



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 October 2020

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/20/3257651

Southend, Riverside Avenue, Newquay, Cornwall TR7 1PN

- 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 Richard Holder against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA19/08832, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is Extension to create additional storey of existing 2 storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to create additional storey of existing 2 storey house at Southend, Riverside Avenue, Newquay, TR7 1PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA19/08832, dated 30 September 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No 2704-3-01 (Location and block plan, existing plans, existing elevations); Drawing No 2704-3-10 Rev A (Plans and elevations); and Drawing No 2704-3-11 (Site section, Visual - montage).
 - 3) The roof of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed of natural slate.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Situated on a hillside overlooking the Gannel Estuary, the appeal site contains a modest and relatively discreet two-storey dwelling set down into the hillside and set behind boundary treatment. It is accessed off the publicly accessible Riverside Avenue which is unadopted and used by walkers, amongst others, as a path. Generally consisting of two to three floors, built form in the area surrounding the site involves a variety of designs and scales, including numerous relatively-large modern properties, some with extensive glazing, and various other dwellings with more traditional features. Several buildings in the

locality are larger and notably more prominent than the existing dwelling in both near and more distant views. Surrounded by properties, the site reads as forming part of the group of buildings that forms the relatively extensive and well-defined built-environment spread across the hillside.

4. With a greater height, more glazing and a change in roof form, the extended dwelling would be more notable in the locality, both from Riverside Avenue and from more distant vantage points including on the opposite side of the estuary. However, the scale, height, mass, form and design of the proposed development would be similar to other properties in the surrounding area. It would maintain both the tiered effect on the hillside in relation to the roof heights of surrounding properties and the space around the building and to adjoining built form. Set against the backdrop of surrounding built form, it would not read as a prominent feature. Sitting comfortably within the site and locality, it would also neither involve development of garden space nor significantly alter the extent of the hillside's green landscape, which is identified as an important feature within the Newquay Character Study (NCS).
5. Accordingly, and as shown in the visualisation in Drawing No 2704-3-11, it would neither appear as a dominating feature nor out of scale with built form in the surrounding area, and it would sufficiently respect and reflect the character and appearance of neighbouring properties and the locality. Significant views, as detailed in the NCS, and including Riverside Avenue, the Gannel, of the Gannelside and its sensitive hillside landscape from across the estuary and the South West Coast Path, and from and along the estuary, would also therefore not be harmed.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find that it accords with Policies H1, H2, D2, G2, LE1 and LE4 of the Newquay Neighbourhood Plan 2019 to 2030 and Policy 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030. Amongst other aspects, these: require development to be of a high quality design, have an appropriate scale, height and mass, and maintain any tiered effect up and down hills at existing roof heights; support extensions which reflect the principles of the relevant part of the NCS and developments in areas of particular landscape sensitivity where there is no negative impact on the character and appearance of the locality and landscape areas; and require relevant development proposals to take account of the objectives for character areas set out in the NCS, be accompanied by accurate visualisations and ensure that key views can continue to be enjoyed.

Other matters

7. A number of other matters have been raised by interested parties and I have taken them all into account. Those related to planning include the adequacy of on-site parking provision, previous decisions on planning applications and appeals on and near the site, disruption and further deterioration of Riverside Avenue due to construction traffic, land stability, and the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, including with regards to privacy, light, overshadowing, outlook, noise, disturbance and light pollution. However, whilst I take these representations seriously, I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable effects in relation to any of these matters. Consequently, they do not lead me to a different overall conclusion

that the appeal should be allowed. With each case determined on its own merits, allowing this development would also not set a precedent.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition in the interests of certainty and clarity requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. As suggested by the Council, a condition covering roof material is necessary with regards to the character and appearance of the area and would be consistent with a key design principle of the NCS.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR