



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3362171**

**Bowls Farm, Castle Road, Ludgvan, Penzance, Cornwall TR20 8HD**

- 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 Mr and Mrs Luke and Nicki Jannaway against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref. is PA24/08315.
  - The development proposed is single storey front and rear extensions and a 2-storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings, in particular Castle Road.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a late Victorian farmhouse which despite some poor quality additions over the years has in large measure retained its period qualities and characteristics. Of particular merit is the original front (southeast facing) elevation, with its simple traditional design and perfect symmetry complemented by the flagstone terrace and attractive enclosed garden. There are views of the upper parts of the building from Castle Road.
4. The main entrance (northwest facing) elevation is of lesser quality with a yard setting used for access and parking, and the house's symmetry affected by the landing window and the dominant appearance of the lean-to wooden garage and the somewhat dilapidated conservatory.
5. Turning to the effect of the proposed extensions on the building and its surroundings including any roadside views, the Council considers that the proposal would be 'overdevelopment' and that the 'very modern' design and large amount of glazing fails to complement or protect the character of the existing dwelling. I note that these views are shared by the Parish Council.
6. As regards overdevelopment, the two-storey side extension would replace the lean-to garage, whilst the reception area and utility room addition to the northwest facing elevation would replace the unsightly conservatory. With its set-back and set-down position and sand/cement painted rendered walls I consider the side extension to be acceptable as a modern addition that would complement the original building.

However, the front wall fenestration of this side addition requires improvement as it would be a weak feature that would detract from its appearance.

7. In respect of the single storey reception and utility area, the design lacks any form of coherence with its mix of traditional and contemporary design; flat and pitched roofs, with stonework and rendered walls. This addition would have a cluttered and complex appearance and read as being harmfully out of keeping with the Victorian characteristics of the main building.
8. Finally, as regards the southeast facing elevation, I have referred in paragraph 3 above to its importance as a largely unaltered original front elevation to the character and appearance of this 'handsome' Victorian farmhouse and its immediate context. On this basis it might be argued that any extension would cause at least some harm.
9. However, with this elevation now functioning as the rear of the building and associated with the main area of private garden, this preclusion would be unreasonable, especially given the importance of the aspect for sunlight and outlook. With that said, the design of the proposed single storey addition in the appeal scheme is unsatisfactory as again it combines a mix of a flat roof, a small pitched roof, stonework, and a fenestration pattern that reads poorly against the simple and traditional Victorian design.
10. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and in particular this principal elevation, an extension with more definite style and character is required. I can see no objection to this including extensive glazing, perhaps in the form of a Victorian style orangery of a design in keeping with the simple form of the house but would not exclude a contemporary addition provided the design is of a high standard. (The appeal statement refers to the existing conservatory as '*a pastiche miniature replica of a Victorian orangery*' but I do not recognise it as such).

## Conclusion

11. I have had regard to all other matters raised, including the potential for a permitted development fallback, but find that in its current form the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its immediate surroundings. As such, there would be conflict with Policies 2, 12 & 24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030; Policy LUD7 of the Ludgvan Parish Neighbourhood Plan; Section 7 of the Parish Council Design Statement, and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework revised December 2024.
12. The appeal therefore fails.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR