



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2023

by S Harrington MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/22/3309328

Land North East of Higher Barn Farm, Trevarrian, Newquay, Cornwall TR8 4AF

- 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 Old against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref PA21/10980, dated 3 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Given the lack of a full site address provided within the planning application form, I have used the site address provided within the Council's decision notice in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within a relatively level field, located within the Watgate and Lanherne Area of Great Landscape Value and within the Landscape Character Area LCA15 Newquay and Perranporth Coast (LCA). I observed that the character of the surrounding area accords with that of the LCA in being one of a rolling pastoral and arable landscape enclosed with Cornish hedges, with sporadic farmsteads and buildings.
5. Although there are no other buildings within the field under the ownership of the applicant, the proposal would be located in near proximity to neighbouring buildings to the south east and small grouping of mature trees, as well as more distant buildings to the south west. The site is visible from both short distance views from the highway and surrounding public rights of way (PROW), as well as longer distance views, particularly from the north east.
6. The proposal would be located to the eastern side of the field and feature a pitch roof design, with a hayloft above a machinery store and windows of a domestic scale to two elevations. I observed that due to the surrounding topography, the proposal would be set above the neighbouring buildings to the south east which are well screened by mature planting, and would be

significantly more prominent than these buildings from both short and long distance viewpoints.

7. While I note that screening has been planted to the south of the appeal site, which in time would help screen the proposal from the highway and other viewpoints to the south, existing mature planting to the east of the appeal site appears to be outside of the control of the appellant, and could therefore be removed. Notwithstanding, even if it is the case that this screening is retained, given the more elevated location, clear views would still be available from numerous public viewpoints including the PROW.
8. I also find that the proposal would draw the eye and have greater presence and prominence in the landscape by reason of its pitch roof design and non-utilitarian appearance within a relatively small field, notwithstanding that the building would be relatively modest in scale. Despite surrounding buildings, the proposal would therefore be seen as separate from any existing farmstead, and would appear somewhat incongruous in its setting. It would be a visually intrusive feature in the patchwork landscape of small fields undermining the landscape value of the area.
9. While I accept that buildings to the south west are set above the appeal site due to their location higher on rising topography, these buildings have a utilitarian appearance, and are seen against the backdrop of an existing farmstead and hedge boundary therefore having a less pronounced visual impact.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant currently stores maintenance equipment at their home address, and the proposal could reduce trips to and from the appeal site. Furthermore, I note the appellants intention to store straw bales, chicken feed and the future intention to increase the number of chickens and other livestock on the site. However, given the relatively small size of the holding, no substantive evidence has been provided that leads me to conclude the proposal is of appropriate scale or design, and these factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified
11. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan 2010-2030. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development maintains and enhances Cornwall's distinctive and natural character and landscape qualities. It would also fail to accord with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework with regard to conserving and enhancing the built environment and valued landscape setting.

Other Matters

12. I note the appellant's comments about the Council's handling of the application, and the frustration this has caused the appellant. However, this has little to do with the planning merits of the case, which I have considered on the basis of the evidence before me.
13. I also note the appellant's comments in relation to neighbouring support for the proposal. Even if there were no third party objections to this development, my assessment of the effect of the development would be unchanged and a lack of objections is not a reason in itself to allow development that is unacceptable.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

S Harrington

INSPECTOR