

## Planning Decision Tencreek Farm

At their public meeting held on 22 February 2024, councillors agreed the parish council's response to this planning application for the development site at Tencreek Farm. The parish council's decision and reasoning is advisory and the final decision on the application will be made by Cornwall Council's Planning Officers.

*If you have comments to make on any aspect of the application, please post your comments on Cornwall Council's Planning Portal. Search online for 'Cornwall online planning register'*

### PA22/03642

#### **Proposal Full planning for the erection of 202 dwellings and associated works**

Location Land At Tencreek Farm Plymouth Road Liskeard.

It was **Resolved not to support** this application. Proposed Cllr Easterbrook. Seconded Cllr Cole. All agreed. Councillors noted these material concerns arising from the Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan.

1.0 The housing needs justification does not reflect current community needs or demonstrate that the present infrastructure can cope with additional housing particularly as regards traffic impact.

#### Comment

The revised Design and Access statement justifies the application as bringing forward the outline approval of 2015 and with reference to Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4 that 'it will reduce pressure on development of other less ideal sites'. There is no demonstration of identified need of units generally or the mix reflecting '*community needs current at the time of application*'

2.0 The land supply for Cornwall at 6.5 years to 2030 now removes the presumption to approve and therefore the application may be refused. Though the specific community needs require that affordable/rentable housing must be considered together with the release of further land for employment. The impact on infrastructure not addressed in particular on traffic and congestion at peak times and lack of social infrastructure for health facilities in particular. Cornwall Council's decision not to apply a requirement for full CIL contributions further exacerbates the pressures on social infrastructure.

3.0 The new layout of the housing estate, its linkages, open spaces and architecture do not demonstrate an understanding of the site location and surrounding landscape.

#### Comment

There has been some slight amendments to the site layout but the 3 storey houses, long cul de sacs and long street parking areas remain. Approximately 25% of the plots now have decking added to the rear which is not a typical feature locally due to the rural nature of the area and the likelihood of attracting rats. Significant new features of transversing retaining structures and hedges have been introduced that change the undulating character and emphasise the lateral nature of the layout. These new structures affect natural surveillance benefits to aid security.

4.0 Integration of public transport within the community particularly to support any area of social focus or maximise accessibility to the service has not been delivered.

#### Comment

Integration of public transport has not been improved.

5.0 There is no focussed social space and play equipment indicated to be provided is for pre-school age with no facility for older children.

6.0 The absence of a gateway landmark building has a significant impact on the identity of the development area.

Comment

The arrival into the development is low key, suburban and weak and fails to make a statement that you are entering into a new neighbourhood with a distinctive character as set out in Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4.

7.0 An integrated sustainable surface water scheme has not been proposed to take into account, extraction and interaction between disposal systems proposed.

Comment

Retention ponds in the public open space now shown to serve a sewage treatment facility with an outfall to a stream. This should be referred to RosPA for consultation on safety. The retention ponds for the southwest albeit considerable distance from the development would also benefit for a review at the same time. A comprehensive flood and pollution risk assessment is required now that all of the water discharge from the site (foul and surface) will discharge into the River Seaton directly or via natural water courses. In particular peak flow rates, the sub soil hydrology and the impact from adjoining sites and filtration of micro plastics at outfalls.

8.0 Bus route access into the development utilising a circulatory connection will only occur on completion of next phases of development.

9.0 There is no public space to act as a focus for social interaction across the development that includes a shop, social space etc.

10.0 Policy 10 (of the Menheniot Plan) Night Skies has not been demonstrated as regards preventing light pollution causing a statutory nuisance to adjoining sites.

11.0 Secure by design principles not demonstrated.

Comment

Further comments from Police still show concern which the parish council shares. In particular, whilst there is some natural surveillance of the children's play area during daylight in that location, after dark it will be a secluded with the potential for anti-social behaviour if the adjacent development of a fast food outlet (with access) is built out.

12.0 The Air Quality Assessment appears to be based on lower numbers of vehicle movements than the transport assessment submitted. Concern that the impact on air quality will be greater than that shown.

Published 26/2/24