



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/24/3355572

62 College Street, Camborne TR14 7LD

- 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 Mr Nigel Crocker against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/05915.
 - The development proposed is rear extension and roof replacement.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

- Whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for occupants of neighbouring properties with specific regard to privacy and outlook; and,
- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Camborne Town Centre Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

3. The proposal would introduce windows into the flank boundary wall between appeal building (No.62) and 60 College Street (No.60) at both ground floor and first floor levels. Whilst the proposal is for obscure glazed, landscape windows, there would still be the perception of being overlooked given that the flank wall and proposed windows would form part of the boundary between the two properties. This factor would be particularly noticeable at nighttime with a light on. In addition, I cannot be certain of how the windows open and therefore it would be possible to overlook the kitchen window of No.60 and the rear garden space, resulting in an adverse effect on the privacy of the present and future occupiers of No.60. The appellant has offered to change this element should it be considered harmful; however, I do not

have those alternative plans before me and therefore I cannot be certain of the acceptability of the alternative scheme.

4. The Council have also raised concerns regarding overlooking and a lack of privacy to other neighbouring properties. The proposal would have a window on a side wall facing toward 64 College Street; however, the window would be obscure glazed, set back from the boundary, and would not provide direct views into habitable rooms. The fenestration to the rear would not afford views directly into any habitable rooms at an inappropriate distance.
5. The proposal would increase the height of the existing ground floor single storey extension to double height. Given that No.62 is already considerably deeper than No.60, then the proposal would extend an already large double storey flank wall by a significant amount. The result would be a sense of overbearing from the kitchen window and the rear garden space directly to the rear of No.60. Furthermore, the rear elevation of No.60 only has two windows at ground floor level. The extension of the flank wall on the boundary would have an adverse effect on outlook and would lead to an adverse sense of enclosure.
6. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies 1, 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030 (the Local Plan), paragraph 9.3.6 of the Cornwall Design Guide 2021 and the relevant paragraphs of National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework), insofar as they seek high quality design with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and avoiding overlooking into other homes at a short distance.

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal building is a terraced residential property fronting onto College Street and has a long thin rear garden as is typical of the area. The property is unusually tall when compared to its direct neighbours, which is explained by its previous use as a St. John Ambulance station. The property is adjoined on one side by No.60 which is considerably lower in construction height, and considerably smaller overall. To the rear elevation the appeal building has two single storey extensions.
8. Many of the dwellings within the same terrace as the appeal property have been altered and extended to the rear. The rear elevation of the terrace as a whole has a mixture of traditional style pitched roof extensions and flat roofed utilitarian style extensions. The various extensions and alterations that have occurred to the rear of the terrace now form part of the context of the site. There are also various ground floor extensions and windows are of mixed design and appearance.
9. Whilst the proposal would increase the height of the existing rear extension, by reason of its scale, set down from the host building's eaves, and subject to the use of materials that match the host, the proposal would remain subservient in scale and appearance to the host dwelling. As such, and given the scale and appearance of other substantial extensions at the rear of this terrace, the proposal would not appear as a dominant nor incongruous addition. It would therefore be acceptable in appearance and would not be harmful to, nor detract from, the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. The appeal building is located within the CA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to

the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

11. The Camborne Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal sets out the significance of College Street and contribution to the CA as being: *'One of oldest of all the 'industrial' residential streets in Camborne; a principal approach to the historic core; direct visual and physical links to core, the church in particular is seen only in long views as the culmination of the long slope up College Street; fine historic vernacular buildings and streetscape'*.
12. Where seen from within the CA, the proposal would be viewed in the same context as the various other rear extensions and alterations that contribute to the highly mixed appearance of the rear elevation of the terrace. Given this context and having regard to the lack of prominence and views of the development from within the CA, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.
13. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policies 2, 12 and 24 of the Local Plan, Policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023, and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework, which amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the historic environment.

Other Matters

14. The appellant advances that they are involved in the provision of adult care and that the extra bedroom would be for this purpose and a public benefit. Whilst I agree and give this some weight in the decision, the circumstances of occupation of the appeal building may not always be the same, whereas the proposed development would represent a permanent feature that would result in the harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents as identified above, and to which I attach significant weight. I therefore conclude that the benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR