

TREVERBYN PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING held on December 9th 2025

**Meeting Room, Parish Offices, Rockhill Business Park commencing
at 5:45pm.**

Present: Cllr L Allen (Chairman), Cllr Mrs. A Double, Cllr P Highland, Cllr O Kimber (substitute), Cllr M Luke and Cllr M Shand.

Also in attendance: The Clerk, Mr D Hawken and The Administrator Mrs B Bassett.

Members of the Public: There were seven (7) members of the public present.

Min PM169/25 - Apologies:

There was an apology received from Cllr B Hollis.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the apology and the reason provided.

Proposed: Cllr L Allen, Seconded: Cllr M Shand. All in Favour.

Min PM170/25 - Declaration of Interests:

There were none recorded

Min PM171/25 - Public Participation:

Various members of the seven public members present, made representations regarding planning application PA25/07216. Those that spoke, made several points and raised several matters objecting to the proposals of the aforementioned planning application.

Min PM172/25 - Minutes of Planning Meeting held on the 25th November 2025

The minutes of the said meeting had been published and circulated to all Committee Members in advance of the meeting. They were duly accepted as a true and accurate record.

Proposed by Cllr Mrs. A Double, Seconded by Cllr O Kimber. All in favour.

Min PM173/25 - Planning applications received for consideration

1. **PA25/08700**- Non-Material Amendment to Condition 1 on Decision Notice PA22/02607 dated 25th March 2025 to vary Plots: 38, 58-67, and 88-96. Location: West Carclaze Garden Village, Carluddon, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8XW

The Clerk updated members, that the information requested by the Case Officer Mr P Banks to the applicant, had yet to be forthcoming. The advice received, was to defer again, pending the receipt of the information.

It was **RESOLVED** to **DEFER** consideration of this application.

Proposed: Cllr M Shand, Seconded: Cllr Mrs. A Double. All in Favour.

2. **PA25/07216** - Change of use of land for the siting of 63 holiday caravans to form an extension to an existing holiday park. Location: Manor Park Caravan Park, Resugga Green, Lane, Penwithick, PL26 8YP.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** strongly to application PA25/07216 and requests refusal for the reasons set out below. The proposal represents an unjustified, harmful and policy-conflicting intensification of caravan development in an area already under significant residential, highway, landscape, ecological and environmental pressure.

This objection incorporates relevant planning history, including the closed pre-application PA24/00086/PREAPP, which raised serious concerns that remain unresolved.

1. Conflicts With Residential Park Status and Protected Site Rules.

Manor Park contains permanent residential park homes, recorded on Cornwall Council's Public Register of Protected Site Rules. Introducing 63 new holiday caravans immediately adjacent to, and intertwined with, an established residential park would create an incompatible mixed-use environment, causing:

- 1) Increased noise and movement from short-term holiday occupants
- 2) Risks to security and residential amenity
- 3) Fundamental conflict between park home residents and transient visitors
- 4) Management and enforcement complications under separate holiday vs. residential site licensing regimes.

The applicant has provided no robust site-wide management plan to prevent the units becoming permanent residences, nor any mechanism to protect existing residents from harm.

2. Direct Conflict with Certificate of Lawfulness and Lawful Site Layout.

A Certificate of Lawfulness (PA25/01376) was recently issued confirming the lawful residential layout and use of the linked Manor Park area. Introducing a large-scale holiday extension fundamentally alters this established lawful situation.

The applicant has provided no analysis demonstrating:

- 1) How this proposal aligns with the lawful residential layout
- 2) How the site licensing arrangements would remain valid
- 3) Whether the expansion undermines the fundamentally residential character of parts of Manor Park.

This absence of explanation is a material deficiency.

3. Public Right of Way Affected – No Mitigation Submitted

Official notices confirm that the proposal affects a public right of way (PRoW). The application contains no PRoW protection strategy, no legally compliant diversion design, and no assessment of safety impacts.

The Parish Council objects unless and until:

- 1) A full PRoW impact assessment
- 2) A lawful diversion proposal (if required)
- 3) Mitigation for loss of amenity are submitted, consulted on, and approved.

4. Highways and Traffic – Insufficient and Potentially Dangerous.

Resugga Green Lane and surrounding roads are narrow, constrained, and already pressured.

The addition of 63 caravans, with peak turnover traffic, service vehicles, and visitor movements, will cause:

- 1) Severe congestion
- 2) Unsafe access / egress
- 3) Danger to pedestrians (including PRoW users)
- 4) Overflow parking into residential lanes
- 5) Emergency-vehicle access risks

No Transport Statement of acceptable standard has been provided. This alone renders the application undeterminable and grounds for refusal.

5. Landscape & Visual Harm – No LVIA Provided

The development would substantially alter the local landscape and countryside character.

Despite this, the applicant has not submitted:

- 1) A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA)

- 2) A full planting/screening plan
- 3) Photomontages or zone-of-visibility mapping

Without such evidence, the LPA cannot judge compliance with the Cornwall Local Plan landscape policies. The application is therefore incomplete and harmful

6. Ecology and Drainage – Insufficient Information, High Risk

No proportionate ecology survey, protected species assessment, habitat plan or drainage strategy (SUDS, infiltration tests, attenuation volumes, foul drainage method) has been published.

Given the scale (63 units), this missing information is a fundamental failure, with potential for:

- 1) Increased flood risk to nearby residential properties
- 2) Pollution or hydraulic overload of local drainage systems
- 3) Loss of habitat and protected species disturbance

Such omissions render the application incapable of approval.

7. Enforcement Precedent – Caravan Use Requires Strict Control.

Cornwall Council and the Planning Inspectorate have repeatedly required robust evidence, controls and lawful justification for caravan-related development.

Given the site's mixture of residential and holiday uses, and the known risks of mixed-use conflict, the LPA must be exceptionally cautious. This application provides no enforceable occupancy restrictions, no management plan, and no mitigation.

8. Submission Deficiencies – Not a Valid Basis for Decision.

Across highways, ecology, drainage, PRow, minerals, landscape, licensing, and lawful site use, the application lacks the minimum information needed for proper scrutiny.

The Parish Council considers the submission fundamentally deficient and unable to be lawfully determined without major additional information.

9. PRE-APPLICATION HISTORY (PA24/00086/PREAPP) – Serious Unresolved Issues

9a. Mineral Safeguarding (Policy MS1) – Clear Conflict

The earlier pre-app (PA24/00086/PREAPP), concerning circa 60 caravans on the same former Hallaze Concrete Block Works land, resulted in formal concerns

under mineral safeguarding policy MS1.

The consultee stated that non-mineral development is only permitted where:

- 1) There is no conflict with mineral resources/infrastructure, or
- 2) There is an overriding strategic need, or
- 3) The site is specifically exempt

The applicant has submitted no mineral resource assessment, no viability evidence, and no MS1 justification.

This is a decisive policy conflict and a prime reason for refusal.

9b. Pre-app Did NOT Receive a Positive In-Principle Response

The pre-application was closed without support.

A full application has now been submitted without addressing the concerns raised in pre-app.

For a scheme larger than the pre-app proposal (63 vs. 60 caravans), the lack of follow-up evidence and mitigation is untenable.

9c. Economic Benefit Claims Cannot Override Clear Planning Harm

The applicant previously asserted up to £1m–£1.8m economic benefit, but did not provide:

- 1) methodology
- 2) quantitative impact evidence
- 3) evidence of net gains rather than displacement
- 4) assessment of negative externalities

Economic benefit alone cannot override policy conflict (MS1), harm to residential amenity, highway capacity, drainage safety, and landscape/ecological values

10. Increased Scale (63 Units) Aggravates All Impacts.

Compared with the pre-app's 60 units, the expansion to 63 caravans:

- 1) increases traffic
- 2) intensifies landscape harm
- 3) worsens drainage risks
- 4) magnifies conflict with residential areas
- 5) increases ecological disturbance
- 6) aggravates mineral-safeguarding conflict

No additional mitigation is provided to offset this escalation.

Conclusion – The Parish Council Requests REFUSAL

For the combined reasons above, including material planning harm, policy conflict (especially MS1), unresolved pre-application concerns, lack of evidence, harm to residential amenity, PRow impacts, highway inadequacy,

landscape and ecological risks, and incompatibility with lawful residential use.

Should officers be minded to approve, the Parish Council requests referral to Planning Committee, not delegation, owing to the significant public interest and the complexity of issues involved.

Proposed: Cllr O Kimber, Seconded: Cllr M Luke. All in Favour

**The seven (7) members of the public left the meeting*

3. **PA25/08596** - Retrospective change of use of holiday let to residential accommodation with no operational development. Location: The Longstore, Restineas Cottage, Garker, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8YA

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the planning application.

Proposed: Cllr O Kimber, Seconded: Cllr M Luke. All in Favour.

4. **PA25/08317** - Installation of 3 shepherd's huts for overnight guest use, permeable surfaces, a parking & turning area, secure bicycle storage and recycling/refuse storage. Also intended is minor landscaping of the site, planting of native species trees, hedgerows, shrubbery and meadow grass with wildflowers throughout the site. Location: Land North of Rescorla, Rescorla, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8YT

After much debate and discussion, Cllr Mrs. A Double proposed to support the application, seconded by Cllr O Kimber.

Cllr M Luke tabled an amendment to **OBJECT**, that was seconded by Cllr L Allen. The amendment yielded four (4) votes and thus, the objection was carried, with the following reasons:

1. Inappropriate Development in the Countryside

The proposal introduces three commercial holiday units into an area that is presently rural, undeveloped, and quiet. Shepherd's huts, though modest individually, collectively represent a new tourism accommodation business, which constitutes a material intensification of use on a site not allocated or identified for such development.

Cornwall Local Plan Policies 1, 2 & 7 direct new development to sustainable locations and seek to protect the character of the countryside. The applicant

has not demonstrated an essential, site-specific need for this location, nor that existing tourism accommodation in the area is insufficient.

2. Harm to Local Character and Landscape

The rural character of the area relies on open views, low densities, and minimal artificial lighting. Even small tourism units introduce increased activity, year-round occupancy, lighting, and vehicle movements that will erode tranquillity, especially during evenings and peak visitor times.

Although described as “minor landscaping,” the intentional planting of trees, hedgerows and meadow areas will inevitably urbanise the setting to create screening, altering the established landscape character. Artificial lighting from shepherd’s huts, parking areas and guests will further detract from local dark-sky conditions.

This conflicts with Cornwall Local Plan Policy 23, requiring development to conserve and enhance landscape character.

3. Traffic, Parking & Highway Safety Concerns

The proposal includes a new parking and turning area for guests, which indicates expected vehicle use. There is no evidence that the existing road network can safely accommodate an increase in:

- 1) visitor vehicles arriving and departing
- 2) service vehicles (cleaning, waste collection, linen drops, etc.)
- 3) cyclists using the proposed cycle store

If the access is via narrow rural lanes, any increase in traffic presents safety risks for pedestrians, horse riders, and existing residents. The applicant has not supplied a transport statement or safety assessment to justify how increased vehicle movements will be mitigated.

4. Noise & Disturbance to Neighbours

Short-term holiday accommodation typically results in:

- 1) irregular arrival/departure times
- 2) outdoor socialising late into the night
- 3) increased noise from vehicles, conversations, and outdoor activities

This introduces a level of noise incompatible with the surrounding rural residential character. Such disturbance is entirely different from long-term residential occupation and is likely to affect neighbouring amenity, contrary to Policy 13 (residential amenity protection).

5. Ecology & Environmental Concerns

Although the application references planting and habitat creation, there is no

formal ecological assessment confirming:

- 1) impact on existing species and habitats
- 2) suitability of the site for increased human presence
- 3) potential disturbance to nocturnal wildlife from lighting
- 4) cumulative effects of increased waste, water use, and site activity

Without an Ecology Report, the application fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy 23 and the requirement for measurable biodiversity net gain.

6. Drainage, Waste Management & Utilities

Three tourism units require robust systems for:

- 1) foul drainage
- 2) water supply
- 3) waste and recycling storage
- 4) surface-water management

The application's mention of "permeable surfaces" is insufficient; there is no detail on foul drainage capacity, potential run-off, or local ground conditions. Inadequate drainage design poses risks of pollution or localised flooding, particularly on rural plots without mains infrastructure.

7. Cumulative Tourism Pressure

The area already experiences strong tourism pressures. Adding more visitor accommodation contributes to:

- 1) year-round increases in visitor numbers
- 2) pressure on local services
- 3) loss of countryside character
- 4) housing market distortions (where tourism use displaces residential use)

Cornwall Council has acknowledged concerns about over-tourism in rural areas, and further incremental intensification is not sustainable.

Conclusion

The proposal represents an inappropriate and unjustified commercial tourism use within a quiet rural location, with inadequate information provided to assess impacts on landscape, ecology, drainage, neighbouring amenity, or highway safety.

**Cllr O Kimber left the room as he realised he had an interest in the next planning application*

5. **PA25/01197/PREAPP** - Pre-application advice for proposed single dwellinghouse. Location: Land East of Drummers Lodge Drummers Hill St Austell Cornwall

Although not officially asked as a consultee on this application, the case officer permitted the Parish Council to discuss the application and submit comments.

The following comments were noted:

1. Principle of Development / Countryside Location

The site appears to lie outside the defined settlement boundary and within open countryside. As such, the proposal conflicts with the fundamental principles of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010–2030, particularly Policy 7, which seeks to strictly control new residential development in the countryside unless it meets clearly defined exceptions.

The Parish Council does not consider that a new, open-market dwelling in this location would represent sustainable development or accord with the plan-led approach to housing growth.

2. Settlement Pattern and Ribbon Development

Drummers Hill is characterised by sporadic, low-density development with a clear rural character. The introduction of an additional dwelling on this site would contribute to encroachment into the countryside and risks setting an undesirable precedent for incremental and ribbon development, eroding the distinct separation between settlements and rural land.

Such an outcome would be contrary to the objectives of Local Plan Policy 2 and Policy 7, which seek to manage growth in a planned and cohesive manner.

3. Landscape Character and Visual Impact

The site forms part of the rural landscape on the approach to St Austell and contributes to the open character of the area. The Parish Council is concerned that development would result in:

- i) Loss of openness and rural character
- ii) Harmful visual intrusion, particularly from public vantage points and the highway
- iii) Urbanising features such as access roads, parking, lighting, and domestic curtilage

Insufficient information has been provided at this stage to demonstrate that landscape harm could be adequately mitigated, contrary to Local Plan Policy 23.

4. Highway Safety and Access

Drummers Hill is a narrow rural road with limited visibility in places and existing traffic pressures. The Parish Council is concerned that:

- i) The creation of a new access may result in substandard visibility splays
- ii) Additional vehicular movements would adversely affect highway safety
- iii) The road is poorly suited to increased residential traffic, including construction vehicles

These concerns raise potential conflict with Local Plan Policy 27.

5. Sustainability and Accessibility

The site appears to have limited access to everyday services, employment, education, and public transport. Future occupiers would likely be heavily reliant on private vehicles, which undermines the principles of sustainable development and conflicts with Local Plan Policies 1 and 27.

6. Infrastructure and Drainage

No information has been provided regarding foul drainage, surface water disposal, or capacity of local infrastructure. The Parish Council is concerned about:

- i) Potential reliance on private drainage systems
- ii) Surface water runoff and flood risk, particularly given the rural nature of the site

These matters would require robust evidence to demonstrate compliance with Local Plan Policy 26.

7. Historical Mining Activity and Ground Stability

The Parish Council is aware that the site is within an area of historic mining activity and that there is a recorded mining Adit on or adjacent to the site. This raises significant concerns regarding:

- i) Ground stability and land contamination
- ii) Risks to future occupiers and construction workers
- iii) Long-term structural safety of any dwelling
- iv) Potential impacts on surrounding land and properties

At this pre-application stage, no mining risk assessment, ground investigation, or mitigation strategy has been provided. The Parish Council considers this to be a substantial constraint to development and notes that any future application

would need to be supported by comprehensive and independently verified mining and geotechnical assessments.

Failure to adequately address these matters would be contrary to Local Plan Policy 26, which requires development to be safe, resilient, and not expose people or property to unacceptable risk.

8. Precedent

Approval of a dwelling on this site could create a precedent for further development along Drummers Hill, making it increasingly difficult to resist similar proposals and leading to cumulative harm to the countryside and settlement pattern.

Conclusion

The Parish Council considers that the proposal conflicts with the spatial strategy of the Cornwall Local Plan, would result in unacceptable countryside encroachment, raises unresolved concerns regarding mining legacy and ground stability, and has not been demonstrated to be sustainable, safe, or appropriate in planning terms.

The Council requests that these concerns are fully taken into account in any future submission and that pre-application advice clearly reflects the significant policy constraints affecting the site.

It was **RESOLVED** to submit the aforementioned comments.

Proposed Cllr M Shand, Seconded: Cllr M Luke. All in Favour.

**Cllr O Kimber returned to the room*

Min PM174/25 - Planning Decisions

There was one (1) planning decision from Cornwall Council to note that was published on the accompanying agenda. There were no planning decisions for the Clerk to orally relay.

It was **RESOLVED** to note the planning decision that was stated on the agenda.

Proposed: Cllr Mrs A Double, Seconded: Cllr M Luke. All in Favour

Min PM175/25 - Planning Correspondence

Planning applications for consideration at the next meeting, as at 09.12.25:

- **PA25/08337** - Cabling crossing land at Higher Biscovillack Farm to facilitate the approved Wheal Martyn wind turbine (PA21/07216). Location: Land at Higher Biscovillack Farm, Greensplat, St Austell, Cornwall.
- **PA25/08980** – Detached Garage/Workshop with Gym/Games Room over replacing existing outbuildings. Location: Channel View, Scredda, St Austell, Cornwall.
- **PA25/07633** - Erection of new pavilion for outdoor and group activities. Location: Drummers Lodge Campsite, Drummers Hill, St Austell, PL26 8XR

Other Planning Correspondence

The Clerk relayed to members, Planning Inspectorate outcomes for two planning applications.

1) Land East of Eden Way, Eden Way, Penwithick, PL26 8FA (PA22/02526).
The Planning Inspectorate has *dismissed* the appeal submitted by the applicant.

2) Land North of 75 Treverbyn Road, St Austell, Cornwall PL25 4EW (PA25/00419).
The Planning Inspectorate has *dismissed* the appeal submitted by the applicant.

Min PM176/25 – Any other Planning Business

The Clerk read out recent correspondence received from Mr R. Skinner. It was **RESOLVED** that the Chairman and the Clerk write to Mr R. Skinner. The Committee agreed unanimously that the response would reflect a collective decision of the entire Committee, with agreed points.

Proposed: Cllr Mrs A. Double, Seconded: Cllr O Kimber. All in favour.

Min PM177/25 – Confidential Items

There were no items raised.

There being no further planning business to transact, the Chairman closed the meeting at 6:42pm

..... (Chairman) (Date)