

Treverbyn Parish Council

Planning Committee Meeting

Tuesday 9th June 2026, 7.00pm

Meeting Room, Parish Offices, Rockhill Business Park, Higher Bugle

Present: Cllr L Allen (Chair), Cllr P Highland, Cllr Mrs J Killacky, Cllr O Kimber and Cllr M Shand.

Also in attendance: The Clerk Mr D Hawken, Administrator Mrs B Bassett and Cornwall Councillor J Hanlon

Members of the Public: Twenty (20) present.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and let members of the public know that they would be allowed to speak for up to 3 minutes under public participation.

Min PM75/26 - Apologies:

Apologies received from Cllr Mrs. A Double and Cllr M Luke.

It was **RESOLVED** to accept the apologies and the reasons given.

Proposed: Cllr M Shand, Seconded: Cllr P Highland. All in Favour.

Min PM76/26 - Declaration of Interests:

There were none recorded.

Min PM77/26 - Public Participation:

Members of the public present, were in attendance to speak planning about applications PA26/03518 and PA26/03519. Several concerns were raised, which included matters appertaining to access, amenities, flooding and drainage, road safety, archaeological remains and intrusion of the countryside.

Min PM78/26 - Minutes of Planning Meeting held on the 26th May 2026

The minutes of the said meeting had been published and circulated to all Committee Members in advance of the meeting. One amendment to be made under apologies and then they were duly accepted as a true and accurate record.

Proposed: Cllr O Kimber, Seconded: Cllr M Shand. All in favour.

Min PM79/26 - Planning applications received for consideration

1. [**PA26/03519**](#) - Permission in Principle for proposed demolition of the existing buildings and the erection of up to 5 dwellings (minimum of 4, maximum 5). Location: Silvertrees, Rescorla, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8YT.

Members **RESOLVED** to strongly **OBJECT** for the following reasons:

The application site comprises agricultural land located outside the established settlement boundary and clearly defined built form of Rescorla. The proposal does not constitute infill development, does not represent a logical rounding-off of the settlement, and cannot be regarded as previously developed land. Rather, it would introduce new residential development into an area of open countryside, resulting in an unjustified extension of the built form beyond its current limits.

Members consider that the proposal is contrary to the spatial strategy of the Cornwall Local Plan, in particular Policies 1, 3 and 21, which seek to direct development to sustainable locations and protect the countryside from inappropriate and unsustainable forms of development. The site does not form a natural or logical continuation of the existing settlement pattern and would instead represent sporadic residential encroachment into the rural landscape.

The Parish Council places considerable weight on the planning history of the site. Members note that application PA21/03743, which sought consent for a single dwelling on this land, was refused by Cornwall Council in 2021. In reaching that decision, the Local Planning Authority concluded that the site lay outside the clearly defined built form of Rescorla, did not represent infill or rounding off, and did not fall within the definition of previously developed land. The refusal further concluded that the proposal would visually extend the built form into the open countryside, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the rural setting.

The Parish Council considers that the conclusions reached under application PA21/03743 remain directly relevant and highly material to the determination of the current application. The site remains unchanged in its relationship to the settlement, its rural character, and its position beyond the established built form of Rescorla. No material change in planning policy, site circumstances, or other planning considerations has been identified that would justify departing

from the conclusions previously reached by the Local Planning Authority.

Indeed, the current proposal seeks once again to establish the principle of residential development on land that has already been found unsuitable for such development. The proposal would perpetuate the same policy conflicts identified under application PA21/03743, namely the unjustified extension of built development into the countryside, the erosion of the rural character and appearance of the area, and development that falls outside the accepted forms of infill or rounding off supported by the Cornwall Local Plan.

Members are particularly concerned that permitting residential development on this site would undermine the objectives of the development plan by weakening the established extent of the settlement and creating pressure for further incremental development in the surrounding countryside. Such expansion would cumulatively erode the rural character of the area, diminish the openness of the landscape, and set an undesirable precedent for further development beyond the existing built form of Rescorla.

The Parish Council also notes concerns regarding the suitability of the existing access to accommodate additional residential development. Whilst detailed highway matters would be considered at a subsequent stage, members consider the existing access to be constrained and substandard and question whether it is capable of safely serving additional residential traffic without detriment to highway safety.

Furthermore, the site comprises agricultural land, and the Parish Council does not consider that residential development represents the most appropriate or sustainable use of the land in this rural location. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land whilst delivering development in a location that is poorly related to the settlement pattern and contrary to the aims and objectives of the development plan.

As this is an application for Planning in Principle, the principal consideration is whether residential development on this site is acceptable in policy terms. For the reasons outlined above, and having particular regard to the previous refusal under application PA21/03743 and the continuing conflict with Policies 1, 3 and 21 of the Cornwall Local Plan, the Parish Council considers that the principle of residential development has not been justified and remains wholly unacceptable.

The Chair asked Cornwall Councillor J Hanlon if he wished to comment – No.

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

1. [PA26/03518](#) - Permission in Principle for the proposed erection of up to 4 dwellings (minimum 3, maximum 4). Location: Land South East of 1 Rescorla, Rescorla, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8YT.

Members **RESOLVED** to strongly **OBJECT** for the following reasons:

The application site comprises agricultural land located outside the established settlement boundary and clearly defined built form of Rescorla. The proposal does not constitute infill development, does not represent a logical rounding-off of the settlement, and cannot be regarded as previously developed land. Rather, it would introduce new residential development into an area of open countryside, resulting in an unjustified extension of the built form beyond its current limits.

Members consider that the proposal is contrary to the spatial strategy of the Cornwall Local Plan, in particular Policies 1, 3 and 21, which seek to direct development to sustainable locations and protect the countryside from inappropriate and unsustainable forms of development. The site does not form a natural or logical continuation of the existing settlement pattern and would instead represent sporadic residential encroachment into the rural landscape.

The Parish Council places considerable weight on the planning history of the adjacent neighbouring site. Members note that application PA21/03743, which sought consent for a single dwelling on this land, was refused by Cornwall Council in 2021. In reaching that decision, the Local Planning Authority concluded that the site lay outside the clearly defined built form of Rescorla, did not represent infill or rounding off, and did not fall within the definition of previously developed land. The refusal further concluded that the proposal would visually extend the built form into the open countryside, resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the rural setting.

The Parish Council considers that the conclusions reached under application PA21/03743 remain directly relevant and highly material to the determination of the current neighbouring application. The site remains unchanged in its

relationship to the settlement, its rural character, and its position beyond the established built form of Rescorla. No material change in planning policy, site circumstances, or other planning considerations has been identified that would justify departing from the conclusions previously reached by the Local Planning Authority.

Indeed, the current proposal seeks once again to establish the principle of residential development on land that has already been found unsuitable for such development. The proposal would perpetuate the same policy conflicts identified under application PA21/03743, namely the unjustified extension of built development into the countryside, the erosion of the rural character and appearance of the area, and development that falls outside the accepted forms of infill or rounding off supported by the Cornwall Local Plan.

Members are particularly concerned that permitting residential development on this site would undermine the objectives of the development plan by weakening the established extent of the settlement and creating pressure for further incremental development in the surrounding countryside. Such piecemeal expansion would cumulatively erode the rural character of the area, diminish the openness of the landscape, and set an undesirable precedent for further development beyond the existing built form of Rescorla.

Furthermore, whilst the application seeks Planning in Principle for between three and four dwellings, the Parish Council considers that even the minimum number of three dwellings would represent an excessive and inappropriate form of development in this location. The upper limit of four dwellings would exacerbate the harm identified and would constitute clear overdevelopment of the site in question, resulting in a form and intensity of development that would be wholly out of keeping with the rural character of the area. The proposed scale of development would further reinforce the urbanising effect of the scheme and increase its visual intrusion into the open countryside.

The Parish Council also notes concerns regarding the suitability of the existing access to accommodate additional residential development. Whilst detailed highway matters would be considered at a subsequent stage, members consider the existing access to be constrained and substandard and question whether it is capable of safely serving additional residential traffic without

detriment to highway safety.

Furthermore, the site comprises agricultural land, and the Parish Council does not consider that residential development represents the most appropriate or sustainable use of the land in this rural location. The proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land whilst delivering development in a location that is poorly related to the settlement pattern and contrary to the aims and objectives of the development plan.

As this is an application for Planning in Principle, the principal consideration is whether residential development on this site is acceptable in policy terms. The Parish Council considers that neither the location nor the scale of development proposed is acceptable. For the reasons outlined above, and having particular regard to the previous refusal under the neighbouring application PA21/03743 and the continuing conflict with Policies 1, 3 and 21 of the Cornwall Local Plan, the Parish Council considers that the principle of residential development has not been justified and remains wholly unacceptable.

Proposed: Cllr O Kimber, Seconded: Cllr Mrs J Killacky. All in Favour.

**All members of the public left the meeting.*

1. [PA26/03431](#) - 1 Storey side and rear extension to a 3 storey semi-attached dwelling. Location: Rainbows End, Lavrean, Bugle, St Austell, Cornwall, PL26 8RN.

Members **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

Proposed: Cllr P Highland, Seconded: Cllr M Shand. All in Favour.

Min PM79/26 - Planning Decisions

One Planning Decision had been received from Cornwall Council since the agenda has been published.

PA26/02873 – Modify Existing tower AY39 to support bespoke cross-arms and outriggers for down leads to sealing end platform. Tower to be raised to support modifications to a height of 27 metres. Location: Land North

of Electricity Distribution Site Bojea, St Austell, Cornwall PL25 5RU. The Parish Council supported the application on 26.05.26. Cornwall Council have since, stated NO OBJECTION to the application.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the decision.

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

Min PM80/26 - Planning Correspondence

The Clerk had circulated the CALC training for the next few months on Planning/Finance etc.

PA25/09509 – Two turbines, land east of Karslake: A five-day protocol was received from Cornwall Council on 1 June following the Parish Council's earlier resolution to object to the application. After circulation of the five-day protocol by email, members agreed to proceed with Option 2 — *"agree to disagree"* — in relation to this application. Clean Earth advised that they wished members to be aware that they value the relationship they have with the Parish Council.

PA26/00146 – Development of 28 dwellings at Cargwyn, Penwithick

It had been understood that this application was to be referred to the Planning Committee, with the support of Cornwall Councillor J Hanlon. However, correspondence received confirmed that this position had since changed, and that Councillor Hanlon no longer supported committee determination. The application has subsequently been approved under delegated authority by the Planning Officer and the Cornwall Councillor.

Councillor Hanlon advised that his previous concerns had been addressed through amendments made by the developer, including changes to speed limits, working hours, and vehicle usage. He further noted that, given planning permission had already been granted for 15 properties on the site in 2013, he no longer considered there to be sufficient grounds for objection.

The Clerk then read a comprehensive email response from the Case Officer, Samantha Hewitt.

Whilst Councillors acknowledged and welcomed the measures proposed to minimise disruption, particularly in relation to vehicle size and working hours,

they remained of the view that the application should have been referred to committee, especially given the earlier support for objection from Councillor Hanlon.

Cllr O Kimber strongly expressed the view that a specific Cornish Planning Policy is needed. Councillors reiterated that their role is to represent the views of the Parish and emphasised the importance of ensuring that public concerns are heard and properly considered.

Councillors requested that a letter be sent to the Leader of Cornwall Council, the Chief Executive, the Portfolio Holder for Housing, and the Head of Planning to formally express their concerns.

Cllr P Highland also requested that the matter be raised through the Cornwall Area Partnership (CAP) meeting.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Clerk write to the relevant officers and raise the matter at the CAP meeting.

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

Cllr P Highland asked whether members of the Parish Council are able to attend Cornwall Council Central Area Planning meetings in order to ensure that the Parish's views are represented and heard.

Cornwall Councillor J Hanlon advised that members are welcome to attend such meetings and confirmed that, should any member wish to speak, prior notice must be given in advance of the meeting.

It was noted that the next Full Council meeting will take place on 21st July at Cornwall Council.

The Clerk informed members that, once again, a request made by the Parish Council under the 5-day protocol for committee determination by the Central Area Planning Committee had been refused in relation to application **PA24/05849** – Development of 8 dwellings at Mulberry Gardens.

Members were advised that the application has since been approved under delegated authority, with both the Case Officer, Alex Lawrey, and Cornwall Councillor J Hanlon supporting the decision.

Min PM81/26 – Any other Planning Items

There were no items raised.

Min PM82/26 – Confidential Items.

There were no items raised.

There being no further planning business to transact, the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.20pm.

..... (Chairman) (Date)