



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2018

**by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 16<sup>th</sup> February 2018.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/17/3181725**

**Bucklawren House, Road from Bucklawren to the Mill Pond, St Martin  
PL13 1NZ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Horner against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref PA17/03524, dated 11 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is the construction of garage, home gym and hobby room.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a rural area and an Area of Great Landscape Value. Bucklawren House is a two storey stone dwelling set within a relatively extensive garden. It is set close to a cluster of other buildings which includes some agricultural and some residential uses. All these buildings are located relatively close to each other and form a fairly tight knit grouping. This has resulted in a well contained area of built development in an otherwise very rural landscape. This is a significant and positive attribute that is a defining characteristic of the local area.
4. The appeal building would be sited on land located to the north and east of Bucklawren House. This area of land is a significant distance from the dwelling. It is separated from it by intervening landscaping and can be accessed from the adjacent road via a separate field gate. It has the appearance of a paddock and as being visually distinct from the main garden area.
5. The distance and landscape features are such that the appeal building would not appear as being associated with Bucklawren House. Rather it would appear visually separated from it. It would extend the built development significantly to the north and east of the current cluster of buildings. It would appear as an incursion into the open countryside and as being set apart from the existing grouping of buildings.
6. The building would have a residential appearance with dormer windows, garage doors and other fenestration of a domestic appearance and scale. The use of the structure for ancillary residential purposes is likely to result in a significant domestication to the character of the land immediately surrounding it. This

would also erode the rural character of the area. Although smaller than that of Bucklawren House, the footprint of the appeal building would still be significant, which, when also considered with the significant separation from this dwelling, would mean that it would not appear as ancillary to it. While some of the materials proposed would be similar to those used on Bucklawren House, this would not be sufficient to create an intrinsic link between the two buildings so that they would appear as closely associated with one another.

7. There is a hedge bank, with trees and some shrubs on it and a number of other trees located close to where the building would be sited. My observations during my site inspection confirmed that the existing landscaping would not hide the building from view even when the planting would be in leaf. The building would be visible from the field access and through gaps in the landscaping. Even if additional landscaping were provided this would not adequately mitigate the harmful incursion into the rural landscape that would arise from the building. The development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would bring about private benefits for the appellants; however, other than some short term benefits associated with the construction phase, the wider public benefits would be extremely limited. While I have taken account of the benefits I only afford this very limited weight. These are not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I note that the appellants have considered other options. However I am not convinced that there are no alternative means to provide some ancillary accommodation either through a modest extension to the existing dwelling or by siting a building within the relatively extensive curtilage. However, even if such other options were not possible, this would not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise from the appeal development.
10. I therefore conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to accord with Policies 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies and saved Policy CL9 of the Caradon Local Plan. Together, these seek to secure development which maintains and where possible enhances the distinctive natural character of the area and do not permit development which would materially harm the character of an Area of Great Landscape Value. The development would also not accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and seeks to ensure development enhances the natural environment.

## **Conclusion**

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan when it is considered as a whole. It would fail to meet the environmental role of sustainable development and when considered in the round the development would not amount to sustainable development.
12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

*K Taylor*

INSPECTOR