PRESENT:

Cllr George Haywood (Chair), Cllr Michaela Linfoot (Vice-chair), Cllr Andy Cottrill, Cllr Barbara Fahey, Cllr Keith Bilston, Cllr Roger Smith.

ABSENT:

Cllr Cath Grey, Cllr Ralph Keam, Clerk to the Parish Mrs Christine Wilson and Ward Member Cllr Simon Rix.

The meeting began at 6:30 pm and the Chairman welcomed all:

16/217 Apologies

Apologies were received from CG, RK, CW and SR.

16/218 Declarations of interest or requests for dispensation

None received.

16/219 Public Session

No members of the public were present.

16/220 Planning

a) Planning correspondence, decision and enforcements

None received.

b) Applications for consultee comments

i) PA17/00618 Telecommunications Mast.

After discussion it was resolved to object to this application (proposed ML, 2nd RS) for the following reasons:

The mast is to be sited at the top of a field which currently drains down to the hamlet of Rosemelling. In wet weather, properties in this hamlet already suffer flooding problems with run off from this field. The groundworks for the mast will result in further reduction in the drainage capacity of this field generating even more run off into the hamlet exacerbating the flooding issue.

Whilst the developer has stated that ‘every effort has been made to minimise the visual impact’, it is disingenuous to suggest that it has been designed specifically for this location as this is presumably a standard mast design. Also the siting of the mast in this location will make it visible to a significant number of dwellings in Luxulyan village, and several adjoining hamlets such as Rosemelling and Treskilling; hardly what could be classed as ‘limited visual impact’ and, whilst it is appreciated that a view cannot be protected in planning, an installation on this site is not ‘preserving the character and appearance of the area’ and it is wrong to state that there will be ‘no detrimental impact upon the wider area setting’.

The installation will also be within 10 metres of a gold footpath and, whilst it is accepted that the footpath passes through a working farm, a telephone mast is hardly a farmyard sight.
The planning process does not appear to have been followed very closely in this instance. It is very disappointing that there has not been any consultation offered by the developer. To consider ‘consultation’ as sending a pre-application letter to the LPA, and not receiving any reply; and sending an email to Simon Rix, and not receiving any response is, at best, negligent. Something as important and intrusive as this surely merits true consultation – two way dialogue- with the residents.

Also, with the Standard Consultation Expiry Date of 14th February, the ‘site notice’ was not posted until the 10th of February.

This surely does not meet the legislative requirements of LPA consultation, as consultation is required with the developer to answer technical aspects of the installation.

b) Applications for consultee comments.
   ii) Applications for consideration since the posting of this Agenda.
       None received

16/221 Other matters for report
   None

16/222 Business for the next meeting
   None

16/223 Dates of next meetings. Staffing Committee 2nd March 3:30 pm and the Ordinary Meeting on 9th March, 6:30 pm, both at the Luxulyan Memorial Institute.

   The Chairman thanked everyone and the meeting closed at 7:15 pm.