



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/Y/25/3366953

22 Fore Street, Mevagissey, Cornwall PL26 6UQ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Korab against the decision of Cornwall Council.
- The application Ref is PA24/06984.
- The works proposed are repairs and renewals, internal alterations, painting of exterior and re-roofing.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my visit the works set out in this appeal had already taken place. As the appeal relates to a listed building consent, I have had special regard to Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the works preserve 18-22 Fore Street, a Grade II listed building¹ along with any special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

Reasons

4. The appeal building forms part of the listed building 18-22 Fore Street. Although now converted to a solely commercial use, I understand the appeal building had previously been in a mixed use, with commercial on the ground floor and domestic accommodation on the upper floors. The adjoining property, number 18, appears to still be in this mixed use.
5. The listed building is primarily of a long, linear form set over two-storeys set immediately onto the carriageway of Fore Street. To the rear is a small three-storey section. The building is built of brick that has been painted and, in the case of number 18, rendered. The whole building is served by a shared roof running parallel to the road, finished in artificial slates. The windows serving number 22 and the shop fronts for both units are timber. Although now removed, a small brick chimney was previously present at the ridge close to the neighbouring property at number 24.
6. The significance of this listed building stems in part from its age, the extent to which it is still intact and its legibility as a small and humble building. Its

¹ List Entry Number 1211145

significance and interest also stems from its relationship to a number of other listed buildings, including those within the group that form a block between the harbour and Fore Street. Listed buildings particularly close to the appeal site include 24 Fore Street, the Coffee Lounge to the east of 24 Fore Street and the King's Arms public house opposite the appeal site. The significance of these buildings similarly stems in part from their age, but as these are generally larger and more detailed they also demonstrate Mevagissey's development through time.

7. A number of works, both internal and external, have been carried out at the appeal site and are covered by this appeal. Although an advert is shown on the plans before me, I understand that this has separately received consent under reference: PA24/07124. The Council's concerns fall on the effect of the replacement roof covering and the removal of the chimney and although I have been mindful of the works as a whole, I have focused my considerations below to these two elements.
8. It appears that at the time of listing, the building's roof covering may have been natural slate but, prior to the works of this appeal they were artificial slates containing asbestos. I do not have any substantive evidence before me to demonstrate whether the slates were changed and, if so, the context of their replacement. During my visit I observed some of these artificial slates which remained on the ground floor roof to the rear. From the photographs before me and my observations on site, those artificial slates were covered by significant levels of moss and were well weathered. Ultimately their appearance was somewhat reflective of the slate rooves common within Mevagissey.
9. In contrast the replacement artificial slates are of a very bright, tidy and regular appearance that sets them apart from the typically more rough and natural appearance of the previous slates and those in the surrounding area. It may be that the new artificial slates will weather appropriately and begin to appear more akin to those they replaced and those within the surrounding area. I have not, though, been provided with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that this would necessarily be the case.
10. It would not be necessary to require the use of natural slate as the works before me have replaced existing artificial slates. As such, although natural slate would be an enhancement, the use of an appropriate artificial slate would not be harmful. Nevertheless, as I have identified above, I have not been provided with sufficient information to ascertain that the slates used would be appropriate.
11. The removal of the chimney has also altered the appearance of the building and the legibility of its historic form. Irrespective of their size or detailing, chimneys are an important indicator and reminder of the way in which buildings were heated prior to central heating boilers. Only unheated buildings of this era would have been without a chimney and the loss of the one serving this building will therefore obfuscate the historic nature and use of this building.
12. I am mindful that it may not have been possible to use the historic chimney due to the close proximity of the windows serving the roof extension at the adjoining number 24 Fore Street. It has also been suggested that the chimney was unstable and leaked to the detriment of the health of the roof and building as a whole. I do not, however, find these to be justifications for the removal of the chimney which, irrespective of its useability, would have been an important visual presence. It has

also not been demonstrated that the chimney could not have been repaired rather than removed.

13. Overall, lacking the suitable level of information required to ascertain that the replacement slates would blend in with those on the surrounding buildings, and with the loss of the historic chimney, the works have caused unacceptable harm to the historic and architectural interest of the historic building. Given the scale of the works, I find that less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset has occurred. Although less than substantial, the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. As a whole, the works will have resulted in some repairs to the building, better securing its long-term conservation and improving its contribution to the wider commercial area. The works have also resulted in the removal of asbestos from the roof of the building where it may have had the potential to affect public health. These matters are public benefits stemming from the works. However, as set out above it has not been demonstrated that the works to the building were necessary to repair it. It has also not been demonstrated that a less harmful option could not have been undertaken in order to achieve the removal of the asbestos from the building. Consequently, I afford only modest weight to these public benefits which, in the circumstances of this appeal, does not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset.
15. The works, with particular regard to the replacement roof slates and the removal of the chimney, have not preserved the special architectural and historic interest of 18-22 Fore Street. The works therefore fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, the development plan and the Framework insofar as they are relevant. I have also been mindful to the guidance contained within the Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment from Historic England.

Other Matters

16. The Council have referred to an appeal for the removal of chimney stacks at a listed building within a conservation area² and I note the comparisons made. I have not been provided with the full details and facts of this appeal but, I note that the nature and location of the building is markedly different to that before me. Whilst other planning and appeal decisions are capable of being material considerations, all decisions turn on their own particular circumstances based on the facts and evidence before those decision-makers at the time. Therefore, I cannot make any meaningful comparisons to the appeal scheme before me, which I must consider on its own merits.

Conclusion

17. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR

² References: APP/H1033/E/09/2117323 & APP/H1033/E/09/2117316