
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/22/3306971

Ferndown, Praze an Beeble, Camborne, Cornwall, TR14 0LH

- 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 Menear against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA22/03064, dated 23 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of garage/storage building for steam engine and other collectables.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Ferndown is a large detached dormer bungalow located in open countryside to the east of Praze an Beeble. It is set in a large plot, with an extensive paved driveway running from the entrance round the front of the house to outbuildings at the rear. There is a scattering of other dwellings and farms along the road.
4. The relevant policies in this case include 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (the local plan) and HT4 of the Crowan Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2030 (the NDP). These policies all seek to ensure that development is of a high design quality, having regard to the value and sensitivity of the landscape and the maintenance and enhancement of the county's distinctive natural character, among other things.
5. The proposed building would be approximately 125sqm in floor area and 4.5m in height. I consider that its proposed design and materials would reflect the character of agricultural buildings I have seen in the area. However, the appeal site itself is residential and has a domestic character and appearance and the building is not required for agricultural purposes.
6. The proposal is a revised and smaller version of an earlier scheme, but it would still be a large building and in my view, the siting of a building of this size close to the boundary with the road would result in a visually intrusive and dominant

feature in the landscape. The appellants state that the building would be cut into the ground level of the garden and have submitted a drawing indicating a typical section across the site which indicates that the floor level of the building would be lower than that of the house. However, the section does not show its relationship with the adjoining road and it is evident on site that the level of the garden, and therefore the proposed building, is noticeably higher than the adjoining road. Although the appellants propose additional planting on top of the existing traditional hedge, I am not convinced that this would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the building.

7. I have taken account of the appellants' need to have a secure location to house their steam roller and associated equipment and their contribution to local charities. However, although I consider that the design of the proposal is acceptable, and that a building of this size could be accommodated within this large site without having an adverse effect on any neighbouring residents, I find that it would be visually dominant in the location proposed so close to and above the road.
8. I conclude that the proposed garage/storage building would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies 2 and 12 of the local plan and HT4 of the NDP.
9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR