



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

**by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 01 August 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/24/3340738**

**Treloyhan Manor, Trelyon Avenue, St Ives, Cornwall TR26 2AL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by St Ives Assets Ltd against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref is PA23/08756.
  - The development proposed is Single Storey Extension to Apartment 6.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey extension to apartment 6 at Treloyhan Manor, Trelyon Avenue, St Ives, Cornwall TR26 2AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA23/08756, and subject to the following condition:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan (TQRQM21147130042168/EP1430, Plan 01); Proposed site plan (HVN21.002RC SP001); Existing basement floor plan (R22/04 PL-02, Rev B); Existing ground floor plan (R22/04 PL-01, Rev B); Existing roof plan (R22/04 PL-03, Rev B); Existing north & east elevation (R22/04 PL-04, Rev B); Existing south & west elevation (R22/04 PL-05, Rev B); Proposed basement, ground and roof plan (R22/04 PL-08, Rev E); Proposed north & west elevations (R22/04 PL-09, Rev E); Proposed east & south elevation (R22/04 PL-10, Rev E); and Proposed sections (R22/04 PL-11, Rev E).

## Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development had begun. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a large, architecturally striking building of Victorian Neo-Gothic design in a relatively open area and prominent position. Although its form and extent has changed over the years, the various alterations – which include some modern features – generally read as sensitive additions. The building's historic character and imposing appearance are therefore apparent.
5. The extension is visible from surrounding properties and from the adjacent driveway and formerly permissive footpath which is subject to a Definitive Map Modification Order. However, due to its position and relatively modest footprint

and height, it reads as an unobtrusive addition that does not detract from or dominate its host or surroundings. The size and position of the previous built form where the extension now is do not lead me to a different conclusion.

6. The stone cladding used matches the existing building's external stone walls. Although the render on the extension's lower walls does not reflect the host building, it reads as an acceptable material given the presence of other (non-stone) materials on surrounding buildings and the various modern features and materials on the host building. The fenestration in the extension does also not match that found in the main building, with its windows having a strong vertical emphasis. However, the windows, on what is clearly an extension, are relatively minor features and do not detract from the main building's overall integrity and form.
7. Treloyhan Manor is included in the Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Historic Environment Record and the St Ives Area Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 – 2030 (NDP) includes the building within its list of non-listed heritage assets. However, Cornwall Council neither identifies the building as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) nor alleges that the proposed development would harm a NDHA. On this basis, and given my findings above, I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not harm the significance of a NDHA.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or surrounding area. I therefore find that it accords with NDP Policy GD1 and Policies 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030. Amongst other aspects, these seek development of a high quality with a design that responds to its context, is sensitive to its surroundings and maintains and respects character. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to achieving well-designed and beautiful places; and the guidance in the Cornwall Design Guide regarding building form and use of materials.

### **Other matters**

9. A number of other matters have been raised by various parties and I have taken them all into account. This includes matters such as the need for the extension; the development having already begun; the development seemingly creating a self-contained apartment despite the main building providing hotel accommodation; the lack of clarity regarding aparthotels and how local policy deals with such uses; the site's planning history including the Council's issuing of a lawful development certificate for a C1 use as an aparthotel; and the need for affordable homes.
10. 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. In addition, whilst the description of development refers to an apartment, the proposed development is for the extension. As such, any change of use that may occur on the site is not determinative as to the acceptability of the appeal proposal and would be a separate matter.

## **Conclusion and Conditions**

11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised and the submitted evidence, I conclude that the proposed development accords with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.
12. With the development having already begun, the standard time limit condition is unnecessary. On the basis that the external walls have been built and the materials used are acceptable, the Council's third suggested condition is also unnecessary. However, I have imposed a plans condition in the interests of clarity and certainty.

*T Gethin*

INSPECTOR