



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) Bsc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3360325

14 Forthvean, Portreath, Cornwall TR16 4NY

- 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 and Mrs Webb against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref. is PA24/07877.
 - The development proposed is an upward extension to create additional accommodation within the roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of No. 14; the semi-detached pair with No. 16 and their surroundings in this part of the Forthvean development.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the semi-detached pair of Nos. 14 & 16 are at the head of a small cul-de-sac that forms part of Forthvean and are somewhat set apart from neighbouring buildings. This position combined with their relatively high siting on the brow of a hill has the effect of making the pair prominent in the Forthvean street scene, including from distance at the junction between Nos. 12 & 18.
4. Although there are differences between the existing Nos. 14 & 16, for example the detailing of the windows and the porches, the original simple design of the gables mirroring one another forms an attractive symmetry which makes a positive contribution to the Forthvean development as a whole, but particularly to this cul-de-sac.
5. The unbalancing of the pair as a result of the proposed development would in my view be an incongruous development. The additional height of the appeal dwelling relative to No. 16 would draw the eye and be perceived negatively as having an unacceptably harmful impact on No. 14 itself; the semi-detached pair, and the cul-de-sac, the latter from both at close quarters and its junction with the main part of Forthvean.
6. The appeal statement seeks to explain the modifications to a previous proposal dismissed on appeal. I acknowledge that the current scheme is an improvement on this earlier proposal as regards both design and its visual impact. Nor are there now any issues as regards an effect on living conditions for neighbours.

Nonetheless, the fundamentals of a higher roof with its greater mass remain, with a consequence of a degree of visual intrusion that would conflict with Policies 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030 and Policy 4 of the Portreath Neighbourhood Development Plan. There would additionally be conflict with the Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, revised December 2024.

7. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal. However, I do not agree with the analysis in section 2 that suggests the cul-de-sac is of limited visual significance in FORTHVEAN. It may be modest in extent, but as I have indicated in paragraph 3 above, the existing impact of the pair of dwellings is one of a positive prominence. Moreover, I do not consider that the extension at No. 18 is particularly relevant, as its context is not one of one half of a semi-detached pair forming a focal point on elevated land at the head of the cul-de-sac – this point having already being made clear by the previous Inspector. The appeal statement is also at pains to demonstrate that the visual impact of the height increase would be of little or no consequence, but again I am unable to agree with the findings of this appraisal.
8. Similarly, the stepped roofs of buildings in TREGEA CLOSE are quite different in both concept and context to the appeal proposal. And whilst the examples of other developments in other parts of Cornwall are noted, I can see no reason why these should merit significant weight in this appeal where my remit is to assess the effect of this development on its surroundings.
9. I have also had regard to all the other matters raised for the appellants but have found nothing to outweigh my conclusion that, although an improvement on the proposal dismissed in the first appeal, the proposed development would be in harmful conflict with local and national policy. I recognise the benefits as regards additional living space but consider that these are clearly outweighed by the scheme's drawbacks.
10. For these reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR