vicinity of the SACs, new residential development would lead to increased levels of recreational activity. This would be likely to have a significant effect on the designated features of the habitats sites either on its own or cumulatively with other similar development, without avoidance measures.

26. The application had been accompanied by an undertaking under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 with an associated financial contribution to seek to mitigate recreational impact of the proposal on the SACs. Notwithstanding, Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 indicates the requirement for an Appropriate Assessment is only necessary where the competent authority is minded to give consent for the proposal.

27. Given my conclusions on the main issue above, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter any further as the proposal would not take place and would not affect the SACs. Moreover, even if I were to find that suitable mitigation had been appropriately secured, a lack of harm would only be a neutral factor.

## Conclusion

28. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations, individually or cumulatively, indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Harrington INSPECTOR



# **GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK**



# GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK

Appeal Notification PA24/06261 Britannia Farm, Sunny Corner

Gwennap Parish Council  
Gwennap Parish Rooms  
Richard Jory Playing Field  
Pulla Cross  
Truro  
TR4 8SA

Your ref:	
My ref:	PA24/06261
Date:	7 May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

## Town and Country Planning (Appeals) (Written Representations Procedure) (England) Regulations 2009

I am writing to let you know that an appeal has been made to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in respect of the following planning application:

MHCLG ref:	<b>APP/D0840/W/25/3362394</b>
Cornwall Council ref:	<b>PA24/06261</b>
Appeal start date:	<b>1 May 2025</b>
Proposal:	<b>Demolition of agricultural building and erection of residential annexe, retention and completion of parking area, domestic shed, change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden land and associated works</b>
Location:	<b>Britannia Farm Sunny Corner Cusgarne Truro Cornwall</b>
Appellant:	<b>Mr Chris Philips</b>
Cornwall Council decision:	<b>REFUSED</b>

The appeal is to be decided on the basis of an exchange of written statements by the parties and a site visit by an Inspector.

You may view the documents relating to this case online at <http://planning.cornwall.gov.uk/online-applications> or at the Council offices during normal working hours.

We have forwarded all the representations made to us on the application to the Planning Inspectorate and the appellant (unless they are expressly confidential). These will be considered by the Inspector when determining the appeal.

**If you wish to make further comments, or modify/withdraw your previous representation, you can do so online using the Planning Inspectorate website at: <https://acp.planninginspectorate.gov.uk>.**

**If you do not have access to the internet, you can email your comments to: The Planning Inspectorate, Ms Sarah Hardy, Room 3M Kite Wing, Temple**

Screenshot



# **GWENNAP PARISH COUNCIL AGENDA PACK**

*Appx.1*  
*Payments*

*Appx.2*  
*Bank Rec*