

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF ST NEOT PARISH COUNCIL
MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 9TH OCTOBER 2019 AT 7PM IN THE
COMMITTEE ROOM, ST NEOT INSTITUTE, ST NEOT**

Present: Councillors Dr L Jones (Chair), H Bunt, C Smith and G Rogers.

Cornwall Councillor M Eddy
Mr Wonnacott
Mr and Mrs Rice
Mr and Mrs Overfield
Sue Blaxley (Parish Clerk)

The Chair opened the meeting at 7pm.

Public Participation

Mr Wonnacott spoke in relation to planning application PA19/07644. He explained that there has been a range of agricultural buildings on the site for a long time. He said that the Applicants have demolished an agricultural building and started re-building it without the benefit of planning permission. He said that the new building is an elongated form of the building that was previously in that location and that it will be higher than the building it replaced as it has a ridged roof whereas the original building had a mono pitch roof with the lower end of the mono pitch abutting the boundary with the neighbouring property, Little Hammett. He said the elongated section of the new building will be slightly lower than the main building and was previously the site of a covered yard. He said that the building has always been used to house livestock. He explained that the building will be clad on the sides and rear elevations. Mr Rice said that the floor of the building will comprise a 10-foot concrete feeding strip with the remainder of the floor being earth. He said it will be used for livestock for 8 months of the year. Mr Wonnacott explained that foul and surface water drainage will be adequately disposed of and that Building Regulations do not cover agricultural buildings. The Chair said that Environmental Health have been consulted on the application and that the disposal of foul and surface water drainage could be dealt with by a condition attached to the planning permission.

Mr Overfield explained that he purchased Little Hammett in 2018 and that he had explained to the Applicant that he did not want a bigger or taller agricultural building on the boundary with his property. He said that the new building will be higher than the building which was in this location and that he is concerned about the visual amenity. He said that as the building is close to bedroom windows, Building Regulations will be required. He said that the building will house 90 cattle and it will be a health risk. He said that he is concerned that the runoff from the building will ingress into his building

and retaining wall. He commented that the proposed development does not comply with policies 2, 12, 16, 23 and 26 of the CLP.

Mr Wonnacott explained that the eaves height of the new building will be the same as the building that was on the site although the roof will be higher. He said that the height of the elongated section of the building will be higher than that which was on the site.

1. Apologies

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillors R Berrett and T Hooper.

2. Declaration of interest in items on the agenda

None

3. To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11th September 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on 11th September 2019, having been previously circulated, were agreed as an accurate record.

4. Applications and appeals received from Cornwall Council

PA19/07644 – Application for erection of a replacement agricultural livestock building, previously constructed without consent at Moorfields, St Neot

It was noted that members of the Planning Committee had visited the site. The Chair said that the site lies within the AONB and that this is the most protected landscape. She said that policy 23 of the CLP relates to enhancing and conserving this special landscape designation and should take pre-eminence over other policies. She said that policy 1 of the CLP is also relevant in that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. She explained that policy 5 of the CLP seeks to support farming and the benefits that farming brings. She said that policy 12 relates to design and that this is a critical policy in terms of the objectors' comments. She said that the building is higher than the original building and there has been a change in design from a mono-pitch to a ridged roof but the question is whether these changes adversely affect the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential property in a material way. She said that policy 21 relates to making the best use of existing land. She said that the fact this is a retrospective application is not a material consideration. The Chair said that the new section of building has the most impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring residential property in that, as their dwelling is at a lower level, it will cause excessive overshadowing. She said that the property has a door and a window on that elevation. In addition, she said that it may cause some overshadowing to some of the solar panels on their dwelling for approximately 6 months of the year.

Councillor H Bunt asked why the trees on the boundary were removed. The Chair said that they were leylandii and were removed and replaced in favour of indigenous beech oak due to their higher biodiversity value. Councillor H Bunt said that the building which has been demolished was condemned under farm assurance. He said that the new building tidies up the yard area and the feed barrier will mean that the animals are further away from the objectors' boundary than they were. He said that the 2 new bays at the end of the building are lower than the main building which is a compromise. He said that he considers that, once it is completed, it will visually blend and will only have a minor visual impact despite the increase in height. He said that he would be surprised if the proposed development caused excessive overshadowing.

Councillor G Rogers said that he was unsure if overshadowing will be a problem. He clarified that the objectors own the embankment on their side of the boundary as he said that he was concerned about possible subsidence to the wall and embankment. He said that the application does not make reference to the disposal of foul and surface water. He said there will be an increase in runoff which may affect the boundary wall.

Councillor C Smith said that the solar panels are in the lower section of Little Hammett behind the original building and he said that as the original buildings are higher than the new building, they will have blocked out any sunlight. He said that the new elongated section may form a sound barrier to the objectors from the remainder of the farm and will therefore be advantageous. He said that if the elongated section was not in place, the area would be used as an open yard. He said that the increase in height is needed and that it cannot be reduced as a building of this height is required to mitigate against pneumonia in cattle. He said that the original building housed animals and that the amount of water runoff will be the same. Councillor H Bunt said that less slurry will be produced.

The Chair said that she understands the needs of the Applicants and the anxieties of the objectors. She said that she considers the elongated section will result in a material loss of amenity to the occupiers of Little Hammett by reason of being overshadowing and overbearing. It was proposed by Councillor C Smith and seconded by Councillor H Bunt that the application be supported subject to a condition that the disposal of foul and surface water drainage is to the satisfaction of the LPA. All Councillors voted in favour of the proposal except for Councillor Dr L Jones who voted against. The proposal was therefore carried.

5. Date of Next Meeting

To be arranged.

There was no further business and the meeting was closed at 7:50 pm.