



## Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 7 September 2022

**by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

all appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 13 October 2022**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/21/3281716**

#### **Coth Bean, Carlidnack Road, Mawnan Smith TR11 5HD**

- 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 and Mrs Eva against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref PA21/02605, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
  - The development proposed compromises of a new entrance porch, single storey rear extension and material change to a garage roof.
- 

### **Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/Y/21/3281715**

#### **Coth Bean, Carlidnack Road, Mawnan Smith TR11 5HD**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Eva against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref PA21/02606, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
  - The works proposed compromise of a new entrance porch, single storey rear extension and material change to a garage roof.
- 

## **Decisions**

1. The appeals are dismissed.

## **Main Issue**

1. Coth Bean is a Grade II listed building of potentially 18<sup>th</sup> Century or early 19<sup>th</sup> Century origin. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

## **Reasons**

2. Coth Bean's special interest lies in its original form as a chall barn, but also in its Victorian or early 20<sup>th</sup> Century conversion to a cottage style dwelling. It is rebuilt and extended in places in a manner which mimics the rusticity of the chall barn element. This includes the west side of the main range, hosting the kitchen, which has largely modern fabric but in plan form is evident on historic mapping. Whilst this approach may sometimes confuse a building's legibility, that is not the case at Coth Bean which, as an historic barn conversion, is in its essence an enigmatic hybrid, in effectively a late *Cottage orné* style.
3. The dining room extension off the southwest corner of Coth Bean is its least successful architecturally and functionally and is a candidate for replacement. That said, it has a low profile and meets Coth Bean with a narrowness and a modest roof. This gives it a degree of both subservience and detachment from the main range, which allows the dining room to defer to it fairly successfully.

4. The same could not be said for its replacement, which would offer a more substantial mass to the front and side of Coth Bean, forming a poor, awkward junction with the southwest corner of the main range, particularly along the eaves and at roof level. Moreover, its markedly larger form would further depart from the original plan of the chall barn to the extent that its overall scale would not maintain requisite subservience to the main range.
5. Whilst I recognise that the replacement would be an improvement functionally and with regard to its fenestration and finishes, this does not serve to mitigate the harmful way in which it would interact with Coth Bean. It is of little consequence to my assessment that the replacement would be predominately sited within Coth Bean's enlarged, modern garden space, and that the harm to the listed building would be largely away from the public domain.
6. Given the inherently imitative *Cottage orné* style of Coth Bean, I do not share the view that replacing the thatch atop its 1992 built garage with slate would better reveal its significance. I do accept, however, that slate would be a safer and more suitable roof cladding for the garage in practical terms. This element of the proposal is therefore a very modest positive. Overall, there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.
7. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) explains that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Paragraph 202 goes on to require decision makers to weigh any less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the scheme, including securing its optimum viable use. That balancing exercise must take place in the context of s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which set a strong presumption against a grant of planning permission or listed building consent for development or works that would cause harm to the special interest of a listed building.
8. The public benefit of the proposal is that the enhanced accommodation would likely promote health and well-being, with a higher standard of amenity for existing and future users of the dwelling. The appellants have also mentioned viability, but it is unclear if this is financial, or relates to the personal requirements of the appellants. Overall, the weight I attach to this benefit falls short of justifying the harm that would be caused; harm that must be given considerable importance and weight in the balancing exercise.
9. That conclusion also leads the proposal into conflict with Policies 12, 13 and 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2016-2030 (adopted 2016) (CLP) and the Cornwall Design Guide, which together seek to protect the historic environment through appropriate design.

### **Other Matters**

10. Coth Bean is within the Cornwall Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places a duty upon me to have regard to the purpose of the AONB to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. Given the small scale of the proposal, its location within the envelope of Mawnan Smith, and Coth Bean's fairly screened boundaries, the proposal would not harm the AONB. It would not in this regard conflict with Policy 23 of the CLP nor Policies 5 and 6 of the emerging, post referendum, Mawnan Neighbourhood Development Plan.

## **Conclusion**

11. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole. For the above given reasons, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

*Matthew Jones*  
INSPECTOR