
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2025

by **H Nicholls MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3366819

Treloyan Cottage, Steeple Lane, St Ives TR26 2AY

- 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 Richard Brindley against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/06472.
 - The development proposed is permission in principle for the construction of 3 new detached dwellings (minimum of 3, maximum of 3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for permission in principle for the construction of 3 new detached dwellings (minimum of 3, maximum of 3) at Treloyan Cottage, Steeple Lane, St Ives, TR26 2AY, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA24/06472 dated 19 August 2024.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for permission in principle (PIP). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The PIP consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or PIP stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second, 'technical details consent' (TDC) stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these 2 stages.
3. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. The amount of residential development should be expressed as a range, indicating the minimum and maximum number of new dwellings. In this case, the description limits the range to no more or less than three dwellings, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development.

Reasons

Location, land use and amount

5. The appeal site extends to around 0.18 hectares of land which was formerly occupied by a dwelling, Treloyan Cottage, and its associated garden. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and falls within the urban area to the

north-western edge of Carbis Bay such that the principle of residential development in this location complies with policy 3 of the *Cornwall Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030* (adopted 2016) (Local Plan) and with the *St Ives Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015 - 2030* (made 2016) (SINDP).

6. The submitted *Site Area Comparison Plan* shows examples of existing neighbouring dwellings with a similar plot size and layout to the smaller plots at Units 2 and 3¹, or at least a similar or smaller plot size with different configuration². Many of these more compact plots are concentrated around an area to the east of the appeal site, with the predominance of larger dwellings set in more spacious plots extending further along Steeple Lane, Steeple Close and Wheal Venture Road. However, it is clear from the submitted information and from my site visit that this particular area is not exclusively made up of large, detached houses in spacious plots and that there is some variety in the built form.
7. As a proposal for three detached dwellings, the appeal proposal would be a more intensive form of development than was the case when the site was occupied by one dwelling. In terms of the amount of development, the submitted *Indicative Site Roof Plan* shows that at a basic level, the site could accommodate the access and manoeuvring space along with three detached dwellings, each with a reasonable ground floor footprint area, its own parking and a garden in excess of 100 square metres (sqm). The largest of the dwellings is also shown with a garage and garden exceeding 365 sqm. The relationship between the plot and building sizes for Units 2 and 3 would not be overly generous relative to some local examples, however, the relationship would be at least suitable. Therefore, on the basis of the information before me, subject to appropriate consideration to layout and design at TDC stage, the amount of development would appear to be capable of being accommodated without material harm to the built environment or the *Coastal Suburb or Railway Resort Character Area*³
8. On the basis of the above, the proposal would not conflict with policies 1, 2 or 12 of the Local Plan or policies GD1 or BE6 of the SINDP. Amongst other things, these policies collectively seek to ensure that development respects and enhances the quality of place with reference to its distinctive, natural, and historic character, surrounding densities and streetscapes.

Other Considerations

9. The site is not in a high risk flood zone and the tree constraints appear to be limited in number. However, aspects such as the retention of trees or precise means of drainage would be considered at TDC stage.
10. Policy H2 of the SINDP requires principal residence conditions on any new dwellings built in the plan area. As conditions are unable to be imposed at the PIP stage, this would be an aspect resolved at TDC stage.
11. I have considered the other representations of neighbours covering aspects other than those addressed above. In terms of highway effects, the net increase of two dwellings would increase the number of vehicle movements coming to and from the site. However, Steeple Lane has the capacity to accept such an increase in traffic without undue harm despite its relatively rural character.

¹ New Steeple House

² Tree Tops, Knill Cottage West, Knill Cottage, Knill House and adjoining Cottages, Ros Bryn, Trewood Ho and others

³ As defined within the SINDP and to which related Policy BE6 refers.

12. As outlined above, the potential effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would be more appropriate to consider at TDC stage.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

13. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing land with appropriate buffer as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). As such, the provisions of Framework paragraph 11 d) are engaged.
14. In any event, having regard to the location, land use and amount, I have found that the proposal complies with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance therewith.
15. In conclusion, the appeal proposal complies with the development plan and the appeal should therefore succeed.

H Nicholls

INSPECTOR