

DRAFT MINUTES

At a future meeting the council will consider the accuracy of these minutes, so they may be subject to change. Please check the minutes to that meeting to confirm whether or not they have been amended

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF FOWEY TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD IN PAVILION HOUSE, FOWEY ON MONDAY 9th FEBRUARY 2026 AT 5.00pm

Present Cllr Mrs F Day, Cllr A Dellow, Cllr Mrs L Simms (*ex officio*)

In Attendance The Town Clerk, Sally Vincent
9 members of the public (part)

25/82 Apologies Cllr C Gibbon (Chairman)

In the absence of the Chairman, Cllr Gibbon, it was proposed by Cllr Simms, seconded Cllr Day and RESOLVED that Cllr Dellow should take the Chair for this meeting.

25/83 Declaration of Interests

Pecuniary – None

Non Registerable – None

Dispensations – None

25/84 Public Participation & Questions

A spokesman representing objectors to PA26/00121 outlined their concerns to the meeting. These included:

- This is not an infill site, it is Backland Development
- The application is in conflict with the Fowey NDP and the Cornwall Local Plan
- There would be unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties
- The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site
- The proposed access onto Lantic Road crosses land potentially being transferred to the Duchy of Cornwall and no legal right of access over it has been demonstrated
- The land potentially accommodating the access route was previously identified as an uninterrupted corridor for bats and wildlife, as set out in the EIA for application PA18/03857.
- The proposal would result in unacceptable harm to character, residential amenity, highway safety and ecological interests.

25/85 Minutes of the Meeting held on 14th January 2026

It was proposed by Cllr Day seconded Cllr Simms and RESOLVED that the minutes be confirmed and be signed by the Chairman.

25/86 Matters Arising not on the Agenda (for report only)

None

25/87 Planning Applications

1. PA26/00121. Application for permission in principle for up to three dwellings (minimum of 1 and maximum of 3). Land west of Carnethic Stables, Lantic Road, PL23 1HQ. It was proposed by Cllr Simms, seconded Cllr Day and RESOLVED that a recommendation of objection should be made to Cornwall Council. *Reason: The drawings indicate three houses on the plot. This constitutes an overdevelopment when compared with similar developments in the gardens of houses in Lankelly Lane. Three houses would almost certainly overbear on the immediate neighbouring properties with resultant loss of privacy and overlooking.*

The site is in the immediate vicinity of a bat-house which was located to satisfy the findings in a site survey commissioned by Westcountry Land prior to the development on an adjacent site. This survey recommended, inter alia, 'Identify key areas for bats, retain these habitats where possible' and 'provide mitigation for loss of roosting site in the form of a "bus shelter" or similar type construction.' A survey of the existing orchard may also establish other wildlife that would also be affected. This questions the sustainability of the development.

The land is understood to be Backland Development and not Infill as stated on the application. Should this be the case the application should be considered in that context. It is noted that the applicant does not own the proposed access route from Lantic Road, the proposed development is on land historically part of the domestic gardens and orchard of Lindisfarne and Trekesten. Both properties access on to Lankelly Lane only.

In addressing the specific questions relevant to an application for planning in principle we would comment as follows:-

1. Is the site well located in relation to existing settlements and infrastructure – is it a sustainable location?

The proposal appears to be a Backland Development located between Lankelly Lane and Lantic Road. The implications of Backland Development should be fully understood before granting Permission in Principle.

It is surrounded by residential development on all sides.

As mentioned in the submitted planning application document, the development site is adjacent main roads, bus routes, schools and access to local shops and amenities. In these regards the site could be considered sustainable.

Notwithstanding the above - it is noted there is an existing bat house in the vicinity of the proposed development land. In the absence of a bat survey, or other ecological surveys to support the proposal, the implications of the proposal is not considered sustainable.

2. Would the development of the site result in such significant harm to the character of an area or the setting of a designated heritage asset or landscape that could not be mitigated?

The proposed development of residential property on the site could be undertaken with respect to the character of existing setting, subject to appropriate density of development being considered. It is however considered that three houses would constitute an overdevelopment.

3. Is the proposed use (typically residential) compatible with neighbouring uses? All surrounding development is residential.

4. If non-residential elements are proposed, are these compatible with the residential element and surrounding land uses?

Not applicable

5. *Is it likely that a number of dwellings within the proposed range could be accommodated on the site?*

The number of dwellings (minimum 1 maximum 3) could physically be accommodated on the site. However, it is considered that three houses would constitute an overdevelopment of the site leading to loss of privacy and overlooking of neighbouring properties.

6. *Would the number of dwellings proposed be in keeping with the density and pattern of development within the immediate setting?*

The density of development with three houses on this site would be greater than other developments to rear of properties on north side of Lankelly Lane and would be considered an overdevelopment of the site.

7. *Would the scale of development make efficient use of land?*

The term 'efficient use of land' in the context of this development is not considered applicable. The number of houses that could theoretically be built does not align in any way with what would be considered an appropriate development to respect the immediate neighbouring dwellings.

2. PA26/00047. Demolition of attached conservatory and garage. Extension and alterations to existing detached single dwelling bungalow. 8, Saffron Close, PL23 1EU. It was proposed by Cllr Dellow, seconded Cllr Simms and RESOLVED that a recommendation of no objection should be made to Cornwall Council.

3. PA26/00288. Works to trees under a Tree Preservation Order, namely 1) Monterey Pine (1) – fell to ground level, due to unsustainable damage to roots, Fowey Hall site. 2) Monterey Pine (2) – fell to ground level, due to significant damage to tree, Fowey Hall site. Both to be replaced with replant with amenity tree, as suggested in previous referrals. Fowey Hall, Hanson Drive, PL23 1ET. Cllr Day confirmed that the Monterey Pines at Fowey Hall were reaching the end of their lives and some were badly damaged. The Tree Officer had raised no objection to the application and it was pleasing that replacement trees would be planted and monitored. It was proposed by Cllr Day, seconded Cllr Simms and RESOLVED that a recommendation of no objection should be made to Cornwall Council.

25/88 Notice of Appeals

None.

25/89 Correspondence

None.

25/90 Breaches of Planning Regulations

None.

Meeting Closed 6.00pm

Date of Next Meeting 18th February 2026