



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2020

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/20/3245623

Stables, Tolgus Place, Redruth TR15 1BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daren Cocking against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA19/06259, dated 17 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as '*outline planning consent for the construction of dwelling with some matters reserved, except the point of access*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application was submitted in outline with all matters aside from access reserved. I assessed the appeal as such, having regard to drawing Refs 18388-PL-00-01 C and 18388-PL-00-04 A on an indicative basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the suitability of the site for a dwelling, having regard to local and national policy for the location of housing.

Reasons

4. The site is a tree and vegetation bound field with, at its south east extent, structures currently being remodelled to establish a cattery, associated areas of hardstanding, and a temporary mobile home¹. It is at the edge of Redruth, the main urban form of which is on the other side of the A3074, which bounds the site to the east. Access is via a stone and timber gateway from the south, off a spur road which connects the A3074 to the B3300, which runs to the west. As the B3300 travels south it passes under the A3074, providing vehicular and pedestrian access to a nearby supermarket within Redruth. A Public Right of Way (the PROW) runs along the north site boundary, with fields beyond.
5. Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010–2030 (adopted 2016) (CLP) establishes a hierarchy of locations for development in Cornwall. In the first instance, development is directed to seventeen named locations, where it is to be distributed through either Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDP) or the Cornwall Site Allocations Development Plan Document (adopted 2019) (CSA). The site is within one such location, named 'Camborne with Pool, Illogan and Redruth' (the CPIR). The site is not within the area of a made NDP.

¹ Granted planning permission under Ref PA16/00744

6. Policy 1 of the CSA states that windfall housing within the named locations will be delivered either through existing sites with planning permission, infill schemes or small scale 'rounding off' schemes that do not physically extend development into the open countryside. Support is also offered to proposals which reuse Previously Developed Land (PDL) within or adjoining settlements.
7. Although the appeal site is close to the urban form of Redruth, the A3074 and its substantial boundary vegetation intervene to visually and physically separate the site from the town. Whilst there is housing along the adjacent section of the B3300, these dwellings are similarly detached from Redruth by the A3047. They appear set in a somewhat loose and straggled manner, and it is the dense roadside greenery which predominates the scene. Given such, the site is not within or adjoining the settlement in my view. The scheme would not, therefore, constitute infill nor the rounding off of Redruth, resulting instead in the physical extension of development into the open countryside.
8. It flows from this that the scheme falls for consideration under Policy 7 of the CLP, which seeks to avoid new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. There is no evidence before me that any of the circumstances within Policy 7 would apply in this case. Policy 21 of the CLP amongst other things, encourages sustainably located proposals that use PDL that is not of high environmental or historic value, or proposals which increase building density where appropriate, taking into account the character of the area and access to services and facilities to ensure an efficient use of land.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) defines PDL as land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. To my mind, the area of the site which is PDL is confined to the nascent cattery business and the associated access and hardstanding. The majority of the site, including the area in which the dwelling would likely be located, is outside of this curtilage. Moreover, the cattery would be retained. It follows that the scheme would not reuse PDL.
10. The site has good access to services and facilities. However, in landscape terms it is dominated by its boundary vegetation and, as with the adjacent B3300, rurality is the overriding character trait. I observed that views into the site are possible from the western end of the PROW, from where the cattery reads as a utilitarian structure typical of such a setting. A dwelling here, with the placement suggested, would be a domestic intervention detrimental to this character. Whilst the harm would be modest, there would nonetheless be conflict with Policy 21.
11. I have been directed to the allocated site CPIR-UE1, some 175m to the west. This allocation is significantly different to the appeal proposal as it is a strategic urban extension. It is not a windfall site and its allocation would have been robustly scrutinised as part of the plan making process. In practical terms, it is clearly separated from the appeal site, and I understand that its closest, eastern side, is required by the CSA to be delivered as open space. As such, although also on the west side of the A3074, I do not consider that site CPIR-UE1 would visually influence the appeal site to any notable degree.
12. Of the planning permissions which have been brought to my attention by the appellant, two predate the adoption of the CSA and were therefore made in a materially different and less certain policy context. In addition, both related to

the reuse of PDL. The more recent scheme in Hayle was found to be within that settlement². These matters have therefore had little influence on my reasoning.

13. Consequently, I conclude that the site would not be suitable for a dwelling, having regard to local and national policy for the location of housing. The proposal would conflict with the relevant aims of Policies 1, 2, 3 7, 12, 21 and 23 of the CLP, Policy 1 of the CSA and the Framework.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant, and the opportunity that the appeal proposal would provide for his family to live together. However, this would principally be a private benefit, and it has not been demonstrated that this could not be achieved by existing housing elsewhere. As such, this matter has not been determinative in my decision.

Planning Balance

15. The government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing and the scheme would provide a family dwelling in an accessible location. However, given that only a single dwelling would be provided, the scheme's benefits attract modest weight. Conversely, the scheme would conflict with development plan policy for the location of housing and would undermine the Council's plan-led approach, contrary to paragraph 15 of the Framework. This matter weighs heavily in the balance, outweighing the benefits of the scheme.
16. I therefore find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and that there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones

INSPECTOR

² Appeal Ref APP/D0840/W/19/3236307