

Planning Decision Tencreek Farm Explainer

4 min read

At their public meeting held on 18 April 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

Full planning for the erection of 202 dwellings and associated works.
Land At Tencreek Farm Plymouth Road Liskeard Cornwall PL14 3PS

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

1.0 The written description of this application registered under number PA22/03642 has been changed from a hybrid (part detail, part outline) to Full planning following revised plans being submitted showing the deletion of self build plots. The application is being treated as a new application for the purpose of consultation and in considering the application of policies.

2.0 **The application is not supported for the following reasons:**

- The housing need justification does not reflect current community needs in accordance with the Menheniot Neighbourhood Development Plan. Policy 4.
- The submission does not demonstrate that the present infrastructure can cope with additional housing particularly as regards traffic impact.

2.1 Further comment

The Design and Access statement revised in March 2024 justifies the application as bringing forward the outline approval of 2015 and with reference to CLP 2a 3 4 and Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4 because 'it will reduce pressure on development of other less ideal sites'. There is no demonstration of identified current need of units numerically or the mix of housing reflecting the '**community needs current at the time of application**'. This is important as Policy 4 recognises that over time needs change. This is demonstrated by the current Cornwall Council Homechoice housing need figures for Menheniot and Liskeard compared to when the 2015 application was approved and the Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan and Liskeard Neighbourhood Plan adopted. For illustration an increase in requirements registered in Menheniot from 19 to over 60 and in Liskeard to over 600.

2.2 Policy 4 supported by Cornwall Local Plan Policy 2a asked for specialised housing and extra care units to be considered. In discussion with Cornwall Council previously, this provision was expected to be met by the disposal of Luxestowe House for such use. Currently this is on the open market and therefore potentially not able to meet the need.

2.3 The land supply for Cornwall at 6.5 years to 2030 now removes the presumption to approve and therefore the application may be refused. The Community Area Partnership

housing provision for the Liskeard and Looe area based on 2023 figures show at present 17 unit shortfall. Windfall sites over the next 7 years will undoubtedly exceed the original target. The overall requirement for the county is already being exceeded.

2.4 The specific community needs show that **appropriate** affordable/rentable and social housing must be considered together with the provision for extra care accommodation.

Reference is made to the building out of the residential element in accordance with the indicative "masterplan" of 2015. As the outline application with illustrative masterplan is no longer extant here is **no** masterplan justified for this development site as referred to in Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4.2.

3.0 Furthermore the impact on infrastructure is not addressed in particular on traffic and congestion at peak times and lack of social infrastructure for health facilities in particular. Cornwall's decision not to apply a requirement for full Community Infrastructure Levy contributions further exacerbates the pressures on social infrastructure.

3.1 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.

3.2 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 which is not characteristic of the area. 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. The impact of transversing retaining structures and hedges may have been reduced but still emphasise the lateral nature of the layout. These new structures may still affect natural surveillance benefits that 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.

4.1 Comment

Integration of public transport has not been provided to meet Menheniot Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4. In the absence of an approved and adopted Master Plan that is phased and linked to a Section 106 agreement there is no circulatory routes to serve the development.

5.0 There is no focussed central social space for social interaction the development that includes a shop, social space etc. The play space at the edge of the site and 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.

6.1 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 to serve the entire development has not been proposed to take into account, extraction and interaction between disposal systems proposed. A comprehensive flood and pollution risk assessment is required.

7.1 Comment

The surface water from the site 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 require assessment. Retention ponds in the public open space should be referred to RosPA for consultation on safety. The retention ponds for the surface water albeit considerable distance from the development would also benefit for a review at the same time. The proposed system serves only this application

A flood risk assessment is required to demonstrate the impact on down stream flooding from the River Seaton

8.0 Night Skies (Policy 10) has not been demonstrated as regards preventing light pollution causing a statutory nuisance to adjoining sites.

9.0 Secure by design principles not demonstrated.

9.1 Comment

Comments from Police still show concern, which the parish council share, in particular whilst there is some natural surveillance of the children's play area during day light in that location after dark it will be a secluded area for youths to congregate. The opportunity for anti social behaviour will increase if adjacent development (fast food outlet) with access is built out.

10.0 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.

Author: Cllr Adrian Cole
Published 22/4/24