

PROJECT: Pendower Beach Hotel Regeneration,
Rocky Lane Ruan High Lanes Truro Cornwall TR2 5LW.

PROJECT NO: 111/4.13,

VENUE: Pilleigh Parish Hall

DATE: 31.01.2023, 2.30pm

MEETING:

Minutes taken by Gary Wyatt, Koha Architects.

PRESENT:

Graham Sylvester (GS) – PPC Chair
 Rob Wing (RW) – PPC Vice-Chair
 David Spreadborough (DS) – NDP Representative
 Derek Julyan (DJulyan) – member
 Nick Harris (NH) – Planning Committee
 Johnny Goldsmith (JG) – PBHH Ltd.
 Gary Wyatt (GW) – Koha Architects Ltd.
 Derek Jackson (DJ) - Koha Architects Ltd.
 Russell Dodge (RD) - Building Location Services, (Planning Consultant)
 Mathew Davey (MD) – G E Consulting (Ecologist)

c.c.

Patricia & Michael Hawes – Mei Loci (Landscape Architect)

REF	MINUTE	ACTION
	<p>Purpose of the meeting: to present the revised design and make comparisons with the withdrawn application design and existing. To welcome an open discussion based upon the agenda in the attached document.</p>	
1.0	Welcome	
1.1	GW welcomed the attendees to the presentation and thanked the Parish for the opportunity to present the revised design	
1.2	GW noted that some time had passed since the last consultation but in the background Koha Architects have remained in contact with Cornwall Council and key consultants to develop revised proposals	
2.0	Overview	
	GW presented the facts around the existing site, the Planning application submitted in 2020, and then withdrawn, and a subsequent Pre-Application to obtain Council comments on the 6no. options submitted. Of all the options the Council confirmed that they would be most inclined to support the scheme with the least amount of development. The revised proposals closely match the planners' preferred option in terms of development amount and footprint	
2.1	GW identified the key points being <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the change to 100% Hotel Use on site (except for existing dwellings on site for owner and staff) - Increase in hotel size from existing 13no. bed hotel (22 beds in total including owner and staff accommodation) to 23no. family suites (2 bedroom). 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GW noted that advice from Savills (Exeter) where their Hotel specialists are located, was that the revised Hotel was suitably sized to meet demand and make for a viable business model - A reduction of 908m² (GIA) of development and a significant reduction in built footprint of over 23%. - Removal of buildings from the northern half of the site. - Removal of the northern car park on the separate land title. 	
2.2	JG commented that there is another person that owns this Northern Land title. JG thought that PBHH owned the land as the Hotel used it and it was sold with the land however it transpired that the title was with others. The parcel is land-locked so of no real use to others. Also located within wet-woodland area so highly protected part of the site.	
2.3	DJ advised that there was an existing residential dwelling that was used by the hotel owner and a dwelling used for staff accommodation as well as a permission for an additional dwelling for staff and management accommodation sited where the now demolished store once was.	
2.4	Slide 4 of the presentation identifies existing hard-standing areas which incorporated a car park as shown in the historic aerial photos submitted previously	
2.5	D Julyan commented that the upper plateau was made up ground and not likely to be properly compacted. DJ responded that there is an existing retaining wall that runs along the length of the upper plateau. The design team are aware of the made up ground, trial pits and soil samples have been taken across the site as part of a soil & ground survey and this has been factored in to the design proposals.	
3.0	Introduction of Revised Plans	
3.1	GW presented the revised plan and noted the following in relation to Slide 7:	
3.2	The existing farmhouse is retained and extended in height as per 2020 design	
3.3	None of the proposed building heights exceed the highest existing ridge	
3.4	All existing buildings are proposed to be demolished except for the Farmhouse as per previous proposals	
3.5	Buildings adjacent to the original farmhouse are of a poor quality and are of minimal architectural or archaeological merit. The farmhouse roof has been relatively recently replaced.	
3.6	To upgrade the existing fabric to be suitable for a modern hotel and to meet current Building regulations standards would be cost-prohibitive and impose serious spatial limitations on the design	
3.7	The northern hotel wing has been slightly amended from the 2020 version however the massing of the building remains very similar.	
3.8	A single storey, low level building is proposed in the location of the existing modern conservatory adjacent to the gable end of the farmhouse. The edge of this building runs over into the likely zone of anticipated coastal erosion so this needs to be investigated with the Geotechnical engineers and may require a slight amendment to the external profile to avoid this.	
3.9	Site access remains in the same location as previous at the base of Rocky lane as shown.	
3.10	Improvements to Rocky Lane remain within these proposals paid for by the developer. DJ confirmed that the upper slope (adjacent to Rocky Lane in the location of the proposed road stabilisation) contains a sliver of land that is un-registered but once belonged to the Gamble family who gifted some of their land (south of Rocky Lane) to the National Trust. This land is not registered and in dispute. PBHH legal advice is that the land can be used for cliff stabilisation and access during construction.	

3.11	GW confirmed that proposed building locations are very limited by visual impact, ecological sensitivity as advised by Green Ecology, Cornwall Wildlife Boundary and coastal erosion. Alternative building positions and orientations are severely limited.	
3.12	The design is still based around traditional granite stone buildings and pitched slate roofs found locally. These materials recess into the landscaped surroundings. The continuous stone buildings are punctuated by small areas of flat green roofs and rendered walls as well as metal clad dormers. GW referred to the many hamlets studied and included in the Design and Access Statement submitted with the 2020 Planning application	
3.13	Transparency of the development is maintained by the gaps between buildings where small courtyards and pocket parking areas are located.	
3.14	The main car park is located on the upper plateau at the base of the main hill on the north-western part of the site. The car park is concealed behind a long Cornish hedge from the SW coast path views whilst increasing Bio-diversity.	
3.15	Bio-diversity targets will be surpassed with the revised scheme. A purpose-built bat building is located at the northern end of the site. This will also contain some gardening equipment to maintain the grounds. A turning circle is provided adjacent to this.	
3.16	The development is contained by an implied line between the two large significant trees at the centre of the site with one tree being located on the upper hillside and the other in the valley area and referred to as tree T15	
3.17	These proposals relate to a self-catered family oriented hotel that in terms of target market will not compete directly with the Nare Hotel. JG commented that the Nare Hotel tends to focus on an older market which operates on a silver-service basis and not the self-catered model.	
3.18	GW explained that this hotel will not require the staffing levels of the Nare Hotel which will take the pressure off car parking provisions. 63no. car parking spaces are proposed with 23 of those being required for the hotel guests (23no. keyed family suites). 40no. car parking spaces will be available for staff and restaurant visitors.	
3.19	Slide 8 illustrates the removal of the former northern car park that was submitted in the 2020 Planning application.	
3.20	Slide 9 indicates that there are no proposed buildings in the northern half of the site.	
4.0	Green Infrastructure	
4.1	GW outlined the proposals for renewable low carbon energy as well as site improvements and ecological benefits.	
4.2	Significant job creation both during construction and in operation. GW expressed the desire to use local tradespersons and take advantage of the local supply chain out of Truro and St. Austell.	
4.3	Stone would be local Cornish stone with granite from local quarries (Mabe was suggested for dressed granite such as Trenoweth or Chywoon) and Devonian sandstone for the coursed rubble 'freestone' areas sourced from the likes of Tredinnick Quarry in Grampound.	
4.4	One concern raised was staff parking with the Nare Hotel employing circa 90no. staff. GW responded that there could be a mini-bus pick up scenario from the main bus stops on the main road A3078. There could also be e bikes made available by the hotel for staff but this would be down to the hotel operator to confirm. It was felt that 40no. parking spaces for staff and restaurant visitors would be ample. The level of staffing for this type of self-catering hotel however would be significantly less than a traditional style hotel like The Nare.	
5.0	Comparison to Previous Plans	

	Public restaurant and Lower ground Floor	
5.1	A revised location for the restaurant was presented. The purpose of the relocation was to improve public / private separation . However GW commented that the perceived loss of courtyard space for the public could be an issue. The courtyard acts as a welcoming space when approaching from Rocky Lane.	
5.2	Slide no. 12 was tabled showing a blue area for the restaurant which was to include an allowance for staff accommodation as well as ancillary facilities such as kitchen and wc's	
5.3	There could be provision for an east-facing terrace outside of the restaurant with some sea views.	
5.4	Slides 123-16 incl. are from the SW coastpath. The existing photo is shown and then comparisons can be made to the 2020 submission. Visual impact of the proposals are significantly reduced with the omission of buildings in the northern half of the site. RW requested that the existing photo be included in the presentation in order to make an informed comparison of the changes.	
5.5	Slides 17 and 18 show the previous 2020 image compared with the revised proposals as seen from the valley wet woodland area. A considerable reduction in building bulk reduces the impact of the development.	
5.6	Slides 20 and 21 illustrate the existing and proposed views. The notable changes being the reduction in height to the height to the southern building ridge height and the slight increase in the height of the farmhouse roof	
5.7	Slides 22 and 23 show the existing hotel entrance and rear access lane compared with proposed. (existing and proposed photos are only an approximate match). Use of local stone and slate with some limited areas of render to break up the continuous stonework. GW explained that large expanses of two-storey timber claddings have been avoided as this is not typical nor traditional on the Roseland Peninsular. Metal claddings have been removed. Passive control of vehicle speeds via material selections, a palette of hard and soft landscaping softens the built form and provides legibility and definition to outside spaces.	
5.8	Slides 24 and 25 make the comparison between existing and proposed with the southern wing recessing further back and being a lower building form than existing lessens the impact of the development when seen from the beach. The stone walls and slate roofs help the development recede in comparison with the rendered walls which stand forward of the green surrounds. The existing farmhouse is given significance in the proposals as the only white rendered building in view from the beach.	
5.9	Slides 26 and 27 indicate views from the proposed car park looking back at the development (photos are not an exact match but give an impression of change). DJ emphasised that full CGI images will be provided as part of the planning application, however the proposed views are generated from an accurate 3D model used to generate and locate building forms on the site. Parking areas are broken up with planting bays and surfacing varies from compacted pea gravel to block paving / cobblestones. Overhead power cables running over the site will be concealed below ground.	
5.10	Slides 28 & 29 are taken from the slipway and illustrate how the proposed southern wing recesses compared with existing. The roof height is also reduced which reduces the impact of the development compared with existing which presents a strong two-storey façade at the edge of Rocky Lane	
6.0	Parish Council Feedback – Q&A	

6.1	<p>Restaurant location</p> <p>GS expressed concerns with the change in location and the loss of courtyard for public use. There needs to be a quantum of outdoor seating for the restaurant to be a success. Circulation to be further explained in terms of deliveries and back of house provisions.</p> <p>Response – GW agreed that the courtyard currently acts as a welcoming space for visitors as they approach from Rocky Lane. Any alternative restaurant location would need to address this, in terms of impact and loss of outdoor seating area.</p> <p>Deliveries would be via a designated lift in the south-west corner of the restaurant area as shown on slide 12. GW commented that staff accommodation would be best located at the southern end of this wing at restaurant level. Koha Architects will explore options for the restaurant and staff</p>	Koha
6.2	<p>Bats</p> <p>D Julyan expressed concerns over the provisions made for bats in the proposals and whether there would be increased risk of diseases being transmitted.</p> <p>Response by MD – Bats do not present a disease risk unless they are being eaten. The bat building provides ideal conditions for bats to thrive and safeguards the existing bat activity on site.</p>	
6.3	<p>Material & repetition</p> <p>DS expressed concerns particularly with the view from the slipway with regard to the number of arched heads to the windows and whether this looked too modern and 'north coast' for Pendower. Excessive repetition should be avoided</p> <p>Response by GW – a more random arrangement of window size and location will be looked at in the revised elevations</p>	
6.4	<p>Future Expansion</p> <p>NH – Assurances are required with regards to avoiding the need for future expansion</p> <p>Response by GW – There are so many existing constraints on the site as well as visual impact limitations from key views that there is no real scope for any expansion beyond minor changes to building outlines which may increase or reduce slightly to suit the function / circumstances. DJ noted the previous submission had far more development but had to be withdrawn due to site constraints and amount of development as highlighted as part of the planning process.</p>	
6.5	<p>Business Model</p> <p>NH – What is the likely success of the Business model in terms of the hotel size?</p> <p>Response by GW – Savills Hotel Consultant has confirmed that this size of hotel is best suited for its location and responds to market needs following assessment of holiday demands. The provision of a new café / restaurant will provide employment opportunities and revenue generation with what will be the supply of locally sourced produce. It may operate as a café by day with a more formal set up in the evening.</p>	
7.0	<p>Community Event</p>	
7.1	<p>DJ confirmed that following the Parish Council meetings (Veryan and Gerrans to follow) that a public event has been planned in early spring. This will be an opportunity for the public to express views prior to a planning submission in April / May or thereafter.</p>	

7.2	Possible beach clean and BBQ event to generate interest from a broad cross-section of the public.	
8.0	Next Steps – Planning, EIA and Programme	
8.1	The revised proposals have been confirmed (via Screening opinion) as requiring an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). We currently await a Scoping Opinion to determine the Council expectations in terms of chapter content.	
8.2	An EIA planning application requires 16 weeks to process in terms of statutory timeframe and therefore determination of the application is anticipated to be achieved in autumn / winter of this year	
	END	