
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/16/3163273

Sunwell Bungalow, Sunwell Lane, Antony PL11 3AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Kevin Down against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA16/03181, dated 31 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of new holiday let on footprint of previously demolished building within the site of Sunwell bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Cornwall Council against Mr & Mrs Kevin Down. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary matters

3. The application was made in outline form with all matters reserved for later consideration. However, as set out in the description of the development above, the intention is for the building to be on the footprint of a former bungalow which is in the north east corner of the site. As such, although I cannot formally consider layout at this stage, I have taken this intention into account.
4. Since the Council's decision, the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP) has been adopted, and therefore Policy TM4 of the Caradon Local Plan First Alteration referred to in the decision notice no longer has any effect. The Council's appeal statement refers to Policies 5 and 23 of the CLP as being relevant to this case. The appellant has referred to both these policies in their submissions.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the development has acceptable access to services and facilities.

Reasons

6. The appeal site currently accommodates Sunwell bungalow and its garden. The existing dwelling is one of a small group of detached properties set in a shallow valley. The group is accessed via a number of narrow lanes and is around one kilometre from the nearest settlement of Antony which is a small village with
-

limited services and facilities. The wider area is generally a popular tourist destination, and the appellant specifically refers to the nearby beaches along Whitsand Bay and other local tourist destinations.

7. However the beaches, the other tourist attractions and the nearest bus stops and local shops in Antony or St John are all a considerable distance from the site if travelling by foot or cycle. Furthermore, the narrowness of the local roads, and the tall hedgerows that line many of them, means that they are not appealing routes for walking or cycling. There are a number of footpaths locally but none are close to the appeal site and pedestrians would need to walk down the narrow local roads for some distance before reaching them. As such these local services and tourist facilities would not be readily accessible from the proposed holiday let other than by a car.
8. Consequently, the development would not be acceptably located in respect of its access to services and facilities in the nearest villages to serve the day to day needs of its future occupiers, or in respect of its access to tourist attractions. Policy 5 of the CLP supports the provision of new tourism accommodation if it would be appropriate in scale to its accessibility by a range of transport modes. As the proposal would be poorly accessible by all modes of transport other than by car, it would not be an appropriate location for tourist accommodation and therefore would be contrary to this policy. The development would also conflict with the advice in paragraph 28 of the National Planning Policy Framework which supports the provision of tourist facilities in appropriate locations.
9. The appellant's suggestion that much tourist accommodation in Cornwall is reliant on private cars does not justify adding to it, even by one unit, if that development has poor accessibility.
10. Furthermore, from the limited details provided in respect of a development at Camperdown Farm¹, I am unable to assess its comparability with the case before me. Notwithstanding this, each case must be determined on its own merits.

Other matters

11. The proposed development would be within the existing garden of Sunwell Bungalow and would be seen in the context of that dwelling and the buildings at the adjacent property at Sunwell Farm. It would not represent an encroachment into the open countryside and instead would fit comfortably within the cluster of buildings that make up the hamlet. Nonetheless, although it would not be isolated from other development, it would be isolated from nearby settlements and the facilities and services available therein.
12. The former bungalow on site has been substantially demolished and all that remains of it are a few courses of bricks above ground level and a lean-to shed, which is constructed of timber and corrugated metal and is used as a garden store. However notwithstanding the condition or extent of the remaining building, the location remains inappropriate for the proposed development.
13. The site is within an Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV). The impact of the proposal on the AGLV or the character and appearance of the area would

¹ Planning ref PA16/01868

largely depend on its appearance and scale, both of which are reserved matters which I am unable to consider in this appeal.

14. The holiday let would provide a benefit to the local economy as its guests would most likely use local businesses such as shops or restaurants. However the economic benefit resulting from one unit would be limited and would not warrant granting planning permission.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR