



**MINUTES OF THE PARISH MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 20<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2022 AT 7.30PM, IN THE MAWNAN MEMORIAL HALL**

**Present:** Cllrs Sadler (Chair), Aherne, Bate, Brooksbank, Caunter, Morris & Whibley

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mrs L Clements, Clerk + members of the public

3507.22 **TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES:** Cllr Bradley, Moyle & Toland

3508.22 **MEMBERS TO DECLARE ANY INTERESTS IN ITEMS ON THE AGENDA OR REQUEST DISPENSATIONS.** – none noted

Cllr Sadler at this point noted for the record the passing of Mr Graham Marsden, former chair of the Parish Council over the Christmas period. The Parish Clerk had sent on our condolences to his family. He also noted that a resignation from Cllr Toland had been received by the clerk today and circulated to all councillors via email. A casual vacancy notice would be requested from Cornwall Council. He also welcomes Cllr Brooksbank back to the Parish council.

3509.22 **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS ON THE AGENDA ONLY**

Multiple comment for PA21/11384 recorded

3510.22 **TO RECEIVE AND APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE 16<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2021 FULL COUNCIL MEETING**

It was proposed by Cllr Whibley seconded by Cllr Aherne and

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 16th December 2021 be approved and signed by the Chair

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

3511.22 **ANY MATTERS ARISING FROM PAST MINUTES NOT ON THE CURRENT AGENDA (Penwarne layby bin; planning enforcement complaints; location for speed visor)**

- The clerk reported that she had made a request to Planning Enforcement via email chasing up an issues logged in October and that at present it was still within the 16 week period given to sort these matters through so nothing had come back to her. She had also written to Phil Mason (Head of Enforcement) to note that this really was not an acceptable practice – as the works in question had continued without any kind of response and enforcement practices needed to be more rigorous.
- Penwarne layby bin – County Cllr Bastin has spoken to County but there was no possibility of a new bin being purchased by them – they would provide a quote for emptying it on contract if we wanted to install one ourselves.
- Location of the speed visor coming from Perran-ar-worthal is still to be agreed.

3512.22 **TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS RECEIVED FROM CORNWALL COUNCIL BY DATE OF THIS MEETING**

**Ref. No: PA21/03307/PREAPP** Penpol Mill Bosanath Valley Mawnan Smith TR11 5LN

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler seconded by Cllr Brooksbank and

**RESOLVED** that the planning officer be asked to note that we are very much against a residential development on this site. Given that this site sits well within the AONB as well as being administered as a County Wildlife Site (Porthnavas Creek) and within an area TPO, no mention is being made of any affordable housing contribution so we ask why it should be classed as fit for residential redevelopment? We do not feel that the residents or developer has given any consideration to our NDP or any other landscape considerations with this application. We recognise through discussions for our NDP that the parish lacks small business premises and that suitable sites for this need to be preserved where they can. We understand that the

engineering business only wound up last year and ask if the commercial premises have been advertised in any way, rather than an immediate pre-app made for housing made? Although the road system around this area is less than ideal for commercial businesses the addition of 9 extra homes would push capacity to the limit – most of the roads a single (or less!) many showing their very limited use with a grass strip through the middle. Trenarth Bridge – which would likely see a significant uptake in the amount of traffic using it and especially larger construction vehicles is a Grade II listed structure and would be hard pushed to cope with more usage. It is also in an area designated as a flood risk and whilst business premises would be affected by this homes would have to bear a greater impact from flooding. We would ask that very strong consideration be made before any form of multi-home residential development be made and that Highways and the emergency services especially have a strong say in the viability of access to this area.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/11384 Meudon Hotel Maenporth Road Maenporth TR11 5HT**

Cllr Sadler explained that he would allow time to take public comment on this application was but that it should be limited to the planning application and that if something had already been covered it would help if it was not restated. The representative of Black Box Planning (for the hotel) was allowed to start to proceedings.

**Ben Reid (BR) – Black Box Planning**

Medium to long term the current hotel capacity is unsustainable. Money has been put in by Kingfisher Resorts already to refurbish facilities but there was a demand by guest for separate accommodations and the need for more amenities.

The proposed 31 extra jobs were to be views as careers within the group and not seasonal, single hotel jobs.

There would be a net gain of 37% (habitat) and 67% (hedgerow) on the field part of the project.

Bream House was already visible from the surrounding area and its redevelopment would provide something visually better within the AONB area.

There had been local consultation on future plans and the parish NDP had been used in the development of the current planning application.

Cornwall County is predominately in support of expansion of local businesses and tourism as part of the Local Plan.

**Cllr Whibley** questioned the use of language – specifically referring the development as units, not dwellings – when they were to be equipped as small houses was to get round building homes outside the NDP guidelines? She also asked why no business plan explain the need for the increased number of keys had been submitted, although Cllr Sadler said that this information was not relevant to the planning applications itself.

**Cllr Brooksbank** asked if a long term (30yr+) planning condition on the BEA including the need for a details strategy to given future material considerations weight so that no building could ever take place on it had been considered, or if a covenant could be put in place for the same? BR responded that this could be considered but that at the time of application there were still issues.

**Cllr Sadler** still questioned the inclusion of the field within the redline boundary on the maps. He said that DEFRA was already encouraging biodiversity on agricultural land – was that not enough? BR responded that since the Environment Act of October 2021 amendments there was a requirement linking biodiversity net gain to the planning process. The red line was used to influence and offset the rest of the rest of the planning application as a single 'one shot' application but that this could be changed and split up/out. History tells us what a red line means as with the old Craig Hotel site at Maenporth, where in 1987 a red line was drawn around the whole site and over the next ten years development spread back over the site away from original hotel just by putting in detailed applications.

**Cllr Ahearne** felt that a number of the plot sizes were too large. BR said that they were scaled to fit the surroundings, being mainly woodland areas. Although 27 trees would need to be removed in a managed scheme of works the topography of the site lent itself to the size of the plots and the units on them.

Cllr Morris referenced the AONB comments 'conspicuously introducing built form ... in this distinctive landscape', the introduction of '...an uncharacteristic element to the coastal landscape' with the field replanting and no explanation, and questioned how this development would conserve and enhance the AONB in any way.

Representations were then given by a number of members of the public and summarised below:

**N Heffernan**

Why was this good for the community? Why did it have to be on such a scale? Destroying the natural habitats was so not good for the community – the field had already begun to rewild after being left fallow for 2 years+ attracting various wildlife to it. Visitors to Cornwall want the coastline, not parkland. Removal of the accommodation block would just see more local need for housing for staff, when staff in the hospitality sector are already in short supply. How can this be justified?

**T Damer**

A prepared statement was read from Terry as the chair of the NDP Steering Group and is included with the appendix documents. It covers the impact on the AONB as well as how the local benefits would, on balance, be outweighed by the harm they would effect on it and how this development could be viewed as housing and not business potential.

**R Bradley**

Has a 3 bed holiday let 200m from the boundary. They love the hotel but object to the impact the buildings closer to the boundary would have on their home and accommodations though noise and light impact. The proposed 3 storey unit in the trees would have a direct line of sight from the viewing platform into their home.

**A Hornidge**

This application was totally wrong for the valley. It was a very special habitat and there would be no net gain with such glass and concrete intrusions to it. These are buildings, not beds and there was 'bending of due diligence being done to push this through. Service would also block the surroundings roads. This development was only an investment portfolio and was not looking to be run organically with the environment.

**M Mercer**

The hotel had been bought at £2 million with profit in mind. The refurbishments would be done and then the group were likely to just sell of making £8 million. There was no interest in the area, it was all about extracting a profit and that tourism was a loophole that was being exploited by developers to get house built.

There were other representations along similar lines made by members of the public and where possible BR/Black Box Planning did respond to them.

A motion to support parts of this planning application was made, however it was discussed and felt that this was not appropriate – it was a whole application and needed to be dealt with as such. Comments explaining this could be included to explain this point further in our submission. Cllr Sadler said that this had to be viewed to best address the balance between tourism and countryside. 3 storey properties are simply not suitable in this location. Light pollution in a predominantly dark skies parish was not acceptable. However support for the amenity building, or a variation thereof, was possible. The field should not be included in the application – there were better ways of increasing biodiversity gain under existing powers.

It was proposed by Cllr Brooksbank seconded by Cllr Morris &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council object to the this application based on the number of proposed units; the scale of development; material proposed for use; impact on the AONB and other factors as per his report to council (appendix doc)

on a vote being taken the matter was approved ~~unanimously~~ with 1 objection



**Ref. No: PA21/11810** (listed) Nansidwell Farm, North Barn Old Church Road Mawnan TR11 5HU

It was proposed by Cllr Brooksbank seconded by Cllr Whibley &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council support this application.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/11811** Nansidwell Farm, North Barn Old Church Road Mawnan TR11 5HU

It was proposed by Cllr Whibley seconded by Cllr Bate &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council support this applications. There should be no detrimental effect to the property from this conversion, and it shows that care for ongoing upkeep and maintenance is being given due consideration..

However with the addition of WC & Kitchenette we ask that a condition so that this area remains tied to the main property for ancillary use only and without any future potential to change into a separate dwelling/ holiday letting is included.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/12032** Masita Penwarne Road Mawnan Smith TR11 5PQ

It was proposed by Cllr Brooksbank seconded by Cllr Aherne &

**RESOLVED** that we are afraid that Mawnan Parish Council cannot give support to this application. We are not happy with the extensive use of cladding on this proposal as it is entirely out of context for the immediate vicinity (as per Policy 5 of our NDP) - almost all of the other homes along this road to the village are rendered with occasional cladding elements.

We also see nothing included about the relocation of the garage and only a passing comment on landscaping works in the Design & Access statement and would ask that further plans for this be requested. We would also ask that Highways be given the opportunity to comment on this application as there are regular concerns about visibility and access to these properties made - from not only from a passing vehicle standpoint but from residents themselves - that could be addressed in this proposal, especially as this has mentioned it being a 'multi-generational' which we have assumed would see more access /egress to the property taking place.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/12160** Cliffside Durgan Mawnan Smith Falmouth TR11 5JT

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler seconded by Cllr Aherne &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council support this application however, as we understand the owners wish to return the outside style of the house to more of what was there maybe 50 years ago and would ask that the use of such a large amount of glass to the frontage be reconsidered. Given that this building is in our Neighbourhood Plan NDHA we would like to see a similar building style to the original for the extension if at all possible.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved with 1 objection

**Ref. No: PA21/12648** Goryon Kerth Little In Sight Mawnan Smith TR11 5EY

It was proposed by Cllr Whibley seconded by Cllr Brooksbank &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council supports this application as it appears to be much in line with revisions being made to a number of homes in this vicinity.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/12835** 2 Greenfields Close Mawnan Smith TR11 5EX

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler seconded by Cllr Aherne &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council supports this application as it appears to be much in line with revisions being made to a number of homes in this vicinity.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA22/00206** Spinark Carwinion Road Mawnan Smith TR11 5JD

It was proposed by Cllr Whibley seconded by Cllr Sadler &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council support this application

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

**Ref. No: PA21/12661** Mincarlo Budock Vean Lane Mawnan Smith Falmouth Cornwall TR11 5LQ

It was proposed by Cllr Whibley seconded by Cllr Aherne &

**RESOLVED** that Mawnan Parish Council feels it can support this application.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

3513.22 **TO RECEIVE A LIST OF PLANNING DECISIONS MADE TO DATE BY CORNWALL COUNCIL** – read out

3514.22 **TO DISCUSS ANY REVISIONS ON THE FOOTPATH MAINTENANCE CONTRACT (ENDING 31/8/21) AND THE PUBLIC SPACES CLEANING CONTRACT (TOILETS) FOR IMMEDIATE PUBLICATION**

The clerk asked that the path from the JPF to Shute Hill be included in the footpath contract, along with the whole length of footpath 20 instead of stopping through the woodland and being notified (regularly) by county that this needed cutting back. She also asked that a bi-annual cleaning of the parish benches be added to the Public Spaces contract to try to extend the life of the new benches at Carlidnack – which just needed some form of regular maintenance to them as they had a 15 year guarantee on them. These changes were agreed to and it was decided to advertise both contracts in the West Briton newspaper and online as soon as possible to get written quotes back for the March meeting.

3515.22 **TO RECEIVE ANY FURTHER COMMUNITY GRANT APPLICATIONS**

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler seconded by Cllr Brooksbank &

**RESOLVED** that an award of £500 be made to Coastwatch for upkeep of the services provided.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

The clerk explained that the Parish Council were unable to fund the school's request directly, as it was seen as something that had already been provided for through their Central Government grant. However she had checked and funding from the CIL monies devolved to the parish could be used. Currently there was only £1500 in the CIL pot thought.

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler seconded by Cllr Bate &

**RESOLVED** that an award of £1000 be made to Mawnan Primary School for play area fencing from the CIL funds held by the PC.

on a vote being taken the matter was approved unanimously

3516.22 **TO RECEIVE AND DISCUSS ANY SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PLATINUM JUBILEE CELEBRATIONS IN JUNE 2022**

Cllr Sadler said that he had already made contact with the WI about extending their planned series of events but that he still thought this should be something that was being organised by the community and not the Parish Council. It was decided that he would contact all of the community groups on the clerk's mailing list to arrange a meeting at the Bowling Club to see if / what events could be arranged. It was still hoped that something could take place on Carwinion Field.

3517.22 **APPROVAL OF THE LIST OF PAYMENTS FOR JAN 2022 & TO RECEIVE DEC 2021 BANK STATEMENTS AND RECONCILIATIONS**

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler, seconded by Cllr Whibley &

**RESOLVED** that accounts totalling £9861.16 inc. VAT be approved for payment & duly signed

It was proposed by Cllr Sadler, seconded by Cllr Caunter &

**RESOLVED** that the statements of payments, receipts & bank reconciliation for the month of December 2021 be received & approved as a true record

on a vote being taken both the matters were approved unanimously

**3518.22 TO AGREED RESPONSES REQUIRED TO ANY CORRESPONDENCES not already made by clerk**

Cllr Sadler said that the Jubilee seeds needed to be done 'sooner rather than later' and suggested that our parish contractors needed to be asked to quote to do this. Cllr Whibley suggested that help might be sought from the Gardening Club.

The clerk also noted that she had received a request from the Farmer's Market to use Carwinion Field in July as the MMH was being used for the annual Craft Fair. She apologised as this was a Trusts item but the organisers needed a swift response to allow stallholders etc. to make suitable arrangements and cricket were unlikely to have their fixture list available until later in February. It was agreed that – with a proviso on cricket – the Farmer's Market would be allowed to use the field but that vehicles would be allowed to park up on the grass.

**3519.22 TO RECEIVE INFORMATION AND MAKE DECISIONS ON NOTED ENVIRONMENT ISSUES INCLUDING TRAFFIC, ROADS, FOOTPATHS AND CLIMATE CONSCIOUS MAWNAN.**

- Cllr Whibley reported that an official application for a DMMO across Trebah Carpark by WARMS had been received and validated by Cornwall Council. A 2nd application for the Tank Road submitted by Cornwall Ramblers was also being processed.
- Preferences for the level of works to be undertaken by the Countryside Access Team to Footpath 19 were requested. It was agreed that we should be looking to keep the stiles along the path unless essential that they be removed (it was noted that one or more had issues with flooding and were regularly in need of digging out in winter) whilst the one leading out directly into Grove Hill on the spur would be replaced with something a little more safety orientated.
- Issues due to erosion of the footbed of footpath 33 were being dealt with by the Countryside Access Team as were the noted issues to the granite steps in this area following on from a site visit by P Hodgson.
- There had been no uptake whatsoever with the request for members to join the Friends of Meudon Woods volunteer group. Cllr Whibley and B Raymond were to look at alternative methods to try to engage others in the project. Meanwhile yet another fallen tree in Carwinion Woods had been reported with the NT arranging for this to be removed.

**3520.22 REPORTS FROM OTHER GROUPS / INDIVIDUALS**

PG reported on the Climate Group meeting which he attended on behalf of the parish:

- There was a presentation about Dark Skies project which once again led to consideration of street lighting changes to Shute Hill which Cllr Bastin would try to sort out
- Rame's Green Guide – a project to 'Save Money, Protect Nature & Fight Climate Change' which can be tailored to individual parishes. Cllr Bastin added that the Network Group were looking into this as a CNP project (with limited funding available).
- The University have a campus working groups that are looking for projects in the parishes to help out with. PG suggested the NT rewilding of the fields at Bosloe. Cllr Whibley would look to contact the NT rangers to see if this was an option once it was decided what the rewilding here entailed.

**3521.22 REPORT FROM CORNWALL COUNCIL WARD MEMBER**

- Cllr Bastin started with notice that Cornwall County had declared a Critical Incident within Adult Social care. He said that a number of private suppliers had left of or broken contracts and with the addition of people stuck within hospitals needing care packages or follow on provisions made the system was near collapse. He said to contact him with any specific cases when a parishioner is 'trapped' in hospital, awaiting suitable post-discharge help. Wheal Vor (the ward working with patients medically able to leave but short on aftercare) is working with jobcentres across the county to provide training qualifications for Health Care Support Workers.
- He also noted the rollout of 'caseworks assist' training for clerks mainly to help them get better response time for queries following on from the large number of Council staff still works outside of normal offices. (Clerk to follow up and email details provided)
- 20 is plenty – current 30mph limits to drop to 20mph in the trial areas by June. Monitoring should be done by the police who are working closely with Cornwall Council in the trial areas.
- Highways Schemes – these will continue within the CNP areas. Expressions of interest can be sent to Esther Richmond as normal.

**3522.22 ITEMS FOR INCLUSION AT THE NEXT MEETING -**

Cllr Sadler at this point added the Cllr Caunter has discussed with him resigning from the vice-chair post, so this, along with Roles & responsibilities would be added to the next Agenda.

**3523.22 MATTERS OF COMMUNITY CONCERN - none noted**

**3524.22 DATE & TIME OF NEXT MEETING: 17<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2022 AT 7.30PM**

Cllr Sadler also gave his apologies for the February meeting as he would be recovering from his knee surgery on the 7<sup>th</sup> February.

Meeting finished at 10.15pm.

Signed:  17<sup>th</sup> February 2022  
(chair)

**Item 3513 -**

Planning decision to date: Dec 21 to Jan 22

**Items in red** are summaries of conditions applied to applications, other than the conditions within 3 years & as to provided plans (Tree works are 2 years & to BS3998 standards)

**Ref. No: PA21/03262/PREAPP Status: Closed - advice given**

Street Record Anna Maria Lane Budock Vean

The Electronic Communications Code (Conditions and restrictions) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 BT intends to install fixed line broadband electronic communications apparatus

**Ref. No: PA21/03261/PREAPP Status: Closed - advice given**

Street Record Budock Vean Lane Mawnan Smith

The Electronic Communications Code (Conditions and restrictions) (Amendment) Regulations 2017 BT intends to install fixed line broadband electronic communications apparatus

**Ref. No: PA21/11860 Status: Approved unconditional**

Yesnaby The Fairway Mawnan Smith TR11 5LR

Non-material amendment (NMA1) for change from white PVCu windows and doors to anthracite aluminium windows and doors, change the existing side access door to the studio to a window and changes to extension and existing house cladding to decision PA21/02185

**Ref. No: PA21/11345 Status: Approved unconditional**

Ilbery West Bay Maenporth Road Maenporth TR11 5HP

Non-material amendment in relation to decision notice PA13/07455 dated 13.08.13 for removal of balcony balustrade and formation of mono-pitched roof covering. Relocation of garage door opening.

**Ref. No: PA21/11239 Status: Approved with conditions (not to be used as separate dwelling) Red Cedars**

Helford Passage Mawnan Smith TR11 5LB

Proposed conversion of store building to form annexe including boot room and covered link

**Ref. No: PA21/09740 Status: Approved with conditions (master en-suite obscured glass) Highfields Grove**

Hill Mawnan Smith TR11 5ER

Revised Scheme Of previous Withdrawn Application - Ground Floor Alterations With New Ground Floor Extension And Front Porch Alterations With Replacement Of Tiled Roof To Natural Slate Roof.

**Ref. No: PA21/09604 Status: Approved with conditions (1<sup>st</sup> floor master bed – obscured glass to doors)**

Rosemaen Maenporth Road Maenporth TR11 5HR

Rear and side extension to existing bungalow with new loft conversion and replace existing garage with new garage and office over.

**Ref. No: PA21/07614 | Status: Approved with conditions**

Heyle Helford Passage Mawnan Smith TR11 5LD

**Ref. No: PA21/11094 Status: Approved with conditions No further new opening to SE elevation Chygwyn**

Sampys Hill Mawnan Smith TR11 5EW

External alterations including external wall insulation and replacement windows/doors, extensions, replacement outbuilding and hard landscaping works

**Ref. No: PA21/10458 Status: Approved with conditions**

Trevean Carwinion Road Mawnan TR11 5JD

Two storey side extension and single storey rear extension (resubmission of previously approved PA21/03512 with additional obscured glass window to SE elevation).



**Item 3517** payments for Jan 2022

Voucher	Code	Supplier	VAT	Total
237	Clerks Pension Contribution	Nest Pensions	0.00	6.47
238	Parish Pension Contribution	Nest Pensions	0.00	14.13
239	Toilet - Cleaning & Materials	KC Payne	0.00	213.67
240	Clerks Salary (inc PAYE & NI)	Clerk	0.00	1,006.91
241	Grass Cutting	R Sanders	17.00	102.00
242	Toilets - Utility Charges	EDF energy	0.00	10.00
243	Clerks Pension Contribution	Nest Pensions	0.00	34.39
244	NDP - Grant Funding	1&1 Ionos	2.00	11.99
245	Parish Pension Contribution	Nest Pensions	0.00	75.24
246	S19 - Junior Playing Field	R Sanders	13.00	78.00
247	S19 - Carwinion Playing Field	R Sanders	30.20	181.20
248	Graveyard Maintenance/ Grounds	Clerk	0.00	1.62
249	Mileage & Parking	Clerk	0.00	1.17
250	Subscriptions	Starboard Systems Ltd	93.60	561.60
251	Toilet - Cleaning & Materials	Hygiene Depot	7.86	47.17
252	Office Supplies	Amazon	0.00	13.40
253	Parish Council Websites	Webhosts UK Ltd	3.10	18.60
254	Meeting Room Hire	Mawnan Memorial Hall	0.00	207.00
255	Donations/ Grants	Mawnan Memorial Hall	0.00	234.00
256	Meeting Room Hire	Mawnan Bowling Club	0.00	90.00
257	Graveyard Maintenance/ Grounds	R Sanders	102.60	615.60
258	Office Supplies	Staples	5.68	34.08
259	Postages	Royal Mail	0.00	3.40
260	S19 - Carwinion Playing Field	Walker Fire	23.22	139.32
261	Telephone & Internet	PlusNet	5.87	35.20
262	Donations/ Grants	Mawnan Anvil Trust	0.00	5,000.00
263	Election Expenses	Cornwall Council	0.00	255.00
264	Graveyard Maintenance/ Grounds	Robbie's Garden Services & Fencing (Pending invoices)	0.00	870.00
			<b>£304.13</b>	<b>£9861.16</b>

**Item 3518-** Correspondences

	Rec'd	Description	From	actions	Agenda
1	17.12.21	May 2021 election recharges – provisional	R Olver – Cc Democratic services	pending	
2	17.12.21	Penwarne layby – litter pick complaint (ongoing)	Resident	pending	
3	17.12.21	Pavement at Lowenna – post CORMAC meeting chaser info	Resident	pending	
4	4.1.22	Death of Graham Marsden – notification from family		For note	
5	5.1.22	CC budget consultation webinar	CC Finance	For info	
6	5.1.22	Local Council survey on nature	CC Environmental Service	For info	
7	5.1.22	DMMO at Trebah Gardens carpark	CC Map Officer	For info	
8	5.1.22	Footpath 19 – footbed works proposals	CC Access Team	Full council	
9	5.1.22	Penwarne bin – Cllr Bastin info	Cllr Bastin	Pending	
10	5.1.22	Jubilee Celebrations – what is being done /by whom	Resident	Full council	

11	5.1.22	Problems with waterlogging of memorials at the graveyard	Resident	Clerk dealt
12	6.1.22	CALC Jan training schedule	CALC	
13	6.1.22	Hotel Meudon – changes between preapp and full application	Black Box Planning	Full council
14	6.1.22	Fal Uni winter newsletter	Fal & Exeter Uni	For info
15	6.1.22	Toilet backflow again – SWW contacted + CC Environmental Health	Contractor/user	Clerk dealing
16	10.1.22	Grant application by school – PC unable to finance from precept - ? CIL funding	Headteacher	Clerk dealing
17	10.1.22	Sewing Jubilee seeds – advice from CORMAC	CORMAC	Full council
18	11.1.22	Report of issues with footpath 33 (below church)	Cllr Whibley	Full council
19	12.1.22	Submission of revised NDP documents	R Lacey, CC	
20	12.1.22	Toilet issue – SWW actions to be taken	From CC	Clerk dealt
	5.1.22	Farmers Market – use of Carwinion in July (MMH being used for craft fair)	Farmer Market	Needs response asap

Please remember that comments on planning application PA21/11384 received directly to the clerk prior to the meeting, along with the comments from T Damer (NDP SG) and the report provided by Cllr Brooksbank to the parish council as an appendix document to these minutes.

## Comments on Planning Application PA21/11384 – Meudon Hotel

General – in principle, Mawnan Parish Council would support sustainable development of the Meudon Hotel to safeguard its long term future and in particular the landscaped valley gardens associated with the hotel.

However, there are a significant number of concerns with the details of the planning application which would need to be addressed before any planning permission should be allowed.

The Parish Council has not seen any business model which requires the scale of development proposed which has only recently been acquired by the applicant who has failed to evidence that development of the scale and nature proposed is both necessary and sufficient for the long-term viability of the hotel.

The proposal is of very small-scale benefit at national level which we consider is significantly outweighed by the potential harm that could be done to this hugely important part of the AONB.

The Parish Council, through its Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) does support business in a rural environment, but this does not outweigh the other policies of the NDP, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the National Planning Policy Framework.

We are aware of a significant number of objections raised by our community to this development, along with the concerns raised by the AONB and Natural England. Cornwall Council Planning Committee must take appropriate cognisance of the concerns raised.

The Parish Council objects to the extent and scale of development as it stands.

In particular:

### **1 – Infrastructure**

1a) Surface Water Drainage – the application is based on 100 year storm + 40% climate change – this is considered insufficient for this location as any run off could have a negative impact on the gardens and Bream & Meudon Beaches. Due to proximity to the sea and the steep valley side on which the development is proposed, it is recommended that a significantly higher basis such as 1 in a 1000 yr storm should be provided for in this significant and important location. Additionally, the existing combined sewer should not be used for additional surface water removal.

1b) Foul Drainage – the application states that individual units to have domestic foul water package pumping stations to nearest foul water gravity chamber. The application refers to main chamber and pumping facility adjacent to Bream House which then feeds across the top of the "Biodiversity Enhancement Area" into drainage in Trelawney Close – the ability of this system to operate effectively and the capacity of the SWW system off site needs to be thoroughly investigated and suitable conditions attached to any permission to ensure robust effluent handling. Any foul water run off would be severely detrimental to the landscaped gardens and potentially Bream and Meudon Beaches. It is understood Maenporth beach has previously been impacted by foul sewer outfall and failure, the added load created by this development would exacerbate this issue.

The provision of hot tubs to each unit is noted and water from these should be treated as foul water and managed accordingly.

1c) Highways and transport – subject to CC highways commentary, concerns raised that the proposed hopper bus for staff and some guests would not be fully utilised and as a result be omitted in the future. If permission is to be given, the provision of a regular hopper bus service should be a

#### **4 – Listed building status**

Both Meudon Hotel and Meudon Barns are Grade 2 listed buildings and the development proposed does not indicate any reference to protecting these heritage assets and minimising negative impact.

#### **5 – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

The site falls within the AONB – policy MD9 refers to high quality development in the right place and of the right scale that is in harmony with the protected landscape, absence of intrusive structures and incongruous development. A tranquil place for quiet enjoyment of dark night skies. S5.17 refers to some parts of Mawnan Smith can be viewed from seaward. Care would need to be taken to ensure that development is of an appropriate scale and blends with surrounding properties and landscape. Plots 8 – 10 are not considered appropriate within this context. Additionally the extensive removal of trees will negatively impact the character of the area.

#### **6 – Cornwall & Isles of Scilly Landscape Character Study LCA CA09**

This document includes planning and land management guidelines: it promotes strategy for development control to ensure new development is appropriately sited and integrated into its surroundings in a sustainable manner. The removal of substantial quantity of trees to make way for this development is excessive and inappropriate in this location.

The study also seeks to ensure the restoration and conservation of historic gardens.

#### **7 – Specific Development Plots:**

- a) Guest Amenities and Outdoor Pool – to note potential noise impact on Meudon Barns and wildlife should be taken into consideration but supported in principle. Times of opening of the pool should be limited by condition.
- b) Plot 1 – excessive height – the Parish Council objects to the second floor as being inappropriate with potential impact on distant views and not in accordance with the community supported MNDP, additionally the inclusion of roof terraces will impact on privacy of adjacent properties.
- c) Plot 2 – Comments as Plot 1 but to note the loss of existing trees is not acceptable to the Parish Council
- d) Plot 3 – image shows stairs adjacent to entrance of this plot which is not shown on the plan – access is unclear. Note also the inclusion of a hot tub close to the entrance of Plot 3 but also considered too close to hot tub proposed for Plot 2.
- e) Plot 4 – Concern as to the loss of trees.
- f) Plots 5 & 6 – Comments as Plot 2
- g) Plot 8 – the Parish Council accepts principle of replacement of existing dwelling, however, does not support the inclusion of a second occupied floor (existing building is 2 floors). The scale and height of this proposal is not in keeping with the environment and would be visibly intrusive from seaward and South West coast path side. Additionally, the inclusion of patinated copper is not considered to be complementary to the local environment and would be expected to have a negative impact on the AONB.  
The MNDP refers to replacement dwellings to not exceed the volume of the original property. The plans for this plot are considerably larger than the existing building and is therefore entirely inappropriate in this highly visible and important location.
- h) Plots 9 & 10 – the Parish Council objects to the inclusion of these plots in the development on the basis of impact on the identified nonregistered heritage asset (the valley gardens), these units fall well within the identified boundary of the important ornamental valley gardens. Additionally, the height, choice of materials (particularly copper) and the impact on



measure as have been undercut by erosion. These need to be re-provided and a contribution for maintenance of the SW path is requested.

Concern is expressed with regard to impact on the seal and other wild animal populations that are known to use Meudon Beach and Bream Cove. Any increased activity in this area, including potential water run off and night lighting needs to be considered to avoid negative impact.

The applicant refers to substantial biodiversity gains, but the loss of a large number of existing mature trees, along with a change to the BEA field are effectively significant losses in biodiversity and will substantially change the natural balance in this location for the worse.

The applicant's agent at the Parish Council Meeting of the 21/2/22 stated that the owners had no intention of developing the BEA field and aim to retain this purely as a natural and biodiverse area. If this is the case then it would be expected that either the owners could vest this land in the Parish Council to ensure its future consistency, or at the least offer appropriate safeguards including a discussion on covenants for the benefit of the community to avoid later built development on this important and visible amenity.

#### **Summary**

The Parish Council could support elements of the planning application but not the proposed development in its entirety. We have detailed concerns regarding much of the proposal.

Although we support the principle of appropriate development, the Parish Council has not seen the business model which requires the scale of development proposed. Should permission be approved for any development at this location, the Parish Council recommends that any approval is limited to replacing the existing ancillary structures plus sympathetic redevelopment of Bream House and Meudon Cottage, which would be consistent with MNDP.

The proposal is of very small-scale benefit at national level which is significantly outweighed by the potential harm that could be done to this hugely important part of the AONB which NPPF Para 176 notes has the highest status of protection.

The NDP does support business in a rural environment, but this does not outweigh the other policies of the NDP, the AONB and the NPPF.

The Parish Council has significant concerns with the infrastructure proposals identified.

In particular the Parish Council objects to the inclusion of units greater than 2 floors in total due to impact on roofscape and environment. The Parish Council specifically objects to any development in the location of plots 8 & 9 which would have a negative impact on the ornamental valley gardens and the seaward view in this AONB.

Finally, the selection of materials is not considered to be appropriate for the location and in particular the use of copper on any plot visible from seaward would not be in keeping with the MNDP or the AONB.

*Ret Siddle*

General – in principle, I would support sustainable development of the Merdon Hotel to safeguard its long term future and in particular the landscaped valley gardens associated with the hotel.

However, there are a significant number of concerns with the details of the planning application which would need to be addressed before any planning permission should be allowed.

The public has not seen any business model which requires the scale of development proposed which has only recently been acquired by the applicant who has failed to evidence that development of the site and nature proposed is both necessary and sufficient for the long term viability of the hotel.

The proposal is of very small scale built at national level which we consider is significantly outweighed by the potential harm that could be done to the highly important part of the AONB.

The Parish Council, through its Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) does support business in a local environment, but this does not outweigh the other policies of the NDP, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the National Planning Policy Framework.

I see a range of a significant number of objections raised by our community to this development, along with the concerns raised by the AONB and Natural England. Councils Council Planning Committee must take appropriate cognizance of the concerns raised.

As part of:

1 – Infrastructure:

1a) Surface Water Drainage – the application is based on 100 year storm + 40% climate change – this is considered insufficient for this location as any run off could have a negative impact on the gardens and Birnos & Merdon Reserves. Due to proximity to the sea and the steep valley side on which the development is proposed, it is recommended that a significantly higher base such as 1 in a 1000 yr storm should be provided for as this significant and important location. Additionally, the existing combined sewer should not be used for additional surface water removal.

1b) Foot Drainage – the application states that individual units to have domestic full water drainage pumping stations to prevent foul water gravity chamber. The application refers to sewer chambers and pumping facilities adjacent to Birnos House which runs back across the top of the “burkhardtly Entertainment Area” into drainage in Trelawney Cove – the ability of this system to operate effectively and the capacity of the SMOV section off site needs to be thoroughly investigated and suitable conditions attached to any permission to ensure robust effluent handling. Any foul water run off must be severely detrimental to the landscaped gardens and potentially Birnos and Birnos Reserves. It is understood Merdon beach has previously been impacted by foul sewer outfall and failure, the added load created by this development would exacerbate this issue.

The provision of fire tubs to each unit to avoid and water from these should be treated as foul water and managed accordingly.

1c) Highways and Transport – subject to CC highways re-orientation, criteria is stated that the proposed transport for staff and some guests would not be fully utilised and as a result be omitted in the future. If permission is to be given, the provision of a regular taxpayer bus service should be a condition of use of any developed buildings.

2 – Neighbourhood Heritage Asset

The Merdon Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) identifies the Merdon Hotel and its location the associated valley gardens as non-registered heritage asset (No. 36). Article 6 of the NDP sets plans as attached therefore clearly identifying boundary of the identified landscaped area. The plan notes that the “original valley gardens comparable to Treask & Derriforgan (No. 3) acres established early 17th and therefore of outstanding landscape and historic interest”. There are elements of the proposed development that intrude on the identified extent of the gardens and therefore would not be considered appropriate for this important location.

3 – The Merdon Parish Design Statement (supplementary document to the NDP) has a number of pertinent policies that should be applied.

Principle 1 – Making a positive response to the landscape character – elements of the development are appropriate, however the extent of development plus individual plots/contours are considered to have a negative impact on the landscape character of the AONB location (specifically plot 1 & 9).

Principle 3 – Appropriate Building Style – although several of the proposed plots would not be visible outside the site, a number would be and those in particular are not considered to be of an appropriate style. In particular the use of copper is not considered to be in keeping with the “local vernacular”.

Principle 4 – Complementary and reinforcing character – elements of the proposed scheme are not considered to be complementary to the environment, none of the plots design bear any reference to the AONB design guide and are not appropriate for this important location.

Principle 5 – Safeguarding views to the coast and into the open countryside – Plot 8, 9 & 10 will all have views across to Edinvalley Bay and as such will also be visible from the sea and from parts of the South West Coast Path within the AONB. Building Plot 10 replaces an existing building with views, redevelopment of this plot is appropriate. However, the additional plots 8 & 9 are not considered to be suitable or appropriate.

Principle 11 – Complementary materials – materials should be relevant and appropriate for the location when the proposed development does not achieve.

Principle 12 – Appropriate Building Scale and Setting – size, height and massing should be appropriate to the built environment and not overbearing or be inappropriate to its surroundings. The relationship of buildings and orientation should follow the characteristics of the place. The NDP specifies that at a rural new building, in the garden should not exceed 2 storeys, identifying that the nearby Trelawney Cove Area is predominantly single storey. The proposed development is substantially 3 storeys in nature and is therefore excessive in height and inappropriate for the location.

The NDP refers to a maximum of 50 dwellings in any development within the envelope of Merdon South village but for a maximum of 2 dwellings for each development elsewhere in the rural landscape.

4 – Listed Building status

Both Merdon Hotel and Merdon Barns are Grade 2 listed buildings and the development proposal also will include any reference in protecting these heritage assets and minimising negative impact

5 – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Bica

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 January 2022 13:28  
**To:** Bica  
**Subject:** Menden Head P02/11304

Dear Lisa,

Further to my email of 9 January, objecting to this application

I attach a photo taken today of the Menden plus field from Rosemounton Head

This clearly shows the potential, permanent damage this could do to the unique location.

I trust the PC will take note and recommend refusal

Kind regards

[REDACTED]



**Summary:** Whilst a strategic plan has been developed by the applicant, this does not remove the fact that the Rosemead Mill sewage pumping station has failed many times over the past decade (most recently the last weekend) and has no capacity for a further 30 large properties. The result will be more frequent pollution of Maresport beach and water.

#### Environmental Issues

**Field within AONB:** This field is prominent from the sea and from the South West Coast Path and is the start of unbroken natural coastline until well up the Method Lane to Method Passage. The view from the sea is of simple fields and wooded valleys that encourage tourists to enjoy the area and return repeatedly. Once the field is developed and becomes built, inevitably the tourists numbers will reduce. Whilst the applicant is not yet applying for any buildings within the field, the whole 23 acre field has been included with the development boundary and they seek a planning change from agricultural use to already. Once ratified of planning, the next stage for an investment company like this would be to apply for full residential planning. The field used to be farmed by the local tenant farmer, under the previous landowner and the new owners have set the field 60 rods to fit natural state, any change to the previous status to much more likely to require urbanisation across the AONB purely to satisfy occupational demands.

**Meudon Valley - Beds of Frey:** This valley is full of water and many beds of peat. Whilst the applicant has discussed in detail the tree plan and created a substantial ecological report, there has been no plan to protect the beds' environment which should not be flooded to the specific place they were spotted but should cover the entire wooded valley, ensuring 10 large buildings (some 4 stories) less their natural habitat with the associated noise and light pollution will very quickly scare away the main species of birds, beds of peat and fish.

#### Conceptual Issues

**Kingsfisher Research Meudon Ltd:** This investment company has multiple financial streams to extract money from the development of The Meudon Hotel. The investment model of building large expensive properties is designed to remove capital (profit) from the site after the new buildings are sold to private second homeowners in order to pay back the investors. As these buildings will become privately owned, many of the income will go to the owner rather than the local business and local community. The aim to provide owners is contrary to AONB rules and might lead to applications for change of use to full residential in future.

An alternative development model of smaller dwellings would create year round tourism that would benefit the hotel in terms of consistent income streams, be less likely to be used as main residences, maintain and create jobs for the local community that the current plans will not.

**Community consultation:** This has been handled by their planning consultants, Nick Box Planning and architects, Iyer. Having been targeted by them as the prime neighbour, Iyer had noted our concerns of investor private plans, more and excessive tall buildings but made absolutely no effort to answer our concerns since seeking us out on that Community Consultation Day. The Community Consultation has proved to be 'smoke and mirrors' solely for the purposes of this application and paying 'lip service' to satisfy AONB requirements. It proves the owner of the hotel has not engaged with their neighbours or the local community's concerns.

From: [REDACTED]  
Sent: 18 January 2022 18:56  
To: [dev@highways.gov.uk](mailto:dev@highways.gov.uk)  
Subject: Fwd: Meudon PA21/11384

Subject: Fwd: Meudon PA21/11384

From: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Sirs,

I write to object to the above proposals.

First, is this application even within the Meudon Heath Neighbourhood Plan? The considerable impact about and erosion that goes into this group's work is rendered pointless if the MDRSP can effectively be ignored by developers.

Beyond that essential principle, the practical reasons for rejection seem to be -

- that the site is in a very sensitive and is yet unspoiled part of the coastal AONB with wonderful views towards it from both the popular public paths and from Fairbairn Bay.

- why, if the development is now claimed as 'essentially essential for the viability of the hotel Meudon (this creating 'sufficiently' exceptional circumstances' to override the AONB principles), were the applicants referred to an successful and experienced hotel/leisure operators, not fully aware of the at the base of their recent 'purchase'?

- additional employment prospects are promised but catering, construction and service industries already report great difficulty in filling existing demand. The 10 units will certainly require cleaners, though not at all odd times, and claims for sustainability of construction require minimal maintenance beyond ground-keeping.

- local steel has all but disappeared though Amazon should benefit, attracting more speedy vans to the narrow access roads would be a dubious benefit.

- the plans indicate that most of the proposed new dwellings will enjoy coastal and sea views which naturally enhance property values. However, public views towards the site must carry greater social value than those of a handful of new properties; from the highly popular footpaths that make this area so appealing and popularity from the water, the views would be permanently impacted and less cover to certainly going to be under pressure in order to maintain views from the mints and probably enhance them as these enhance security. Fives sailing along the SW coastline over the past couple of decades we've seen how much of it is already ruined by unsympathetic leisure developments, currently, the Meudon seem will present a beautiful and comparatively natural part of the peninsula.

- the proposal's rationale is development of additional accommodation for the hotel but it already looks like (re)development has been in great demand whenever Covid restrictions have prevented, given some normal times a return to seasonality might be expected and so demand more limited as off-peak periods. However, it seems far more likely that the mints would become quasi second homes (and AirBnBs?) resulting in a £2m capital gain for the applicant with some additional use of hotel facilities that it really means that the application is about 'holiday homes'.

- any ecological benefits from proposals for the sensitivity field area seem rather remote, becoming a managed part of a leisure complex would make it easier for some change of use at a later date.

- because the AONB principle that development should only be permitted in 'exceptional circumstances' means the area becomes no longer 'practicable', how much further development is required to render the AONB status inappropriate? If that initial application should succeed it would surely be followed by attempts to



As the proposal reviews overdevelopment, visual intrusion and does not conserve and enhance the designed landscape, it does not comply with the local planning policy (see policies 1, 3 and 8 of the Maudon Local Plan).

3. After viewing the proposed design plans for the 10 garden bridges and Green House, we were both jointly shocked by the colossal scale, ungraceful design and height of the proposed units. They are truly out-of-character for the area, cover a large footprint and very tall (10.5m). The area is not built like this and we certainly don't want it to become like it.

4. It is equally difficult to see how an extension of the hotel site area can be justified by the reduction of the adjoining agricultural land, which is highly visible from many viewpoints and provides an essential open break. The open field should not form part of an agricultural site, as defined by the red line boundary, and should remain or be replaced as adjoining land or the ownership of the soil and not be used within a stable business. We see this as a risky to secure further future development. The best way to protect the field is to leave it to nature. It is already evident that the birds and bat species and numbers have increased dramatically since the field has been returned to its natural state. We are aware that the conversion to an 'amenity' field would be a stepping stone to future building development.

5. The sustainability statement is extremely weak. We are also very concerned about the solution and not all of them through the valley and into the east, light pollution and night-time noise. These would all negatively affect the Maudon Valley.

6. Whilst the proposals for the field are vague at the stage, anything that would reduce the openness of the field would be of major concern. It is vital that any path system remain open lanes rather than any sort of make-up path. We do not have anything like this in our coastline in the area and would consider this to be ACHIEVE.

7. A concerning aspect of viewing the presentation at Maudon Hotel is the confirmation from Maudon directly that they plan to restrict access to the beach. My understanding is that the beach is only owned by Maudon up to the high water mark, which in the case of Swan Cove, is up to the slipway, meaning no beach is owned by them at all. The thought of restricting access to open and possibly 'empty' beach would cause public outrage within the community.

8. We are also very concerned about increased traffic, access and car, which are all very narrow with poor visibility. Staff parking is already an issue at Maudon, with many staff cars parking daily along the road at Woodlands and outside of Maudon Farm. Maudon states that staff will be based in on a shuttle bus. The reality of this happening and staff agreeing is highly unlikely. Maudon proposes that there would be no more traffic as a result of the bridges as guests would be staying on-site. As a leader with 30 years experience with a very simple customer demographic, this is simply laughable. A few days of course may be spent walking our paths and on the beach, but guests will have to explore elsewhere. There is also the extra parking requirements for non-incident guests using the swimming pool, spa, restaurant etc. Is this indicate the plans are conflicting as an area indicated for the spa is also allocated for covering??

The conclusion of these visit findings would require delivery of materials on a huge scale. Where and how are the HDV's going to deliver? The road along from the village to Oceanic Barns is often closed with parked cars and then the usual issue of dropping materials in Maudon cove. The construction of the car park and entrance would not allow a large lorry to pull in (at the road??)

Deliveries and bus pick-ups are currently an issue at Maudon without any extra cables, holding, clearing etc. The road is frequently blocked and messy. This must be addressed prior to any future development.

9. The current sewage infrastructure cannot cope. The 50-year-old main sewer is almost operating beyond its capacity, subject to frequent overflows and that week pollution Maudon Beach. See the Fulwith pack report dated 11 January 2022.

Thank you for taking the time to consider our concerns. I hope you or all you can to uphold the wonderful wild, agricultural and beautiful nature of our community. Please do not allow our beautiful landscape to be spoiled due to greed. I appreciate that permission will be given for some development at Maudon, but I beg of you to keep it within the confines of the existing hotel grounds and that it remains hidden from everyone else to protect the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

submit comments up to the 28th January.

In summary it is proposing:

**To build 10 new houses within the hotel grounds,** 7 of which replace existing buildings. These replacements are bigger than those they replace. The others are in effect 8 new houses in the AONB. Each is a self-contained house, privately owned, operating within the hotel.

Some existing trees will be cut down and some trimmed (crown management) or pruned.

Many of the houses will have sea views (helped by the tree cutting) and are reverse level to achieve this.

Heating via stoves means they will be visible from the sea and will have a significant effect on the appearance of the coastline from the water (see the attached photo). Some will be visible from the coast path.

The plan intends to gain change of use for the land to the north of the hotel from agricultural use (see the attached photo - the land to the right of the hotel woodland). This is claimed to be an environmental, bio-diversity area with kochutras, trees and shrubs. I guess this will look like parking.

The land has been fallow for some time and is, as it stands, going wild and is part of the field system in the locality.

Even though planting new trees looks good, this does not compensate in the short term for the loss of old trees and the carbon they hold.

It therefore arguably has a negative effect on Cornwall Council's objective of being carbon neutral by 2030.

In my view the application should be rejected as it represents new houses within the AONB and would have a detrimental effect on this beautiful area. The protection of the AONB status is of great importance if we are to take the environment seriously.

I'm no expert in planning but understand that to get approval within an AONB, a case must be made for exceptional circumstances, local need and local support must be demonstrated.

It's hard to see how this can be met.

We have no requirement for new luxury houses in the parish and as a community we have shown that we love our coast and countryside, wishing it to be protected.

I should say that while I would like the Hotel to succeed, this is not the right way.

**Objecting** to this application will help ensure this cannot meet the criteria of exceptional circumstance or local need.

This takes numbers (of objections) for the message to get through.

**So, if you agree that this is undesirable, then please put an objection on to the website. Even a few words clearly stating - Objection - will help. Good back-up reasons would be even better.**

**Remember, in order to place a comment you need to register.**

I attach a photo that I took in September (when I heard that this might happen) from the bay. The one house that is visible would be replaced by a much larger (6 bedroom) property (plot 8 in the application).

It is likely that around 6 of the new houses will be visible above or through the trees in order to have sea views.

I had to place my objection on the CC website and also to the Parish Council within the next few days.

Please could you forward this to anyone I might have missed or to anyone in the locality you think would be interested in this application.

Thank you for reading this.

David Thompson - Chairman Hedford Marine Conservation Group

The field proposed for wild flower planting has naturally become established and the increase in biodiversity and birds of prey has already been established. The need for wild flowers is an expensive waste and unnecessary.

#### COMMUNITY CONSULTATION DAY

It was apparent in talking to the architect that they had no idea at all about the road occupation as a normal. Similarly when we entered the house appointments and the height of Plot A, they had the answer that the tree line would hide them. Some of the trees shown on their plans do not exist. The whole consultation was a complete waste of time.

#### LOCAL EMPLOYMENT

The developers say they are creating jobs, but these jobs will be cleaners, gardeners and disabled staff. Builders will be brought in from outside the locality as happened when the hotel was refurbished. There are many vacancies in unskilled work which builders cannot fill, so employment will have to come out of county.

#### STATEMENT TO MARRAN PARISH COUNCIL Concerning the Meadon Hotel planning application.

- My name is [redacted] and I have been [redacted] since its formation by the Parish Council in 2017.
- I wish to make three important points.
- Firstly, from the beginning we were careful not to have opinions of our own. Council Councillors' guidance was directed to us so exactly, widely across the Parish, gather the views of the residents, and have our proposals on what we learned from them.
- From this engagement process we learned that overwhelmingly the residents of Marran were concerned to preserve the beauty of this coastal location.
- Mr. Second point is that more development was probably seen as housing development. None of us foresaw the sort of proposed part (overset by the Meadon Hotel).
- Whilst one cannot begrudge the new owners the desire to create an economically viable business, my personal view is that these are Houses, built to be physically capable of full-time living, sold on the open market as holiday homes with lease back so the hotel, and that this is not the only, or indeed the best way, of addressing the issue of business viability.
- It is worth mentioning that a separate document concerning the future of the Meadon Hotel says that the two key drivers for the developers are visitor demand and real estate value. I emphasize that second point, real estate value as it shows that this is not all about tourism.
- Mr. Third point is that it is a result of the consultation process, the draft NDP has 14 policies but what is important to understand is that one policy trumps the others.
- In the case of the Meadon Hotel's planning application one has to balance the case for business development for example, against the damage that that development may cause to the landscape and natural environment.
- In the Meadon Hotel's case there may be tourism, or employment benefits, or viability of the business in favour, but these are legal benefits to the business, and provide modest hotel employment.
- If you have other matters that suggest refusal, such as harm to the AONB, which is safeguarded nationally, then harm to a national asset outweighs any modest local benefits.
- The professional advice we have is that in the balance, the harm outweighs the benefits, and thus refusal is justified. The AONB has the highest status of protection, equivalent to a national park.
- The Cornwall AONB Unit Planning Officer says that the proposed development, with its variously conspicuous character fails to address the AONB's sensitivity and character whilst conserving and enhancing the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB and we object to it on this basis.
- The AONB Unit's comments say it will harm the AONB. Our planning consultant says the same. Parliamenters in their response to the consultants said that protecting the AONB was a high priority. I hope the Parish Council might take the same view which perhaps making allowance to support any concerns of the scheme they feel could go ahead such as a more appropriate redevelopment of Brian House and Meadon View Cottage.
- To help the Parish Council with their view I would refer them to the decision by Falmouth Town Councilors in December to recommend refusal of an application to build six holiday homes on the east of Falmouth Golf Club on the grounds that in an area of outstanding natural beauty they would have a huge impact on the countryside. Very sadly the Falmouth Packet online reported on Tuesday that the Meadon was building 10 holiday cabins. (Yahoo!)
- Finally, the statement by Blued Box planning consultants that they had "participated in the neighbourhood planning process" was true inasmuch as they submitted a lengthy report of our proposal to make the Meadon valley a Local Green Space on the grounds that it would hinder the economic viability of the hotel, to which we responded by agreeing to remove that designation but instead making the hotel and its grounds a non-designated heritage asset, to which they agreed. Any reference of other engagement with the NDP on a formal level would be false.

Thank you

20/01/22