

Planning Comments received for application PA21/07080

Received via email 25/08/2021

Please be informed that I OBJECT to this planning application in the strongest possible terms.

It is totally out of keeping with the rest of the buildings in the hamlet of Westdowns which are almost exclusively domestic and which have not been added to by any significant amount for decades. It is adjacent to the border with a designated AONB. The fields in which the proposed development will be built has been left in a wild state for many years and has become a habitat for many species of flora and fauna. There is an existing footpath across the field which has already been re-routed from its designated course. This may well result in even further disruption. There is very poor visibility when exiting from the proposed access position onto the highway. Only a short distance from the access point is a junction with the B3314, being the main road between Tintagel and Polzeath which is very busy during the holiday season. Additional traffic exiting from this junction will make it even more unsafe than it already is.

About 5 years ago a planning application for two dwellings on this land was refused by Cornwall Council and I can't see that the reasons given at that time should be any different now as detailed below:

1 The proposed development would, as a result of the lack of any physical feature on the southern site boundary which would act as a barrier to further growth, represent an undesirable extension and intrusion of the settlement into the countryside, eroding the setting of Westdowns, and as a consequence of the prominent site location, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore represents an unsustainable form of development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 - 2030 and Sections 6, 7 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

2 The proposal will result in a material increase in vehicle movements over the B3314/Westdowns (U6136) junction (to the northwest of the site) which is substandard in terms of width and visibility. In the absence of information to demonstrate otherwise, a safe and suitable access to the development has not been demonstrated and the application is contrary to Policy 27 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 and paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

I would reiterate that I OBJECT to this application

From



Received via email 25/08/2021

To whom it may concern,

I would like to object to the above planning application on west downs based on the following concerns:

- Loss of light or overshadowing
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Visual amenity
- Adequacy of parking/loading/turning
- Highway safety
- Traffic generation
- Noise and disturbance resulting from use
- Hazardous materials
- Smells
- Loss of trees, hedges and bushes
- Effect on conservation
- Layout and density of building
- Design, appearance and material
- Road access
- Nature conservation, destruction of wildlife in that area close to AONB
- Agricultural land used for non agricultural use

I understand it will be on the parish council agenda in September.

Many thanks

██████

Received via email 26/08/2021

Hi,

I hope you can help me.

I am concerned about the below planning application to build a mixed residential/ work facility to the land south of Moorland View in West Downs. I believe it is going to be on the agenda for the Parish meeting in September. If not I would like it to be. I object to this application the following grounds:

- 1.They are planning to build, in what I see, as open countryside.
- 2.From looking at Right Move, I feel there are plenty of industrial units available for rental or sale within 10 miles of the proposed development
- 3.I feel if planning is granted for this, then it leaves the door open to infill, again in open countryside, to the north of the proposed site in the triangle of land behind Moorland View and West Downs House.
- 4.This is a very fast road, putting in another driveway, which will be heavily used, could well lead to an accident.

I look forward to hearing from you

██████████

Received via email 27/08/2021

We are residents of Westdowns.

We wish to bring your attention to the strong local feeling of the residents of Westdowns that a current proposed planning application for a new work/live development in Westdowns (PA21/07080) should not proceed.

We request that you use your good offices as a Parish Councillor on Delabole Parish Council to raise our objections (which are both detailed below and logged as comments-objections on the proposed planning application) and have this planning proposal rejected.

Kind Regards

████████████████████

████████████████████

We have a number of comments to make with respect to the above planning application. The comments below directly relate to comments / claims made by the applicants.

1) Land utilisation

The applicants claim the land is underutilised. This is a direct consequence of the current landowners not utilising the land and leaving it to become derelict in the hope of developing / selling the land for housing as demonstrated by their previous application (PA17/07462). The current site condition does not represent the previously developed land, with historic aerial photography dating back to 2001 (Google Earth Images), indicative of the land being used for agricultural purposes as a small grazing paddock.

2) Rounding Off

The applicants claim that the development of this land meets the criteria of

"Rounding Off" development. Cornwall Council Chief planning officer's advice note "Infill/Rounding Off" clearly states that "*Suitable sites are likely to be surrounded on at least two sides by existing built development*" This proposal clearly does not meet this criteria.

3) Infill schemes

Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan states that "*Infill schemes that fill a small gap in an otherwise continuous built frontage and do not physically extend the settlement into the open countryside*". Though an argument can be made that this proposal is an extension of the frontage along the eastern boundary, it fails on the other boundaries, is not small and extends the clearly delineated boundaries of the hamlet to the south.

4) Reduction in overall use of private transport

Though this proposal might reduce the applicants use of private transport to see his clients, it is likely that the clients of Keystone Consultants will increase their travel to the proposed new premises. This will also increase the number of vehicles turning from the B3314 on to the B3267 which is currently a busy junction with stationary traffic on both roads waiting to pass the junction. This proposal at the best will have a minor impact on private transport, but a detrimental impact to road safety at the junction of B3314 to the B3267.

5) Efficient operation and expansion of two existing businesses.

The applicant states that this development seeks to fulfil their business and residential needs. The applicant's current property (West Winds, St Minver) is a substantial dwelling on a spacious location of roughly equivalent area as the proposed new dwelling at Westdowns. The applicants are also not constrained by planning to develop that location as shown by a recent application (approved) for an extension at West Winds (PA19/05313). Therefore, the proposed location at Westdowns will not provide the benefits/advantages as outlined in their application and their existing premises could provide the live/work premises required.

6) Extension of Westdowns Hamlet


The proposed development would further extend the built form of the settlement into the open countryside. On the basis of the application submitted, it is contended that the proposed development would visually extend built residential form into the open countryside, that would erode the rural setting of the hamlet and the character and appearance of the area, where the site is very prominent in the street scene due to the topography and the limited boundary treatments to the wider parcel of land.

Conclusion

1. The proposal does not meet the requirements for a development under the "Rounding Off" or "Infill" criteria as detailed in Cornwall Council Chief planning officer's advice note "Infill/Rounding Off".

2. The arguments for live/work and development of their businesses and a permanent family home are not substantiated since their existing property is suitable for such development.
3. The land is derelict by the choice of the landowners.
4. This proposal will extend the footprint and characteristics of the hamlet of Westdowns as documented previously by Cornwall Council in the Planning proposal rejection, Delegated Officer report of 4/8/17 (PA17/07462).

We therefore believe that this planning application should be rejected


We have a number of comments to make with respect to the above planning application. The comments below directly relate to comments / claims made by the applicants.

1) Installation of a septic tank and soak away.

This would be within the River Camel SAC which currently has a temporary moratorium on development due to issues with phosphate eutrophication in the River Camel.

British Standard 6297:2007 states that the requirements for a septic tank soak away:-

10 metres from buildings:

this would preclude the use of land outside the River Camel SAC since it would be too close to the proposed building and would necessitate the use of land within the River Camel SAC. Operation of a commercial laundry above and beyond a domestic premises will increase the phosphate load into the River Camel SAC.

Ground water at least 1.5m below the surface:

no evidence has been given that this condition has been met, local indication (from a well) indicate that in winter, ground water could be higher than 1.5m below ground level.

Percolation test:

no data has been presented to demonstrate that the site is suitable for a septic tank soak away particularly with the proposed flow of 1.4m³/day. Though the argument could be made that there are other soak aways in the neighbouring properties these were all installed (in 80s) prior to 2007 British Standard requirements but none would have this discharge volume.

Further, British Standard 6297:2007 states that septic tank soak away are to be used for domestic wastewater only, and therefore it would not be suitable for a commercial laundry.

The installation and use of a septic tank and soak away in the River Camel SAC needs a clear environmental justification and also a site-specific design taking into consideration ground water levels throughout the year and also the percolation properties of the underlying strata. As none of this has been presented, the application should be rejected.

2) Visual impact

The proposed development has a frontal length on the B3267 of greater than 30

metres which is double the frontage of the next largest property (Workshop) and triple the frontage of any of the other residential properties on the road at Westdowns. Therefore, the proposed development is completely out of character for the hamlet of Westdowns and would cause a significant visual impact and change the characteristics of the hamlet.

3) Commercial laundry

The application does not provide any details of the proposed commercial laundry activities i.e. amount of washing, chemicals to be used, operating times, amount of extra traffic generated, process for handling and treating of commercial effluent etc. An environmental impact assessment of the commercial laundry activities is not included in the application. On these grounds the application should be rejected.

4) Second home

As the applicants already have significant premises in St Minver where there have been no restrictions on development as demonstrated by planning application PA19/05313 (agreed) it is believed that this is a second home development and should be rejected on this criterion.

Conclusion

1. The applicant has not proposed a suitable drainage system to meet the requirements of a commercial laundry and domestic premises, particularly with respect to the discharge of phosphate into the River Camel SAC with a known issue of phosphate eutrophication.
2. The size of the development (frontage) will have a significant visual impact which is much greater than existing properties (by a factor of 2 to 3). This would therefore significantly change the characteristics of the hamlet.
3. No details have been provided on the proposed commercial laundry.
4. We believe that this is an application for a second home.

We believe that this planning application should be rejected.

26/08/2021 via email

I object to this application based on the following

- 1) septic tank and soak away within the river camel SAC
- 2) increase of traffic in what is already a busy area
- 3) visual impact
- 4) a second home
- 5) destruction of habitat for species of floral and fauna
- 6) land utilisation, originally used as agricultural land but the current owners have allowed it to get into this state
- 7) rounding off and in fill schemes, clearly does not fulfil these