



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/21/3279310

The Shed, Ox Lane, St Mawgan TR8 4EU

- 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 Andrew Williams against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA21/04257, dated 20 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of two open market dwellings with associated amenity space and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the site is in an appropriate location for the development, with regard to policies of the development plan, and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. St Mawgan has a tight nucleated core nestled in the bottom of a river valley. From here roads extend up the steep hillsides fronted, to varying degrees, by a more linear pattern of development. Ox Lane is one such road and, while the built form along it is intermittent in places, The Shed is clearly part of the overall settlement.
4. Policy 3 of the Cornwall Local Plan 2016 (LP) sets out a broad development strategy based upon the role and function of places. At settlements such as St Mawgan, it allows development through rounding off on land immediately adjoining that settlement of a scale appropriate to its role. Supporting text indicates that the policy relates to land that is substantially enclosed, but outside of the urban form of the settlement and where its edge is clearly defined by a physical feature that also acts as a barrier to further growth. It goes on to confirm that it should not visually extend building into the countryside.
5. A Chief Planning Officer's Advice Note (CPOAN) on infill and rounding off adds further guidance. It indicates that proposals must be adjacent to existing development, contained with long-standing boundary features, and that suitable sites are likely to be surrounded on at least two sides by built development.

6. The site is a broadly rectangular parcel of land that lies just beyond The Shed when exiting St Mawgan. It does not have a particularly natural appearance and so is distinct from the surrounding countryside and wider landscape character. The design of the dwellings, together with new additional landscaping, could reduce any visual impact of the new buildings, such that the effect on the general character and appearance of the area would be limited, and there would be no substantive conflict with those aims of LP Policies 12 and 23 that seek to protect such interests. However, as undeveloped land, the site does not read as part of the settlement.
7. The Shed is at one end of the site, closest to the settlement. Other than the access to The Shed the site is open land. Beyond the boundary opposite Ox Lane, are agricultural buildings and dwellings at Higher Winsor Farm. Higher Winsor is accessed from another road that forms the fourth site boundary and so the buildings there appear as a separate farmstead entity and not part of St Mawgan.
8. Neither the LP or CPOAN suggest that adjoining built form must be part of the settlement. However, The Shed is also set substantially back from Ox Lane and so, when leaving St Mawgan, the settlement appears to stop at this point. Despite the surrounding buildings, hedge and road boundaries advocated in the LP and CPOAN as barriers to future growth, the proposal would have the clear effect of extending the settlement into the countryside.
9. With regard to the above, although adjacent to the settlement edge, from where future residents could easily access the facilities and services within St Mawgan, I find that the proposal is not rounding off. Accordingly development in this location is in conflict with LP Policy 3 and the overall settlement strategy of the development plan, read as a whole.
10. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR