



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 23 November 2017

Site visit made on 23 November 2017

by J Wilde C Eng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/17/3175637

Rosslyn, 110 Kimberley Park Road, Falmouth, Cornwall TR11 2JJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Wells (Studios Building (Falmouth) Ltd) against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA16/03586, dated 19 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is redevelopment of the former Rosslyn Hotel site for 128 managed bed spaces, ancillary accommodation and associated works, landscaping and vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 117 managed bed spaces, ancillary accommodation and associated works, landscaping and vehicular access at Rosslyn, 110 Kimberley Park Road, Falmouth, Cornwall TR11 2JJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PA16/03586, dated 19 April 2016, subject to the conditions contained within the attached schedule.

Application for costs

2. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Mr J Wells (Studios Building (Falmouth) Ltd) against Cornwall Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural matters

3. During the application process, and prior to the Council's decision, the application was amended and scaled down to 117 bed spaces and it is this latter scheme that was discussed at the Hearing and is the subject of this decision.
4. Prior to the Hearing I was supplied with a Certified Planning Obligation by Deed of Undertaking given pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (UU). This UU would mean that, on planning permission being granted, contributions would be provided to the Council to mitigate the effects of the proposed development on open space provision and on the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation. It was agreed by the main parties at the Hearing that the provision of the UU overcomes the Council's original reason for refusal No 2. I will briefly return to the UU later in this decision.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:-

- a) Whether or not the proposed development would be prejudicial to the plan led planning system with particular respect to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan and the emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Document.
- b) The effect of the proposed development, by virtue of the numbers of bed spaces proposed, on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and disturbance.

Reasons

The site

6. The Appeal site is a former hotel, now somewhat dilapidated. The site has extant planning permission for demolition of the hotel and the construction of 33 retirement apartments. Prior to the latest planning permission the site had permission for 12 residential apartments. It was confirmed at the Hearing that the site is brownfield and can be considered a windfall site. The site is within walking distance of Falmouth centre and Penmere railway station, as well as being on a bus route.

Local plan situation

7. The Council have an emerging Site Allocations Development Plan Document (eDPD). This document was submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination at the end of October 2017 and still has unresolved objections. At the Hearing both main parties accepted that this document should only be afforded limited weight in my decision, and I have been given no evidence that would lead me to a contrary view.
8. Similarly there is an emerging Falmouth Neighbourhood Plan (eNP). This was initially published in December 2016 but since then has undergone a number of revisions, some of which have been necessary to ensure that it will be in line with the eDPD. It is envisaged that the plan could be subject to a referendum in the spring of 2018. However, as it has yet to be finalised and examined by an appointed independent assessor, it can carry only limited weight in my decision, a position accepted by both main parties.
9. The adopted plan is the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (LP). Policy 3 of the LP is particularly important in assessing the proposed development. The policy makes clear that the delivery of housing in Falmouth and Penryn will be managed through the eDPD. The supporting text to the policy at paragraph 1.56 states that *in addition, the Plan seeks to ensure additional purpose built accommodation is provided for students in Falmouth and Penryn.*
10. Paragraph 2.27 of the LP acknowledges the importance of the growth of higher education in Cornwall as a significant contributor to the economy whilst accepting that this can lead to tensions between the needs of the student population and local residents. The paragraph goes on to say *in order to help redress this imbalance and provide for existing and future need, the provision of specialised student accommodation in appropriate and sustainable locations,*

in addition to meeting the needs of the local resident population, will be supported. In Falmouth and Penryn towns, and Mabe in particular, whilst there are limited opportunities, every effort should be made to deliver good quality, managed accommodation within the towns and in locations close to the university. Such provision will help to reduce the reliance on existing housing stock in the community for use by students.

11. It follows that the proposed development would accord with policy 3 and the general thrust of how students should be accommodated. I acknowledge from the evidence presented to me before the Hearing and from discussion during the Hearing that seemingly the Council is trying to re-align its strategy for student housing in Falmouth and Penryn such that all of the future accommodation would be in Penryn rather than Falmouth and Penryn. However, I have already found that the eDPD carries little weight in my decision, which must assess the proposed development against the adopted development plan.

Prematurity

12. At the Hearing a considerable amount of time was spent considering the need for the proposed student accommodation, and although this is not a main issue, it does impinge, to an extent, on the question of prematurity. I will, therefore, consider the need for the student accommodation before moving onto the actual question of prematurity.
13. There is presently a cap on the number of students allowed at the universities in Falmouth and Penryn (Falmouth University and Exeter University) of 5000 students. This cap is now to be lifted in a staged manner to 7500. The planning permission for this has been agreed by the Council subject to a Planning Obligation being completed.
14. At the Hearing it was confirmed that there are a number of sites either with planning permission or identified in the eDPD that will cater for students. At the southern end of the Penryn campus there is planning permission for 1049 bed spaces and a recent appeal decision¹ has allowed 190 bed spaces at the Ocean Bowl site. A site at Packsaddle will deliver a further 125 bed spaces.
15. The Council have identified further sites in the eDPD at Parkengue and two sites at Treliever. However, these latter sites are contained within the eDPD which I have already concluded carries little weight. Furthermore they are to an extent aspirational with land ownership difficulties.
16. Even with the Parkengue site there would still be a three figure shortfall of bed spaces. I was also given evidence at the Hearing that in some instances students are doubling up with bunk beds being provided in rooms designed for one occupant. This evidence seems to be backed up by a comment in a Housing statement prepared for the combined universities by Terence O'Rourke and dated April 2016. Paragraph 4.5 of this document mentions *the doubling up of existing rooms at Glasney Student Village*. I note that this document also indicates that the private sector is seen as a key component in delivering specialised student housing.
17. The eNP on page 30 also makes clear that unless the sites identified in the eDPD come on-stream quickly then the unmet demand for student

¹ APP/D0840/W/17/3182360

accommodation will significantly impact on the local private rental housing market.

18. I do accept and have some sympathy with the Council's position. They are trying to implement a comprehensive strategy that would enable growth at the universities and deliver the necessary student accommodation. However, the LP has a start date of 2010. It is now 2017 and the eDPD will be adopted next year at the very earliest. Meanwhile it has been demonstrated there exists a need for student accommodation now.
19. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes clear² that arguments that an application is premature are unlikely to justify a refusal for planning permission other than where it is clear that the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The PPG goes on to clarify this by saying that such circumstances are likely to be limited to situations where (a) both the development proposed is so substantial, or its cumulative effect would be so significant, that to grant permission would undermine the planning process by predetermining decisions about the scale, location or phasing of new development that are central to an emerging local or neighbourhood plan and (b) the emerging plan is at an advanced stage.
20. In this particular case, I have already concluded that the emerging plans are at a stage where they should not be afforded significant weight and furthermore, whilst I accept that there are other student accommodation applications in the pipeline, I do not consider that the cumulative scale of these is so substantial that they are central to the emerging plans. I cannot therefore accept the Council's position on the prematurity argument.

Noise and disturbance

21. The appeal site lies to the north of the junction of Kimberely Park Road and Tregenver Road, about 1km from Falmouth Town Centre. Both of these roads are relatively busy. The area is predominantly residential although there is a large doctor's surgery next door and Falmouth Hospital lies beyond that to the west. There are three houses in the immediate vicinity that have been converted to house students and are classified as houses in multiple occupation (HMO). Whilst the immediate area is residential the presence of the hospital and surgery, and the road traffic, means that it cannot be considered to be a quiet suburban backwater.
22. Noise and disturbance could be generated by the occupants of the proposed development from inside the development itself or when travelling to and from the town centre or the university, and I will consider each of these in turn.
23. The proposed accommodation would be managed with a site manager and/or paid student warden on site 24 hours per day, with a 24 hours emergency phone number. The students would have to sign a tenancy agreement that would include a specific clause relating to noise and disturbance. The Council's Environmental Health Officer, when consulted about the proposed development, confirmed that he was satisfied with the supplied noise assessment in that the proposals would deal with concerns in relation to the impact of internally generated noise and I have been given no significant evidence that would lead me to a contrary view.

² Paragraph 21b-014-20140306

24. With respect to noise and disturbance generated by students coming and going, I note concerns that the proposed scheme could turn into a local hub and that, with the existing HMO student accommodation in the immediate vicinity, there would be a heavy concentration of students within a small area. I have also taken note of anecdotal evidence regarding the general behaviour of students. However, there are powers outside of the planning system designed to deal with anti-social behaviour, and I do consider that the managed nature of the proposed scheme sets it apart from non-managed houses in multiple occupation. I also note that the Council's Environmental Health Officer considered that whilst concerns of this nature are justified, there remains the possibility that there could be little or no impact due to this issue. Overall, whilst I take the evidence presented to me at the Hearing very seriously, I do not consider it sufficient to justify dismissing the appeal.
25. Evidence was given at the Hearing relating to the concentration and behaviour of students at night within the town centre. However, I was also given evidence that students are bussed into Falmouth town centre on a regular basis, and that students tend to prefer Falmouth to Penryn. As the Council has accepted that student numbers will increase, it seems to me that it would be wrong to dismiss the appeal on the basis that students from the appeal site may cause noise and disturbance in the town centre when they would be likely to congregate there wherever they were based.

Other matters

26. The appeal site lies to the west of residential properties on Mayfield Road and concern has been expressed by some residents of that road that the proposed development would overlook their properties and would appear dominating and lead to a loss of light. However, the east elevation of the proposed building would be almost in the middle of the site, well away from properties in Mayfield Road. Furthermore the proposed building would in the main be lower than the building already given extant planning permission for retirement apartments and the windows of the upper storey would be set at an angle. Therefore, notwithstanding that the gardens of the properties in Mayfield Road are slightly lower than the appeal site, I do not consider that the living conditions of occupiers of properties in Mayfield road would be significantly harmed by the proposed development.
27. Similarly the nearest properties in Highfield Road to the north would be far enough away from the proposed development such that no significant harm would occur to the residents in terms of loss of light, overlooking or domination by the proposed built form.
28. The issue of parking was a concern for local residents. However, the tenancy agreement that the students would have to enter into would have a clause stipulating that they would not be able to have the use of a car in Falmouth. The Council have also proposed a condition requiring a parking management plan and a travel plan and I note that they had no objections to the proposed development on highway/parking grounds. I acknowledge that at the start and end of terms there may be some congestion caused by students being dropped off and picked up. However, these days would be few and far between and do not in my view justify dismissing the appeal.
29. In terms of the character and appearance I acknowledge that the proposed development would be seen effectively on the skyline when viewed from the

south. However, the proposed building would be about 1m lower than the existing hotel at the front and would have almost the same silhouette as the permitted retirement apartments. I have been given no significant evidence that would lead me to conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.

Contributions

30. The supplied UU would provide contributions to mitigate the effects of the proposed development on open space provision and on the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation. I have considered the UU in the light of the statutory tests contained in Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (CIL) and the tests at paragraph 204 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). My attention has been directed to various documents supplied by the Council that I consider justify the need for these contributions. Overall, I am satisfied that the contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, are directly related to the development and are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to it. In respect of these contributions I therefore take the UU into account in my decision.
31. The UU also includes for a contribution towards the Council's costs of consulting on and/or implementing a Traffic Regulation Order to mitigate any parking impacts of the proposed development. I have however already found that such impacts would be very limited. Furthermore no specific schemes have been put forward by the Council and their officers had no objections to the scheme on highway grounds. It follows that the contribution cannot be deemed to be necessary or directly related to the proposed scheme. For these reasons I cannot take this contribution into account in this decision.

Conditions

32. The conditions contained in the attached schedule were contained within the statement of common ground and discussed at the Hearing. To protect the living conditions of local residents during the construction process I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of a Construction and Environmental Construction Plan. In the interests of sustainability I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of a travel plan and a further one requiring the provision of cycle parking.
33. To ensure highway safety I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of a parking management plan and to ensure the safety of future residents I have imposed a condition requiring an investigation for contamination, with remedial measures to be carried out if necessary. To prevent flooding I have imposed a condition requiring the submission and approval of a surface water management plan.
34. In the interest of the appearance of the finished scheme I have imposed conditions relating to soft and hard landscaping and the external materials to be used. For certainty I have imposed a condition detailing the plans relating to the scheme. To protect the amenity of neighbouring residents I have also imposed a condition relating to the noise emitted from the finished scheme and a further one requiring the submission and approval of a management plan. The latter condition is the one suggested by the appellant as, after fully

considering the matter, I consider that the use of student wardens at night would provide the necessary level of control.

35. Finally in the interest of reducing anti-social behaviour I have imposed a condition requiring the installation of a CCTV system and in the interest of ecology I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the previous Bat surveys.

Conclusion

36. I have found that the proposed development would be in compliance with policy 3 of the LP and that any conflict with either the emerging DPD or NP carries limited weight. I have also found that the Council's argument relating to prematurity is ill-founded and that the issue of noise and disturbance is not of such magnitude as to merit dismissing the appeal. Therefore, in light of my above reasoning and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 18 months from the date of this decision.
- 2) No development shall commence (including any works of demolition, site clearance or ground works) until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include:
 - (i) Construction vehicle details (number, size and type);
 - (ii) Vehicular routes and delivery hours;
 - (iii) Means of access and parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - (iv) Loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - (v) Storage of plant and materials;
 - (vi) Location of site compound and welfare facilities;
 - (vii) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
 - (viii) Wheel washing facilities;
 - (ix) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during demolition, site clearance and construction works;
 - (x) Measures to control noise during demolition, site clearance and construction works;
 - (xi) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition, site clearance and construction works;
 - (xii) Hours of working;
 - (xiii) Management of surface water for the avoidance of pollution;
 - (xiv) Procedures to avoid pollution incidents, e.g. from fuel spills or site run-off, based on an understanding of the wildlife interest at risk (i.e. the designated sites);
 - (xv) Contingency/emergency measures for accidents and unexpected events, including pollution incidents (e.g. use of spill kits with the machinery
 - (xvi) Risk assessments of potentially ecologically damaging construction activities;
 - (xvii) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features;
 - (xviii) If necessary, the times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be present on site to oversee works;
 - (xix) Responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - (xx) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person;
 - (xxi) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved CEMP, which shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the demolition, site clearance and construction periods.

- 3) No development shall take place until a detailed Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in line with Cornwall Council guidance: 'Travel Plans - Advice for Developers in Cornwall'. No part of the new development shall be occupied prior to implementation of those parts identified in the Approved Travel Plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation. Those parts of the Approved Travel Plan that are identified therein as capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented in accordance with the approved details as long as any part of the development is occupied.
- 4) (a) The development hereby permitted shall remain in single ownership and the development shall be residentially occupied solely by persons who are students registered with and pursuing a course of full-time educational study, including graduate and post-graduate study, at any institute, college or university within Falmouth and Penryn. Such occupation shall be deemed to include any guest, partner or dependent of a student satisfying the above criteria and temporarily resident in the same unit of residential accommodation at the same time as the occupying student. The names of the occupiers of the development shall be kept on a register on site along with proof of their registration.

(b) Residential occupation shall be managed by a single management company fully in accordance with a final Management Plan to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is first occupied. The Management Plan shall include provision for either a manager or live-in student warden to be present on-site at all times over a 24 hour period while the student accommodation hereby approved is occupied.
- 5) Before the student accommodation hereby permitted is first occupied the cycle parking shown on the approved plans shall be provided in accordance with the approved details. The cycle parking shall be maintained and made available for the use of residents of the development at all times thereafter.
- 6) Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, a Parking Management Plan setting out how the parking provision serving the development will be managed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The parking shall be used strictly in accordance with the approved Parking Management Plan which shall be implemented upon first occupation of any part of the development and shall remain in force thereafter.
- 7) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras to monitor the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. The details shall include the type and number of cameras and their locations together with details of lighting to enable surveillance and details of signage appropriately located to indicate which areas are off limits to the public and that CCTV is in use. The CCTV cameras shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and brought into use before the development is first occupied.

- 8) Development other than that required to be carried out as part of an approved scheme of remediation must not commence until criteria 1 to 4 have been complied with. If unexpected contamination is found after development has begun, development must be halted on that part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination to the extent specified by the local planning authority in writing until criteria 4 has been complied with in relation to that contamination.

Criteria 1: Site Characterisation

An investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval, in writing, of the local planning authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval, in writing, of the local planning authority. The report of the findings must include:

- a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
- an assessment of the potential risks to:
 - a) human health,
 - b) property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
 - c) adjoining land,
 - d) groundwaters and surface waters,
 - e) ecological systems,
 - f) archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
- an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).
This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's

'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'.

Criteria 2: Submission of Remediation Scheme

A detailed remediation scheme to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health,

buildings and other property and the natural and historical environment must be prepared, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The scheme must include all works to be undertaken, proposed remediation objectives and remediation criteria, timetable of works and site management procedures. The scheme must ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation.

Criteria 3: Implementation of Approved Remediation Scheme

The approved remediation scheme must be carried out in accordance with its terms prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out remediation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The local planning authority must be given two weeks written notification of commencement of the remediation scheme works. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme, a verification report (sometimes referred to as a validation report) that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be produced, and is subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority.

Criteria 4: Reporting of Unexpected Contamination

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the local planning authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of criteria 1, and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with the requirements of criteria 2, which is subject to the approval, in writing, of the local planning authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority in accordance with criteria 3.

- 9) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of a scheme for the provision of foul and surface water management and treatment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The details shall include:

- a description of the foul and surface water drainage systems operation
- details of the final drainage schemes including calculations, layout, sections and percolation test results
- a Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan including the management of silt on and off site, and details of temporary surface water management arrangements
- details and the design of exceedance pathways and overland flow routes
- a timetable of construction including a plan indicating the phasing of

development

- a Construction Quality Control Procedure
- confirmation of who will maintain the drainage systems and a plan for the future maintenance and management, including responsibilities for the drainage systems and any overland flow routes
- timetable for implementation of the drainage systems

Thereafter, the approved scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the details and timetable so agreed and the scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details. Details of the maintenance schedule shall be kept up to date and be made available to the local planning authority within 28 days of the receipt of a written request.

- 10) The proposed development shall be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in section 5.1 of the Preliminary Bat and Bird Assessment, and Detailed Bat Survey Report dated 4 August 2016 and drawing numbers 957 108 and 957 109.
- 11) The rating level L_{Ar,Tr} of sound from the proposed development at the curtilage of amenity areas at Noise Sensitive Receptors should not be greater than the LA₉₀ background sound level. The rating level is to be determined in accordance with the methodology prescribed in BS 4142:2014.
- 12) No development shall commence until full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and these works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any unit hereby permitted and notice shall be given to the local planning authority when the approved scheme has been completed.

The hard landscaping details shall include:

- proposed finished ground levels or contours;
 - means of enclosure;
 - car parking layout;
 - other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
 - hard surfacing materials
 - minor artefacts and structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc.);
 - proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc.)
- 13) No development shall commence until a scheme of landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The landscaping scheme shall provide planting plans with written specifications including:

- details of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, showing any to be retained and measures for their protection to be used in the course of development;

- full schedule of plants;
- details of the mix, size, distribution and density of all trees/shrubs/hedges;
- cultivation proposals for the maintenance and management of the soft landscaping

The protection measures proposed shall be completed in accordance with the approved scheme before the development hereby permitted commences and shall thereafter be retained until it is completed. Notice shall be given to the local planning authority when the approved scheme has been completed.

All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved scheme of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Notice shall be given to the local planning authority when the approved scheme has been completed.

Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species as those originally planted.

- 14) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces (doors/windows/lintels/sills/stonework/ brickwork/roof covering and method of fixing) of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.
- 15) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
- 957-100 Rev A - Location Plan
 - DG07533-1-1 – Topographical Survey
 - 957-101 Rev C - Existing Site Context
 - 957-202 Rev A – Proposed Site and Roof Plan
 - 957-203 Rev A – Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan
 - 957-204 Rev A – Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan
 - 957-205 Rev A – Proposed First Floor Plan
 - 957-206 Rev A – Proposed Second Floor Plan
 - 957-207 Rev A – Proposed Third Floor Plan
 - 957-208 Rev B – Proposed South and East Elevations
 - 957-209 Rev B – Proposed North and West Elevations

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Stephen Whale of Counsel
Mr Adam Parsons
Mr Neil Morgan
Ms Coral Ducroq

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr James Holman
Mr Mathew Brown

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Laundon
Mr Wells
Councillor Jewell
Mr Ellis
Ms Hawkins
Mr Ellis
Mrs Boulton
Mrs Howard
Councillor Spargo
Ms Bailey
Mrs Ward
Mrs Rich
Mrs Duffield
Mr Killelay
Mr Robson
Mrs Cowan
Mr Martin
Mrs Bailey
Mr Kellett
Councillor Saunby

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Falmouth market demand report by C
- 2 Strategy text and associated documents
- 3 Falmouth Neighbourhood Plan position statement - November 2017
- 4 Open space standards
- 5 Environment and Open Spaces Working Group – Work Programme
- 6 Costs documentation
- 7 Transcript of Strategic Planning Committee 2/3/17
- 8 Minutes of Falmouth Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group 24/7/17
- 9 Statement from Councillor Saunby
- 10 Statement from Councillor Jewell

