



Grampound with Creed Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

HELD IN THE TOWN HALL, ON

TUESDAY, 10th DECEMBER 2019 @ 7.30 pm

Present: Cllr. Taylor (Chair)
Cllr. Wells

Cllr. Miss James

Cllr. Mrs Turner

	<p>In the absence of Cllr. McGuinness, Cllr Taylor was elected to the Chair.</p> <p><u>Chairman's Welcome / Public Forum</u> – Members of the Public were welcomed. Mr Darran Goldby (a Ladock PC resident and close neighbour of the PA19/09765 application) addressed the Committee regarding that application.</p>	
PL35/2019	<p><u>Apologies</u> – Cllr. McGuinness</p>	
PL36/2019	<p><u>Members' Interests</u> –</p> <p>a. <i>Pecuniary/Registerable Declarations of Interests</i> – none.</p> <p>b. <i>Non-Pecuniary/Disclosable Interests</i> – none.</p> <p>c. <i>Declaration of Gifts</i> – none.</p>	
PL37/2019	<p><u>Planning Applications</u> –</p> <p>a. <i>PA19/09765, Tredinnick Quarry, Grampound Road</i> – existing permission title – an aggregates recycling facility within the existing quarry void; the infilling of void with quarry wastes and other imported inert materials to provide site restoration; proposed quarry extension, and new access road and ancillary works – Planning Ref CC/CK/03/00354/WAS [CK41(5)] dated 22.02.2005. Permission expires 31.03.2020.</p> <p>For clarity, the current application is made under Section 73A seeking for variation/ amendment/ deletion (as appropriate) in respect of Condition Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 22, 26, 28, 29, 33, 34, 35, 36 as explained in the Supporting Statement and document titled Proposed Amendments to Planning Conditions. For example: Condition No.2 specifies the current end date of 31.03.2020 and it is proposed to extend this to 31.03.2030 etc. Refer to the documents for full details of the other proposed changes.</p> <p>Cllr. Taylor commented that he had several issues with the renewal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. An application for new properties a short distance from the quarry was recently granted and building had commenced. This must surely have been approved on the basis that the quarry was dormant as these properties would be far too close if the quarry was active. ii. There had been ample opportunity available to extract useable minerals within the lifetime of the original agreement, which had not been taken and there is therefore no justification for an extension. iii. Re-instatement was supposed to be completed within the terms of the original agreement i.e. by 2020, and no comments had been made as to why this hadn't been even attempted. iv. Disposal of Japanese Knotweed had, reportedly, already taken place. Bringing this Bio-hazardous material so close to the Fal waterway, in particular, is alarming. <p>Cllr. Turner also commented that there appear to be numerous regulations flouted by the operators of the quarry and agreed that there are various properties too close. The other Members agreed with the comments made.</p>	

