
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/24/3348691

Carn Glaze Farm, St. Just, Penzance, Cornwall TR19 7RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Milia Purppura against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA23/02481.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached stable tackroom/feed store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application subject to this appeal was submitted on behalf of Ms M Hau. For the appeal, the appellant was named as Mrs Milia Purppura. I am satisfied that these are one and the same person, and that the appellant is entitled to make the appeal.
3. Since the appeal was made, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. Although I have made my determination against the updated national policy context, the relevant changes to the Framework are not fundamental to matters which are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, which lies within the Cornwall National Landscape, also referred to as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

5. The site consists of land adjacent to the Penwith Moors Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It is associated with Carn Glaze Farm and its house and buildings, some of which are being converted into holiday accommodation. Public footpaths and a bridleway run close to or within the site. The proposal seeks to erect a detached stable tack room and feed store. It would be built of traditional granite stone, under a roof of natural slate and clay ridge tiles. The building would be used for domestic stabling, with the horse(s) being available to holiday guests. It would also assist in the management of the land.
6. The site lies within the Penwith Central Hills Landscape Character Area of the Cornwall Character Assessment Study, 2007 (CCA). The area is identified as having settlement concentrated in the sheltered valleys, forming clusters of small

farms. The unenclosed moorland is described in the CCA as being bleak and remote, with a sense of wilderness.

7. The site contains a bench and is said to have been used for camping. Natural England excluded the land from the SSSI designation on the basis that it constitutes domestic curtilage. However, the Council disputes that it forms part of the immediate curtilage of the house. It is linked by stone hedgerows, copses and fields to the rest of Carn Glaze Farm, which can be seen in some views with Leswidden Farm opposite. Nevertheless, the appeal site forms a separate parcel of land and is some distance from the dwelling itself.
8. The appeal site has open heathland on several sides, providing wide vistas. It is contained by low-level stone boulder walling and windswept vegetation, but otherwise consists of open, wild grassland. The site currently contains no buildings and has the appearance of remote countryside. As such, it and the immediate surroundings broadly reflect the CCA description.
9. The proposal would be built of sympathetic external materials, and be of modest size. A planning condition could restrict the use of lighting. Nevertheless, it would result in the encroachment of quasi-domestic built form into the site. Some taller trees nearby, protected by the SSSI designation, would provide a degree of screening. Even so, given the low level of much of the surrounding vegetation and heathland, the proposal would be a conspicuous and intrusive feature, including when seen from the nearby footpaths and bridleway.
10. Examples of separate buildings in the area have been identified by the appellant. However, some of these are on steep hillsides, or have other buildings nearby, making them less intrusive. Other examples appeared to be historic, and may not have required planning permission. In any case, they do not justify the harmful effects of the proposal.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the Cornwall National Landscape/AONB. It would therefore conflict with policies 2, 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP), adopted November 2016, and policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document, adopted February 2023. It would similarly conflict with policies AD8, BD1 and CD4 of the St Just-in-Penwith Parish Neighbourhood Plan, made September 2021, as well as the Cornwall AONB Management Plan, read in the round.
12. Together, these policies require proposals to conserve and enhance the character of the area and to avoid a negative effect on the landscape, including using the guidance which is now within the CCA. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the requirement under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, as amended, that I must further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Framework paragraph 189 makes similar requirements, to which I give great weight.
13. In light of the conflict with the other CLP policies, it follows that the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in CLP Policy 1 is not engaged. As a result, this policy is neutral in the planning balance.

Other Matters

14. The proposal would have economic benefits that would provide a service for the tourist business. Its construction would assist the building industry to some extent. The proposal would contribute to sustainable transport options for visitors and is accessible from the bridleway (rather than the more constrained footpaths) and a nearby bus stop. The proposal would be built to high environmental standards and may be beneficial to local habitat retention. However, given its relatively modest size, I give these benefits only moderate weight in favour of the proposal. Consequently, they do not overcome the harm I have identified.
15. The appellant has expressed concerns about the handling of the appeal planning application by the Council. This includes its communication and a delay in the displaying of the plans on the Council's website. Nevertheless, the processing of the application is not a matter for me, and I have focused my consideration on the planning merits of the proposal.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, I have found conflict with the Development Plan as a whole. The material considerations in this case, and the weight I give to them, do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the Development Plan. This leads me to conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR