

**St. Mellion Parish Council**  
**Extraordinary Meeting to consider Planning Application PA21/06319**  
**2<sup>nd</sup> August 2021 at St. Mellion Church Hall at 7:30 p.m.**  
**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Bridie Kent - Chair (BK); Pam Sambrook (PS); Ben Bryan (BB); Hilary Gill (HG).

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Ren Jackaman - Parish Clerk (RJ); Cllr Sharon Daw and 22 members of the public.

**1. Councillor matters:**

1.1. To receive apologies for absences:

Nick Habermehl (NH).

1.2. To receive declarations of pecuniary interests:

NH as occupant of a neighbouring property, as detailed on his Register of Interests.

1.3. To receive declarations of non-registrable interests:

None.

1.4. To approve written requests for dispensations:

None.

**2. Planning Applications:**

- **PA21/06319 Messers Zachariah, Bryan Jnr And Bryan Snr Hammond**  
*Outline Planning for the construction of two dwellings with all matters reserved - Land West Of The Laurels St Mellion PL12 6RG*

**BK opened the floor to the public for comment.**

Bryan Hammond (the applicant): owns the field with family, this is the second application, the first having been refused. The issue of whether the development would constitute rounding off is something Mr. Hammond has explored extensively with several planning officers and the Ward Councillor and has been assured that the site does represent rounding off. The Case Officer does not agree.

The public present met the above comments with general agreement. Mr. Hammond, was given praise by many of those present, as an asset to the parish, being an active member of the community, a good neighbour and having made many contributions to the parish in terms of volunteer work.

The issue of the site as surrounded by Open Countryside was likewise questioned, since the bordering of the site is houses, a road and the Golf Course, which is not perceived as open countryside by most parishioners.

Cllr Sharon Daw also asserted that this development should be considered rounding off.

One person present agreed with the praise of Mr. Hammond but stated that the land in question is agricultural land and therefore not suitable for development, further that the site has been changed considerably by the applicant in advance of the development without any permissions being given and that the issue of rounding off should be the domain of the case officer to decide.

Cllr Sharon Daw asserted that this development would be valid as a Rural Exception Site. The possibility and importance of providing accommodation for local people was stressed.

A person who had previously looked at buying the same plot, indicated that it was confirmed as not being agricultural land at the time they looked to purchasing it.

Praise was also given to the quality and design of Mr. Hammond's earlier development on Dunstan Lane.

**The floor was closed to public comment.**

BK opened the council discussion of the application by giving background from the documents released onto the Planning Register and the relevant sections of the Cornwall Local Plan. The definition of the rounding off from the planning guidance was also given.

It was noted that:

- The site has been identified as a potential Rural Exception Site for affordable housing.
- The site was confirmed as not previously part of the golf course or owned by Crown Golf or any other management or owners of the St. Mellion Hotel & Country Club. The Case Officer has incorrectly identified the plot as formerly part of the Golf Club land, which it is not and never has been.
- In the supporting statement and the design statement it is declared that the site is adjacent to but not inside the existing parish boundary, therefore this development would be pushing the boundary further than it currently stands.
- The proposed development consists of two houses and is therefore considered 'small' but the plot is considerably larger than the footprint; it is feared this could lead to a 'creep' of development on either the plot itself or the empty plot on the opposite side of the road.
- The advice note of the Chief Planning Officer for Cornwall has a set of criteria to establish rounding off, these were considered in turn:
  - ❖ 'Formal Village Boundaries', the village has no formal boundaries recorded, so it is difficult to consider the development as falling outside of a boundary, any judgement on this would therefore have to be speculative in nature.
  - ❖ The site should be enclosed by long standing boundaries, the site is bounded by enclosed by ancient Cornish Hedges and a road.
  - ❖ It must have the appearance of being within the physical footprint of the village, which councillors who have visited the site confirmed that when viewed from the site itself, is the case.
  - ❖ 'Existing Development' it was asserted that the Golf Club has changed the topography of the site, created buggy paths and greens, this should be considered 'development' if not 'built development'.
  - ❖ The site is bounded by existing houses, though one set is across the road.
- The site was originally one field, part of which was incorporated into the Golf Club, a section of the same field had the neighbouring houses built upon it and the remainder forms this plot. It is a natural assumption that it could have been developed at the same time the other houses but for some reason was not.
- If considered in a retrospective view or past classification and use of the land, there is an argument for refusal but looking forward rather than back, it is difficult to see what other use could the land be put to? In this light, the development can be viewed positively.
- It was argued that potential for adverse future development could be guarded against if this development is supported.
- The proposed development is for two houses with relatively little impact and suitable for family dwellings is considered a positive.

It was not without reservations that the council proceeded to vote, it being an finely balanced case to determine, with valid arguments for both a positive and negative outcome.

It was proposed by HG that application PA21/06319 be supported, this was seconded by BB, votes in favour three, one against.

**BK closed the meeting at 8:28 p.m.**