



Redruth Civic Centre, Alma Place, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2AT

Tel No: 01209-210038 e-mail: [admin@redruth-tc.gov.uk](mailto:admin@redruth-tc.gov.uk)

**Town Mayor: Cllr A Biscoe**

**Town Clerk: C Caldwell**

See Distribution

*Our Reference:*  
RTC/420/3/Mtg  
*Date:*  
4<sup>th</sup> June 2025

Dear Councillor

**Meeting of the Planning Committee – Monday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Redruth Town Council Planning Committee to be held at Redruth Civic Centre, Alma Place on Monday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025. Proceedings will commence promptly at 7pm.

The Agenda and associated papers are enclosed for your reference and information.

Yours sincerely

Charlotte Caldwell  
Town Clerk

**Enclosure:**

1. Agenda and associated documentation

**Distribution:**

**Action:**

Cllr H Biscoe  
Cllr W Tremayne  
Cllr A Biscoe  
Cllr P Broad  
Cllr K Cunningham  
Cllr R Major  
Cllr D Ragan  
Cllr I Thomas

**Information:**

All other Councillors  
Cornwall Council Members  
Press & Public

**REDRUTH TOWN COUNCIL**  
**MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE – Monday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

**AGENDA**

**PART I – PUBLIC SESSION**

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. Members to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or non-registerable interests (including details thereof) in respect of any item(s) on this Agenda
3. Public participation session - to allow the public to put questions to the Council on any matters relating to this Agenda
4. To consider the planning applications (schedule attached)
5. To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2025 (Minutes attached)
6. To receive correspondence:
  - 6.1 Decision Notice Schedule
  - 6.2 Planning Inspectorate – Appeal Decision, Wheal Buller, Buller Downs, Cornwall, TR16 6ST
  - 6.3 Cornwall Council – PA24/09801 Land North West of the Old Coach House, Fore Street, Redruth, TR15 2AE 5 day protocol letter
  - 6.4 Cornwall Council – PA24/09484 Land East of Plen An Merther, Radnor Road, Redruth, TR16 5EL 5 day protocol letter
  - 6.5 5 Day Protocol schedule

# REDRUTH TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

**SUBMISSIONS FOR: Monday 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

## **LIST 1 (FOR APPROVAL EN-BLOC)**

<b>Ser No</b>	<b>Planning App No (All PA25/ unless otherwise stated)</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Reply</b>
1	03535	12 Clijah Close, Redruth TR15 2NS  Proposed rear extension and general alterations	South	Supported
2	03608	114 Albany Road, Redruth TR15 2HZ  Non-material amendment in relation to Decision Notice PA24/04367 dated 18/09/24 - The first floor extension to the rear will now cover all of the ground floor extension	South	Supported
3	03625	Land Adj To The Nook, The Nook, Wheal Montague, North Country, Redruth  Erection of a self/custom build detached dwelling and associated landscaping works	North	Supported
4	03640	London Inn Apartments, 34 Fore Street, Redruth TR15 2AE  Change of use from vacant commercial unit to a 1 bed flat	North	Supported
5	03689	5 Mount Pleasant Redruth Highway Redruth TR15 1RU  Demolition of existing extension and erection of replacement single storey rear extension	Central	Supported

## **LIST 2**

<b>Ser No</b>	<b>Planning App No (All PA25/ unless otherwise stated)</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Ward</b>	<b>Reply</b>
6	03407 (P.Broad)	UK Storage Company SW Ltd, Cardrew Industrial Estate, Cardrew Way, Redruth TR15 1SS  Advertisement consent for relocation of existing signage & 1 no (new) freestanding illuminated digital signboard (displaying static images)	Central	



Redruth Civic Centre, Alma Place, Redruth, Cornwall TR15 2AT

Tel No: 01209-210038 e-mail: [admin@redruth-tc.gov.uk](mailto:admin@redruth-tc.gov.uk)

**Town Mayor: Cllr R S Barnes**

**Town Clerk: Ms C Caldwell**

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held at Redruth Civic Centre, Alma Place, Redruth  
on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2025

Present: Cllr H Biscoe  
Cllr W Tremayne  
Cllr S Barnes  
Cllr A Biscoe  
Cllr K Grasso  
Cllr R Major  
Cllr I Thomas

Chair

In attendance: Ms C Caldwell  
Mrs H Bardle  
Miss K O'Dell  
Mr D Lloyd  
Mr B Wooley  
Mr D Mitchell  
Mr S Johns  
Mr D Knuckey  
2 members of the public also in attendance

Town Clerk  
Responsible Finance Officer  
Administrator  
Agent for applicant  
Applicant  
Agent for applicant  
Applicant

**PART I – PUBLIC SESSION**

**1618.1 To receive apologies for absence**

None.

**1618.2 Members to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests or non-registerable interests (including details thereof) in respect of any item(s) on this Agenda**

None were declared.

**1618.3 Public participation session - to allow the public to put questions to the Council on any matters relating to this Agenda**

Mr Knuckey spoke against PA25/01607. He was representing himself and his neighbours and wished to raise several issues they have with the application. One was an administrative issue; he stated that he understood that the owners do not own all the land marked in red. He is concerned about traffic. There have been near misses on the junction with the main road and Mr Knuckey believed that more traffic would only compound the issue. He asked the committee to view the property before making a final decision. The proposed buildings would also cause a loss of privacy as could look directly across into Mr Knuckey's and his neighbours' properties. His final concern was the septic tank which was put in place circa 1990 and at full capacity so not fit for purpose if more dwellings are built. Cllr Barnes asked to look at the plans which Mr Knuckey had brought. Cllr H Biscoe thanked Mr Knuckey for his time.

Mr Wooley said he was the applicant for PA25/01556. Cllr H Biscoe had visited the property and said it was bigger than it looked on the plans. Cllr Thomas raised concerns about the proximity of the entrance to the junction on the Old Portreath Road as it is a dangerous junction, and more traffic could make that worse. Mr Wooley responded that there used to be much more traffic when the archery club were there but appreciated Cllr Thomas's point. Cllr H Biscoe thanked Mr Wooley for his time.

Mr Lloyd introduced himself as the agent for PA25/01203 and explained he was attending as the applicant was away. He stated that the current application had been amended and improved having addressed reasons for previous refusal which were on the grounds of overdevelopment and not in keeping with surrounding area. The new design has been made more traditional and the external amenity areas similar to the original proposal which were not objected to by Redruth Town Council or Cornwall Council. He added that there have been no negative public comments to the proposal. He concluded that this proposal would be a welcome addition to housing provision in the Redruth area and would be energy efficient complying to both local and national requirements. Cllr H Biscoe thanked Mr Lloyd for his time.

Mr Mitchell and Mr Johns said they were at the meeting to speak about PA25/09801. They have considered that it had previously been refused on grounds of overdevelopment and emergency access. However, Mr Mitchell said that housing in the town centre should be encouraged as it has no impact on the high street. He added that recently there had been a fire and emergency service access had not been a problem. Mr Johns said he was frustrated and unsure why planning kept being refused, he simply wants to provide homes for people in the town. These would be primarily used for key workers or NHS workers. Cllr H Biscoe reminded him that Redruth Town Council are consultees only and the final decisions are taken by Cornwall Council. Cllr Major asked for clarification regarding the parking situation. Mr Mitchell said there would be no vehicles parked in that area and Cllr H Biscoe said these properties would appeal to those who are users of public transport or able to park further away. Cllr Thomas said RTC are dedicated to building homes on brown-field sites and each case is looked at on its own merits. Cllr Barnes said he is genuinely concerned about the archway and that he would suggest talks with the Red Lion regarding car park access. Mr Johns said this was something he had been working on. Cllr Thomas asked if there were anyway to access via the Flowerpot Chapel car park. Mr Johns replied that it is something that had been investigated but is not thought to be viable. Cllr H Biscoe thanked Mr Mitchell and Mr Johns for their time.

Mr Johns left the meeting at this point.

#### **1618.4 To consider the planning applications**

- 1618.4.1 The planning applications were dealt with in accordance with the attached Annex A to these minutes.

Mr Mitchell, Mr Lloyd and 1 member of the public left the meeting at this point.

#### **1618.5 To confirm the Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2025**

- 1618.5.1 Unanimously RESOLVED that the minutes of the Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2025 be accepted as a true and accurate record of proceedings [Proposed Cllr A Biscoe Seconded Cllr Barnes].

## 1618.6 Clerk's Report

The report was circulated prior to the meeting. Since the report had been sent the Town Clerk had received notification that the independent examiner had gone through the NDP and concluded that it meets the basic conditions and would proceed to referendum which is good news. Cllr Thomas asked if RTC would get any financial assistance. Town Clerk replied that we would ask. It would be a few months before going any further as there is a backlog at Cornwall Council. The Town Clerk had received an email from Cornwall Council regarding the Bonded Warehouse building which they are now looking to dispose of on the open market. The Town Clerk confirmed that she had asked for a meeting to discuss options, which would be on 23<sup>rd</sup> April. She would then bring it before the new council after the elections for further discussion and decisions. Cllr Thomas recalled having many conversations about this building and remembered that a condition of its sale to Cornwall Council was that it would be turned into housing, and he was concerned that might get forgotten. The Town Clerk said Cllr Thomas was correct about the housing, but that use of the building appeared to now be more flexible. Cllr Barnes said he thought that it was a shame it had not already been saved before now and although he has not been inside, he wondered whether it could be a community hub, similar to The Brick charity services which the Town Clerk and Chair of Engagement Committee had seen when they visited good practice examples in Wigan. Cllr Grasso suggested if several support organisations were viable to be housed there under one roof then the premises they currently occupied could be considered for housing.

## 1618.7 To receive correspondence:

### 1618.7.1 *Decision Notice Schedule*

The schedule was noted.

### 1618.7.2 *Licensed Premises Schedule*

None.

### 1618.7.3 *Pre-application Schedule*

None.

### 1618.7.4 *5-day Protocol*

The 5-day protocol was considered, and it was Unanimously RESOLVED to 'agree to disagree' [Proposed Cllr H Biscoe; Seconded Cllr Tremayne]

All 5 day protocols received will be sent to the Chair and Vice-Chair of Planning for expedient consideration.

**Chair**

# REDRUTH TOWN COUNCIL - PLANNING SCHEDULE

All references for PA25/ unless otherwise stated.

Meeting: Monday 14<sup>th</sup> April 2025

REF NO	CC REF	SITE	PROPOSAL	DECISION
<p><b>LIST 1</b></p> <p>Unanimously RESOLVED to add PA25/01607, PA25/01203 and PA25/01335 to the Full Council agenda for the 28<sup>th</sup> April 2025 [Proposed Cllr Barnes; Seconded Cllr A Biscoe]</p> <p>Unanimously RESOLVED that the remainder of the Applications on List 1 are supported en bloc. [Proposed Cllr Tremayne; Seconded Cllr A Biscoe]</p>				
1	02235	Green Lane Dental Practice, 28 Green Lane, Redruth	Listed Building Consent for proposed installation of signage associated with business	Supported
2	02236	Green Lane Dental Practice, 28 Green Lane, Redruth	Advertisement consent for a proposed non-illuminated fascia sign	Supported
3	09484	Land East of Plen An Merther, Radnor Road, Radnor TR16 5EL	New self-build and custom build dwelling	Supported



4	01607	The Barn, West Trefula Farm, Greenbank, Redruth TR16 5ET	Use of existing property as independent unrestricted residential dwelling (Use Class C3)	To be moved to meeting on 28 <sup>th</sup> April 2025	Supported
5	02191	45 Clinton Road, Redruth TR15 2LP	Works to trees in a Conservation Area for Acer Pseudoplatanus hedge (Tree A) – previously pollarded small sycamores (approximately 5ft tall), proposed to re-pollard to previous points. Laurus Nobilis (Tree B) – previously coppiced, proposed to pollard to 6ft from deck height	Supported	
6	01203	Land East of 1 St Day Road, St Day Road, Redruth TR15 2EH	The Proposal is to create a new dwelling on a brownfield site which is currently vacant	To be moved to meeting on 28 <sup>th</sup> April 2025	
7	09801	Land North West of The Old Coach House, Fore Street, Redruth TR15 2AE	Construction of four dwellingshouses	To be moved to meeting on 28 <sup>th</sup> April 2025	
8	04335	Little Stars Nursery Ground Floor Shop, Warmstar House, Chapel Street, Redruth TR15 2BY	Change of use from D1 to residential (C3) of the ground floor nursery to a single bedroom flat	Supported	
9	01642	Bastions Pharmacy, 16 Chapel Street, Redruth TR15 2DB	Advertisement consent for installation of Vinyl wrap to the front of the proposed Pick-up prescription collection machine with operation instructions, name and logo	Supported	
10	01704	26 Trelawney Avenue, Treskerby, Redruth TR15 1RH	Single storey, front and rear extensions and alteration	Supported	
11	01227	Redruth Foyer Alma Place, Redruth TR15 2AT	Proposed replacement windows at the side and rear elevations	Supported	

12	02108	2 Trewirgie Gardens, Redruth TR15 2TL	Works to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order – felling of T1 and T2 (Ash trees)	Supported
13	02338	Harveys of Bond Street, Newsagents 7 Bond Street, Redruth TR15 2QA	Proposed change of use to ground floor former retail shop area known as 'Harveys Newsagents and Tobacconists' to be integrated within existing dwelling occupying ground, lower ground and first floor levels of the same property	Supported
14	00919	5 East Park, Redruth TR15 2DP	Extensions, interior alterations and off-road parking	Supported
15	00399	Westcliffe 28 Basset Street, Redruth TR15 2EA	'New dwelling with variation of condition 2 of decision PA18/01159 dated 06.04.2018' without compliance with Condition 2 and 3 of decision notice PA22/06795 dated 13/09/2022.	Supported
16	02465	Dainton Self Storage Ltd, Seton Business Centre, Scortier Road, Redruth TR16 5AW	Advertisement consent for 1 no freestanding digital signboard (displaying static images)	Supported
17	09675	Land North of Homestead, Old Sandy Lane, Redruth TR16 5BW	Construction of agricultural building for maintenance purposes & associated works	Supported

LIST 2				
REF NO	CC REF	SITE	PROPOSAL	DECISION
18	01556	Land Adj To The Chapel Of Rest, Lower North Country, Redruth TR16 4HJ	Application for Permission in Principle for the construction of between four and five dwellings	Unanimously RESOLVED not to support the application for permission in principle due to grounds of overdevelopment in a rural area and access concerns [Proposed Cllr H Biscoe; Seconded Cllr Tremayne]
19	01612	55 Fore Street, Redruth TR15 2AF	Prior approval for proposed change of use from retail outlet with stores to café and two apartments	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application [Proposed Cllr Grasso; Seconded Cllr A Biscoe]

# Planning Committee

Meeting 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025

## Decision Notice Schedule

All references for PA25 unless otherwise stated

RTC REF	CC REF	SITE	PROPOSAL	RTC DECISION	CC DECISION
1606.4.1.1	PA24/08544	Channel View, Sandy Lane	Change of use of land to a secure dog walking field and retention of associated perimeter fencing and parking area	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1606.4.1.8	PA24/09675	Land North of Homestead, Old Sandy Lane	Construction of agricultural building for maintenance purposes & associated works	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1611.4.1.8	PA24/09842	Land South West of Wheal Tolgus, Tolgus Mount	Application for Permission in Principle for proposed rural exception scheme for up to 4 dwellings (minimum 2, maximum 4)	RESOLVED by majority to support the application	Granted (CAADs, PIPs and LUs only)
1611.4.1.5	PA24/09350	9 South Park Close	To build a single storey extension to the rear of the property	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1161.4.2.9	PA24/09475	Glebe Barn, Churchtown	Outline application for residential development of land for 1 no. dwelling including access	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved with conditions
1611.4.1.1	00094	St Euny's Church, Churchtown	Works to a mature Sycamore tree (T10) subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - to remove the bough of the tree as part of ongoing safety repair works to the western boundary retaining wall	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1611.4.2.11	00175	The Bungalow, Mount Carbis Road	Construction of two single garages and associated landscaping	Unanimously RESOLVED not to support the application on the grounds of concerns over access and highway issues.	Approved

1611.4.1.3	00476	Chyventon House, Forth Noweth	Works to Tree(s) covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) - T1 Ash - Fell to ground. T12 Sycamore - Remove 2 x crossing branches overhanging path. G2 Sycamore - Re-coppice. T6 Lime - Crown lift over garden to 2.5m. Remove crossing branch at 5m. T7 Sycamore - Crown lift over garden to 2.5m. G3 Sycamore/lime - Reduce branches over hanging garden by 4m. T11 Elm - Reduce lowest, overextending branch back to boundary. G4 Sycamore - Crown lift over garden to 2.5m	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1611.4.1.6	00585	6B Trevingey Road	Works to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order TPO: 2 medium sized trees require the canopy reducing and the overhang onto 3 neighbours properties who are all keen for the work to be completed	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1611.4.1.7	00328	CoOp, Falmouth Road	Advertisement consent for remove old signs and replace with new	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1611.4.2.12	00737	Bryher Lodge, Trevingey Road	Change of use of existing residential annexe to become separate dwelling	Unanimously RESOLVED that the Redruth Town Council Planning Committee is unable to make a decision due to insufficient information having been provided	Approved
1614.4.1.1	00871	Bryenton House, Penventon Terrace, West End, Redruth TR15 3AD	Two single storey extensions	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1614.4.2.7	01204	Tregays Yard, off 18 Higher Fore Street	Extension and alterations to two dwellings	RESOLVED by Majority not to support the application on the grounds of insufficient documentation re: safety of access and egress for emergency services	Approved
1614.4.1.2	01440	Telephone exchange, Trewirgie Road	Works to trees subject to a TPO	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1614.4.1.3	00396	Land adj Pickety Witch and Lock Up Garage, North Country, Redruth TR16 4AJ	Construction of a dwelling and assoc works	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1614.4.1.4	00824	3 Langarth Court, Redruth	Work to trees subject to TPO	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved

n/a	00885	Chycarn West, Trewirgie Road	Construction of extension	n/a – missed window for commenting	Approved with conditions
1614.4.2.8	00932	Land to rear of 78 Albany Park Rd	Conversion of treble garage into dwelling	Unanimously RESOLVED not to support the application on the grounds over overdevelopment of an existing site and removal of parking facilities	Refused
1614.1.1.5	00940	Chapel of Ease, Chapel Street	Listed building consent replacement windows	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
n/a	01693	Treskerby Farm, Treskerby, Redruth TR16 5AG	Submission of details to discharge condition 3 in relation to Decision notice PA22/01327 dated 07.06.2022	n/a – missed window for commenting	S52/S106 and discharge of condition apps
1618.4.1.1	02235	Green Lane Dental Practice, 28 Green Lane, Redruth	Listed Building Consent for proposed installation of signage associated with business	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Withdrawn
1618.4.1.2	02236	Green Lane Dental Practice, 28 Green Lane, Redruth	Advertisement consent for a proposed non-illuminated fascia sign	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Withdrawn
1618.4.1.4	01607	The Barn, West Trefula Farm, Greenbank, Redruth TR16 5ET	Use of existing property as independent unrestricted residential dwelling (Use Class C3)	n/a	Invalid - removed from online planning register
1618.4.1.5	02191	45 Clinton Road, Redruth TR15 2LP	Works to trees in a Conservation Area for Acer pseudoplatanus hedge (Tree A) – previously pollarded to small sycamores (approximately 5ft tall), proposed to re-pollard to previous points. Laurus Nobilis (Tree B) – previously coppiced, proposed to pollard to 6ft from deck height	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Decided not to make a TPO (TCA apps)
1618.4.1.6	01203	Land East of 1 St Day Road, St Day Road, Redruth TR15 2EH	The proposal is to create a new dwelling on a brownfield site which is currently vacant	n/a	Refused
1618.4.1.8	01335	Little Stars Nursery, Ground Floor Shop, Warmstar House, Chapel Street, Redruth	Change of use from D1 to residential (C3) of the ground floor nursery to a single bedroom flat	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
n/a	01641	Bastions Pharmacy - 16 Chapel Street, Redruth TR15 2DB	Installation of a Pick-up prescription collection machine to the existing pharmacy shopfront window	n/a – accidentally missed off list	Approved

1618.4.1.9	01642	Bastions Pharmacy - 16 Chapel Street, Redruth TR15 2DB	Advertisement consent for installation of Vinyl wrap to the front of the proposed Pick-up prescription collection machine with operation instructions, name and logo	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1618.4.1.10	01704	26 Trelawny Avenue, Treskerby, Redruth TR15 1RH	Single storey, front and rear extensions and alteration	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
n/a	01749	Land to the North of Drump Road, Redruth TR15 1LZ	Non material amendment in relation to Decision Notice PA20/07938 dated 08/03/21 - Minor changes to external finishes, minor change to position of doors on Plot 52, the re-location of 2no, Air Source Heat Pumps, changes to garden facing retaining walls and steps, minor adjustments to garden access paths to suit levels and adjustment to position of parking bays	n/a – missed window for commenting	Approved
1618.4.1.11	01277	Redruth Foyer, Alma Place, Redruth TR15 2AT	Proposed replacement windows at the side and rear elevations	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1618.4.1.12	02108	2 Trewirgie Gardens, Redruth TR15 2TL	Works to trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order - felling of T1 and T2 (Ash trees)	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1618.4.1.13	02338	Harveys of Bond Street Newsagents, 7 Bond Street, Redruth TR15 2QA	Proposed change of use of ground floor former retail shop area known as 'Harveys Newsagents and Tobacconists' to be integrated within existing dwelling occupying ground, lower ground and first floor levels of the same property	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1618.4.1.15	00399	Westcliffe 28 Basset Street, Redruth TR15 2EA	'New dwelling with variation of condition 2 of decision PA18/01159 dated 06.04.2018' without compliance with Condition 2 and 3 of decision notice PA22/06795 dated 13/09/2022.	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
1618.4.2.18	01566	Land Adj To The Chapel Of Rest, Lower North Country, Redruth, TR16 4HJ	Application for Permission in Principle for the construction of between four and five dwellings	Unanimously RESOLVED not to support the application for permission in principle due to grounds of overdevelopment in a rural area and access concerns	Refused
1618.4.2.19	01612	55 Fore Street, Redruth TR15 2AF	Prior approval for proposed change of use from retail outlet with stores to cafe and two apartments	Unanimously RESOLVED to support the application	Approved
n/a	02199	Wynndham House, Higher North Country, Redruth TR16 4DB	Certificate of lawfulness for existing use of land used in association with Wynndham House Higher North Country, Redruth	n/a – missed window for commenting	Granted (CAADs, PIPs and LUs only)
1621.9.5	02944	7 Beckett Close, Redruth TR15 2HJ	Proposed replacement rear single-storey extension	RESOLVED by Majority to Support the application	Approved

1621.9.6	02641	79 Falmouth Road, Redruth TR15 2QT	Demolition of existing rear extension and construction of a two storey rear extension	RESOLVED by Majority to Support the application	Approved
----------	-------	---------------------------------------	--	--	----------





---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2025

by **G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3361581**

**Derelict land site, Wheal Buller, Buller Downs, Cornwall, TR16 6ST**

- 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 Riley against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref is PA24/06226.
  - The development proposed is erection of workshop and access track.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. I have adopted the address from the application form.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force on 12 December 2024. However, the appeal was not lodged until 3 March 2025 and both parties have had, therefore, various opportunities to refer to the revised NPPF in their appeal submissions. Even so, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed, albeit some of the paragraph numbering has.

### Main Issues

4. Whilst there is only one reason for refusal it raises two separate issues namely, (a) whether the location of the appeal site would be suitable for the development, and (b) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

#### *Suitability of location*

5. The Council refer to policies 1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development), 2 (Spatial strategy) and 12 (Design) of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 - 2030 (CLP). These require, amongst other matters, that new development provides a sustainable approach to accommodating growth, taking account of, in particular, location, layout and design that maintains the dispersed development pattern of Cornwall. Policy 2, in particular, seeks to manage the scale and location of all new development and to direct it to appropriate locations whilst at the same time supporting the expansion of existing businesses and the indigenous business of agriculture. Policy C1 (Climate change principles) of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document (DPD) has also been referred to, which, amongst

other matters, requires development to be sustainable and actively support walking and cycling, rather than the use of the private car.

6. Whilst there is no specific CLP policy in relation to new agricultural buildings, both parties have referred to policy 5 (Business & tourism) of the CLP. Part 1 relates to new business and employment uses, including those proposed in the countryside, which should be of a scale appropriate to their location or demonstrate an overriding locational and business need to be in that location. Paragraph 2.7 states that supporting the continued growth of the agricultural sector and diversification of the industry will be critical to Cornwall's future, long term prosperity.
7. The above policies are consistent with those in the NPPF, including paragraphs 8 and 88, with the latter stating that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.
8. The appeal site comprises an open field of some 0.25 hectares and forms part of a holding that extends to some 0.87 hectares. The appeal site is largely enclosed by Cornish Hedging apart from its south western boundary which has no physical features as the appeal site and the Appellants overall holding effectively form one single field. The site is located to the south of a minor County Road (the C0028) and access is via a partly metalled track that leads from the County Road past a property known as Penair towards some scattered properties, to the north and north east of the appeal site. The site is surrounded by similar fields which appear to be used for pasture.
9. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a single storey workshop building with hardcore access track and parking/turning area. The proposed building would be just under 5.2 metres high to the ridge with a 12 x 12 metre footprint.
10. The address on the application form refers to the appeal site as a derelict site, but then later on its existing use is described as a paddock. The Appellants Statement of Case (ASOC) suggests that the workshop is required to enhance the operational efficiency and durability of an ongoing arable use of the land. In particular, that it is required to safely store the Appellants agricultural equipment and materials used to work the land including the growing of crops and the keeping of a small selection of livestock, on the whole of their holding. However, there are no details of the type of agricultural activity the new building would support or the equipment involved. It is also unclear where this equipment is currently stored or whether this would be for a new agricultural venture.
11. The Council have confirmed that at the time of their site visit there was no evidence of any agricultural activity taking place. That was also the position during my own site visit. As I also observed, there were no signs of any recent agricultural activity or work having taken place. The Appellant has provided no specific evidence of an ongoing agricultural use or a business, and I understand that the intention is that a large part of the holding (field) would be left wild to promote biodiversity measures. There is also no indication as to whether any agricultural activity or business extends to other land owned or leased by the Appellant.
12. Overall, no evidence has been put forward to justify the new building in this open countryside location and on such a small holding. There is no evidence to demonstrate that there is an essential business need for the proposed building in

this location. Whilst the ASOC states that there is a need and that the building is required to make the use viable, no substantive evidence has been provided to support those statements. There is also no evidence before me that the proposal would support the diversification of an existing business or is required to sustainably grow an existing or new agricultural business. Furthermore, the appeal site is located a long distance from any settlements or existing buildings and would be isolated within what is currently an open field surrounded by similar fields. As such, it would result in an unsustainable development with no opportunities to make the location more sustainable.

13. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal fails to comply with policies 1, 2, 5 and 12 of the CLP, policy C1 of the DPD and the corresponding policies of the NPPF.

*Character and appearance*

14. Policies 2 and 12 of the CLP require new development to be of a high quality, to ensure that Cornwall's enduring distinctiveness is maintained and enhanced, and that its distinctive natural character and landscapes are conserved and enhanced. Policy 23 (Natural environment) continues by requiring new development to protect and where possible enhance Cornwall's natural environment and assets, according to their international, national and local significance. For "*Cornish Landscapes*" the policy requires development to be of an appropriate scale, and to recognise and respect the landscape character of both designated and undesignated landscapes. The same approach is set out in policy C1 of the DPD which requires development to conserve and enhance Cornwall's natural environment.
15. As I confirmed earlier, the appeal site forms part of larger field within an undulating open rural landscape. It is surrounded by similar undeveloped fields and benefits from long range views to the hills to the north east and east. The proposed building would be sited within a prominent position in the north western corner of the appeal site close to its nominal boundary with the remainder of the Appellants' holding. A new hardcore access track would extend from the gated access, on the sites south eastern boundary, along the eastern boundary to meet a large area of hardcore for parking and turning. The amount of new hardstanding would be substantial and the proposed building itself would be significant in terms of its height, footprint and scale. The visual prominence of the new building would be accentuated by the use of corrugated sheeting to the walls and roof.
16. The appeal proposal would represent a discordant feature that would detract from the rural and undeveloped character of the appeal site and its surrounds. It would lead to the urbanisation of the open field and its rural appearance, harming the character and appearance of the countryside. The proposed building is excessive in terms of its scale, height and mass and its poor design and pallet of materials results in a development that is not, in my view, characteristic of the landscape, does not respect or maintain local distinctiveness and would be out of character with the more traditional form of agricultural buildings that are commonly found throughout Cornwall. The new building is also isolated with no physical or visual relationship to an existing farmstead or other outbuildings. It would be visually prominent from the access track and the County Road, in long range and other public views.
17. The key characteristics of the local landscape for the appeal site are set out in the Cornwall Character Area Description for CCA 10 Carmenellis. These include: a

dominant landcover of improved grassland/pasture; field patterns of medium scale and regular fields enclosed by Cornish Hedging; bleak and exposed landscape with long range views across and into the area; outside the main settlements scattered development over a rural landscape; a scenic and highly tranquil rolling landscape of dark night skies and isolated dwellings. The appeal proposal would, in my view, result in a harmful impact on a number of the key characteristics of the CCA.

18. In relation policies 2, 12 and 23 of the CLP and policy C1 of the DPD, insofar as these require development to ensure or secure Cornwall's enduring distinctiveness, maintain and enhance its distinctive natural character and where possible enhance Cornwall's natural environment and assets according to their international, national and local significance, the appeal proposal would, for the reasons given above, conflict with the aims and objectives of these policies.
19. Those policies are consistent with paragraphs 8, 135 and 187 (previously 180) of the NPPF, with the latter stating the importance of planning decisions contributing to and enhancing the natural and local environment, and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the open countryside. As I have found above, the appeal proposal would be contrary to these aims and objectives.
20. The ASOC includes photographs of what it refers to as other agricultural buildings in the locality. However, no details of their specific location are provided, neither is there any information before me of the planning background to these barns. One of the examples appears to be an older barn and there are no details of whether these barns were approved, involved permitted development or were justified in terms of their location and scale to support the development or expansion or diversification of agricultural or rural businesses. Even so, as is required, I have determined the appeal proposal on its individual merits having regard to its local context and the specific circumstances of the case.
21. The existence of these examples does not, therefore, affect my findings on this issue and neither does the fact that the application was supported by the Parish Council and other interested parties. That support does not negate the need for the proposal to be properly assessed against the prevailing development plan policies in terms of its impact on the open countryside and landscape.
22. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside and its undesignated landscape contrary to policies 2, 12 and 23 of the CLP, policy C1 of the DPD and the corresponding policies of the NPPF.

## Conclusions

23. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*G Roberts*

INSPECTOR



Ms Charlotte Caldwell  
Town Clerk  
Redruth Civic Centre  
Alma Place  
Redruth  
TR15 2AT

**My ref:** PA24/09801  
**Date:** 14 May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application number:** PA24/09801  
**Proposal:** Construction of four dwellinghouses  
**Location:** Land North West Of The Old Coach House Fore Street Redruth  
Cornwall TR15 2AE  
**Applicant:** Mr Simon Johns

Thank you for the Town Council response to the above proposal which I have set out below:

**Redruth Town Council (29 April 2025)**

**“Resolved by a MAJORITY to support the application.”**

Attention is drawn to the comments received from the World Heritage Site Office, Historic Environment Planning Officer and Forestry Officer, which state as follows:

**World Heritage Site Office (05 Mach 2025)**

“Thank you for consulting the Cornish Mining World Heritage Site Office. We have reviewed the submitted information and note that this is a revised scheme to that refused under previous application PA24/03709.

The changes to the scheme whilst resulting in a lower number of units and revised design, still seems overly scaled for the plot, as the individual dwellings now appear larger and still occupy a large area of the overall plot.

Development Management Service

Cornwall Council

PROTLC

Correspondence Address: Cornwall Council Planning Dept, New County Hall, Treyew Rd, Truro,  
TR1 3AY

[planning@cornwall.gov.uk](mailto:planning@cornwall.gov.uk)

Page 2

Ms Charlotte Caldwell

14 May 2025

The resultant impact is to look out of scale and having a massing and bulk that somewhat fills the application site, as opposed to achieving a more balanced ratio between the open space and the dwellings.”

**Historic Environment Planning Officer (04 March 2025)**

“It is recommended that the massing, scale and height of the proposed works are not appropriate to meet the requirements of NPPF Sections 213, 214 and 219 (2024), and Policy 24 of Cornwall Structure Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, and the Heritage Impact Assessment relates to the previous iteration which was refused (PA24/03709).

Consultation response

Thank you for consulting the Historic Environment Planning (HEP) Service on this planning application.

The proposed site development is within the rear historic curtilage of No 33 (Former London Hotel) and No 34 (Shop to left of the former Hotel) Fore St, Redruth, all within Redruth Conservation Area, WHS and Redruth HAZ. Both buildings which front Fore St are Grade II Listed (No. 1142558); 'Former coaching inn, now in commercial and residential use. Late C18, altered. Dressed granite, brought to courses, roof of local slate and Welsh slate. Elongated L-shaped plan formed by a long front range, with a central wagon-passage between the shop to the left and the public house to the right, and a long rear wing to the right-hand end. Three storeys and 4+3 bays; the wagon entrance in the fourth bay has a quoined surround and rectangular lintel supported at the right-hand end by a cut-away corbel. The four-bay shop to the left has a modern shop-front at ground floor, four 12-pane sashed windows at first floor (that over the wagon entrance slightly smaller), and four low six-pane sashes at second floor. The three-bay public house to the right is symmetrical, with a wide Doric porch in the centre (the top carrying iron railings), flanked by tripartite sashed windows with lintels scored in imitation of voussoirs; at first floor, a 16-pane sash in the centre and large 25-pane sashes to each side; and at second floor, altered and enlarged windows breaking through the eaves, with hipped dormer roofs, now all 20-pane sashes (but formerly like those to the left). All windows have raised sills and quoined jambs. Large gable chimney stacks. The rear and rear wing are considered to be of lesser interest.



14 May 2025

HISTORY: 33 & 34 Fore Street were built in 1776. 33 Fore Street was formerly a townhouse that was converted into a mining office in 1880 and later a commercial building. In 1964 the building became a supermarket on the ground floor with residential apartments on the upper floors, and a rear extension added. The building was converted into separate shop units in the 1970s. 34 Fore Street was built as a coaching inn called the London Inn or Hotel; it is now referred to as The Old Coach House. It was one of the principal hostelrys of the town with 12 bedrooms and stabling for up to 60 horses and carriages, replaced by extensions in the early-C20. The site was owned primarily by Redruth Brewery'.

The 2024 SWARCH assessment report details the site history; the 1809 OS Drawings map interestingly showing the primary linear development down Fore St and starting along Green Lane. Reference to historic mapping shows that in the 1840s the rear curtilage of No 33/34 appears to be undeveloped, but by the late 1870s, there are a few small buildings within the site (storage ?), within a compounded site, whose location was not hampered by rear curtilage walls of either No 33 or 34. However, there was (and still is) a rear boundary wall on the west side which marks the eastern end of the houses/curtilage plots for houses fronting Green Lane. By 1908 a larger building had been built adjacent to the rear of a rectangular building sited on the eastern boundary of No 8/10 Green Lane (the same pre 1880s building that the development should not compromise but be subservient). It is recommended this extant building has site significance, within this open rear curtilage site. The Cornwall Historic Environment Record states (Site MCO67509); 'Extant Post Medieval walled yards, highlighted as being of historical note and significant to the character of the local area' quoted from the Redruth and Plain An Gwary, CISI, 177).

Thus, historically, this rear curtilage site at the rear of Nos 33 and 34, and beyond the rear curtilage of buildings fronting Green Lane, and south of Belmont House walled garden boundary, appears to have had sporadic storage or small warehouse /compound buildings throughout the C20. The principle of any sizeable development for housing is therefore constrained by its impact with the existing significant buildings to the site, but also to its very open nature/setting/character and historically far less developed site, both historically and to this day, to the north and east.

A previous site visit for a planning preapp (PA23/00653/Preapp) for this same site (and a comment used for the revised iteration of PA24/03709 ' subsequently refused), stated; " comments given on site to the first iteration design for a number of dwellings resulted in objections to the massing, scale, design and size of the proposals. It was recommended that given the C19 site constraints, and in particular

14 May 2025

the still open character of the site, that an equally open natured single storey mews type development of perhaps 6 horse- shoe shaped buildings would better reflect the open low characteristics of the site, the former sporadic small storage character, and to be subservient to both the rear of the Listed buildings, and the adjacent C19 building that still survives'.

Unfortunately, comments for this latest iteration are still relevant as previously stated for PA24/03709; 'this new planning application that has been presented is of a linear mass design that still appears to contradict the open spacious feel of the site. Its singular linear massing appears to dominate this still open site (height/setting impacts to the adjacent building is not known), the massing apparently filling the site; where a more open and spacious site distribution was felt to be more appropriate for a site which it appears, has never been occupied for residential purposes (rather C19 light industrial). In any future revised schemes, it is recommended that the lower walls are constructed with stone or stone quoins and stone lintels etc to reflect the C19 development of the area, and the setting of the listed buildings and Redruth Conservation Area. The use of slate for the roof is appropriate, but the limited use of quoin stones appears to be insufficient. The context of the design philosophy appears to be better sited within a large residential estate rather than this location in Redruth Conservation Area, associated with Listed buildings, the WHS area and Redruth HAZ'.

Whilst aspects of the materials are somewhat improved, the massing, scale and height again appears to be disproportionate to reflect the context of the surrounding historic landscape and existing buildings.

The Heritage Impact Assessment relates to the previous iteration which was refused (PA24/03709).

NPPF 219 (2024) states: 'Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably'. It is recommended that this planning application proposal does not 'enhance or better reveal the setting of heritage assets or their significance' nor 'preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance)'.



14 May 2025

The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the general duty in respect to Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works (within the curtilage of the Listed building), the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses (S16 (2)).

Therefore, it is recommended that the massing, scale and height of the proposed works are not appropriate to meet the requirements of NPPF Sections 213, 214 and 219 (2024), and Policy 24 of Cornwall Structure Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, and the Heritage Impact Assessment relates to the previous iteration which was refused (PA24/03709)."

**Forestry Officer (20 February 2025)**

"This proposal differs significantly from the previously outlined proposal for a terrace of small dwellings. The previous indicative layout allowed significantly more space between the Northernmost dwelling and the boundary. There is a group of maturing broad leaved trees just outside the Northern boundary wall of the site and, if these are to be retained, Unit 4 will be adversely affected by these in terms of leaf litter drop and direct overhang of the crown. This will, in my opinion, lead to pressure to remove at least some of these trees. This should be factored into any planning decision. Ian Davies, Forestry Officer."

The current application has been submitted following the refusal of full planning application ref. PA24/03709, which sought permission for the erection of a terrace comprising six two-storey dwellings. Whilst the number of dwellings proposed at this stage have been reduced, the scale of each dwelling has been increased. It is still considered that the revised proposal would continue result in an overly dense form of development that adversely dominates the plot and fails to respect the historic character of the site as rear service and storage land, which historically served the associated grade II listed building. The development would not be sympathetic to local character and history, nor would it function well and add to the overall quality of the area. The harm resulting from the development proposed to the historical and cultural significance of grade II listed buildings, Redruth Conservation Area and the outstanding universal value of Camborne and Redruth Mining District World Heritage Site would be graded as less than substantial and would not be outweighed by any overriding public benefits. Overall, the development would fail to respond positively to the local historical, cultural and landscape context and would ultimately be contextually inappropriate. Consequently, the development would conflict with the aims and intentions

Page 6

Ms Charlotte Caldwell

14 May 2025

of aims and intentions of Policies 1, 2, 12, 21, 23 and 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 - 2030, Policies C1, TC1, TC3 and TC4 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023, Policies C2, C9 and P3 of the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site Management Plan 2020-2025, paragraphs 8, 124, 129, 135, 202, 210 and 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, paragraphs 3.1.2, 3.2.1, 3.3.5 and 4.2.5 of the Cornwall Design Guide 2021 and Sections 66 (1) and 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

In accordance with paragraph 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, development that is not well designed should be refused.

Policy G3 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023 establishes that, amongst other things, proposal for minor development should explore all options in relation to canopy provision and take appropriate measures to both avoid or reduce harm to existing onsite trees. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF recognises that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments and can also help mitigate and adapt to climate change. There is a group of trees located on the outer edge of the northern boundary of the site. The trees have been categorised as B grade and are assessed as being in reasonable condition with a moderate amenity value within the Tree Survey submitted. The Forestry Officer clarifies that the presence of the proposed development would increase pressure from the future occupants for the removal of the trees, and this pressure would increase with time as the trees get taller and the crowns get larger. This adds to the consideration that the proposal would be cramped within the plot by reason of the avoidable pressures on this grouping of trees, presenting some conflict with the aims and intentions of Policy G3 of the CEDPD, paragraph 136 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 and paragraphs 3.5.1 and 6.1.6 of the Cornwall Design Guide 2021.

In light of the above, I intend to recommend the application for refusal.

I would respectfully request that your Council consider the following options as set out within the Protocol for Local Councils:

1. Agree with my recommendation
2. Agree to disagree
3. It is requested the LPA consider referring the matter to planning committee

Please tell me which option you wish to choose within 5 working days from the date of this communication.

Page 7

Ms Charlotte Caldwell

14 May 2025

If I do not hear from you within 5 working days, a delegated decision may be issued in accordance with my recommendation following discussion with the Divisional Member. If our recommendation changes for any reason we will notify you so that you may reconsider your own position.

*\*Planning committees can be viewed and accessed remotely. Further information can be found on our website at [Webcasts - Cornwall Council](#).*

**Hannah England**  
**Development Management Service**  
**Senior Development Officer**  
**Tel: 01872 322222**  
**Email: [hannah.england@cornwall.gov.uk](mailto:hannah.england@cornwall.gov.uk)**



Ms Charlotte Caldwell  
Town Clerk  
Redruth Civic Centre  
Alma Place  
Redruth  
TR15 2AT

**My ref:** PA24/09484  
**Date:** 14 May 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application number:** PA24/09484  
**Proposal:** New self-build and custom build dwelling  
**Location:** Land East Of Plen An Merther, Radnor Road, Radnor, Cornwall,  
TR16 5EL  
**Applicant:** Mr And Mrs N Hancock

Thank you for the Town Council response to the above proposal which I have set out below:

**Redruth Town Council (16 April 2025)**

**“Supported”**

In response to the above, I have the following comments:

The application follows three refused applications refs. PA17/10345, PA19/05872 and PA21/04082 at the site. Both PA17/10345 and PA21/04082 were subsequently dismissed at appeal due to the impact on the setting of the Grade II Listed Wheal Peavor engine houses, which also forms a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and are situated within the Wheal Peavor World World Heritage Site (WHS). I attach copies of both appeal decisions.

The Cornish Mining WHS Office has reviewed the current proposal and provide the following comments:

*“The WHS Office must again object to the proposed development here as it would result in the same harm that has been previously identified across the various previous planning applications, which was sufficient reason for all previous applications to be refused consent.*

Development Management Service

Cornwall Council

PROTLC

Correspondence Address: Cornwall Council Planning Dept, New County Hall, Treyew Rd, Truro,  
TR1 3AY

planning@cornwall.gov.uk

14 May 2025

*The submission posits that the slight revision in siting of the dwelling overcomes the visual impact of the development. The WHS Office would note that it is still in the foreground that forms the setting of the Grade II listed Wheal Peevor engine houses and is still within the area of land previously proposed for development.*

*The WHS Office notes that tree growth is cited as another justification for the proposed development now not impacting upon the setting of the Grade II listed Wheal Peevor engine houses, which also form a Scheduled Ancient Monument and are within the World Heritage Site.*

*The WHS Office would note that vegetation density and levels of foliage fluctuate and are impermanent features that will not provide visual mitigation year-round or indeed when trees naturally expire. The issue of landscape cover to screen development has been subject to a number of appeal cases where Inspectors have noted that, landscaping should not be used in an attempt to hide unacceptable development as it may fail in the future. Trees will lose their leaves and will be subject to death and disease over time, reducing their effectiveness as a visual barrier.*

*The WHS Office is concerned that the justifications and revisions to the scheme are not significant enough to overcome the harm caused by the proposed development, where such development has been consistently refused multiple times across a number of applications and planning appeals.*

*The WHS Office must again object to the proposed development here as it would result in the same harm that has been previously identified across the various previous planning applications, which was sufficient reason for all previous applications to be refused consent."*

Policy 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2020 (CLP) affords great weight to be given to the conservation of Cornwall's heritage assets. Development within the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape World Heritage Site (WHS) and its setting should accord with the WHS Management Plan. Proposals that would result in harm to the authenticity and integrity of the Outstanding Universal Value, should be wholly exceptional. Any harm to the significance of a designated or non-designated heritage asset must be justified. Proposals causing harm will be weighed against the substantial public, not private, benefits of the proposal.

Similarly, paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF) states 'when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harms to its significance'.

Page 3

Ms Charlotte Caldwell

14 May 2025

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF states 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

The Local Planning Authority concur with the comments of the WHS Officer. By reason of its positioning in the direct setting of the Grade II Listed Wheal Peavor engine houses, which also forms a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and are situated within the Wheal Peavor World WHS, the proposed development would erode the open qualities of the setting of the engine houses. In the context of paragraph 215 of the NPPF, the resulting harm from this proposal to the WHS is graded as less than substantial. However, the limited public benefits arising from the provision of a single dwelling are not considered to outweigh the harm identified. Consequently, the proposal fails to protect, conserve or enhance the setting of the Grade II Listed Wheal Peavor engine houses, which are designed as Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and the setting of the Wheal Peavor WHS. The proposal therefore conflicts with policies 1, 2, 12 and 24 of the CLP, policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023 (CEDPD), policies C2 and C9 of the and paragraphs 8, 135, 210, 215 and 215 of the NPPF.

In light of the above, I intend to recommend the application for refusal.

I would respectfully request that your Council consider the following options as set out within the Protocol for Local Councils:

1. Agree with my recommendation
2. Agree to disagree
3. It is requested the LPA consider referring the matter to planning committee

Please tell me which option you wish to choose within 5 working days from the date of this communication.

If I do not hear from you within 5 working days, a delegated decision may be issued in accordance with my recommendation following discussion with the Divisional Member. If our recommendation changes for any reason we will notify you so that you may reconsider your own position.

*\*Planning committees can be viewed and accessed remotely. Further information can be found on our website at [Webcasts - Cornwall Council](#).*

**Katie Lever**  
**Development Management Service**  
**Senior Development Officer**

Page 4

Ms Charlotte Caldwell

14 May 2025

**Tel: 01872 322222**

**Email: [katie.lever@cornwall.gov.uk](mailto:katie.lever@cornwall.gov.uk)**

**Redruth Town Council**  
**Planning Committee – 5 Day Protocols**  
**Meeting Date: 9<sup>th</sup> June 2025**

Reference	Item	Action	RTC Response
PA25/01204	Extension and alterations to existing two dwellings  Tregays Yard Rear Of 18 Higher Fore Street Redruth TR15 2AP	5-day protocol notice issued 15/05/2025	Agree to disagree  Notified 19/05/2025
PA24/09801	Construction of four dwelling houses.  Land North West Of The Old Coach House Fore Street Redruth Cornwall TR15 2AE	5-day protocol notice issued 14/05/2025	Disagree - Refer to Planning Committee  Notified 15/05/2025