



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2020

by Tobias Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/20/3244813

Long Island, Trevillet, Tintagel, Cornwall PL34 0HL

- 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 C Hulme against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA19/06837, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed extension to provide a garden room and utility room on ground floor and lounge on upper floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development, with particular regard to the roof extension, on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Heritage Coast and the Cornwall Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

3. Situated on the edge of Trevillet, the appeal site is located near to a small number of residential properties, including some two-storey dwellings. There are also some barns/workshop buildings in the vicinity. Amongst other aspects, the site contains a modest bungalow with a simple design and form that respects the local built environment. The site is surrounded by agricultural fields and countryside on three sides and looks out over the undulating landscape and coast to the north. These and the site are within the Cornwall AONB and Heritage Coast area. Although soft landscaping provides some screening, I observed on my site visit that the bungalow is visible in the surrounding area.
4. Despite its hipped roof, the proposed roof extension would appear as a significant, prominent and bulky addition that would dominate the existing building. Its form, layout and scale would also neither reflect the bungalow nor other built form in the locality.
5. Despite topography and the screening presence of soft landscaping limiting the exposure of the site to some extent, the unsympathetic form and scale of the roof extension would nevertheless be noticeable in the locality and public realm. This includes from the lane which leads to the site and the adjacent public right of way. From the available evidence and my observations on my site visit, it seems to me that the roof extension would also be visible in the

wider AONB and Heritage Coast landscape in some longer distance views. Accordingly, and irrespective of whether it would be visually prominent in the wider landscape setting, the roof extension would appear as an incongruous addition that would fail to respect its surroundings, which includes the Heritage Coast and the AONB.

6. In coming to this view, I have taken account of the officer report relating to the nearby agricultural building that was approved by the Council in 2017. However, being situated on lower land and involving a different development, the particular circumstances of that scheme and its siting do not reflect the proposed development. I have therefore dealt with the appeal proposal on its own merits. The lack of comment or objection from the Cornwall AONB officer, Parish Council and the public also do not lead me to a different conclusion.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Heritage Coast and the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. I therefore find that it conflicts with Policies 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan 2010-2030. Amongst other aspects, these require development to maintain local distinctiveness and character, provide continuity with existing built form, be of an appropriate scale, mass and design, conserve and enhance the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB, and maintain the distinctive qualities of the Heritage Coast. It would also be inconsistent with the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to achieving well-designed places. Although the main parties refer to the Cornwall AONB Management Plan, my attention has not been drawn to any specific policies or requirements within it which the appeal proposal is alleged to either comply or conflict with.

Other matters

8. I note that the appellants discussed the proposal with the Council and submitted amended plans during the determination of the planning application, reducing the roof extension's height and length in line with planning officers' suggestions. However, these issues are not determinative as to the acceptability of the appeal proposal, which I have considered on its own merits, based on the submitted plans and the evidence before me.
9. The Council have not raised concerns about the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Be that as it may, this does not indicate that harmful development should be permitted. The harm that I have identified also indicates that the proposed development does not accord with the development plan and the Framework as a whole, and this is sufficient for me to find against the proposal.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Tobias Gethin

INSPECTOR