



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **S Harrington MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> August 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3368088**

**13 Beach View Close, Newquay, Cornwall TR7 3LE**

- 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 Emma De-La-Hunty against the decision of Cornwall Council.
  - The application Ref is PA25/02249.
  - The development proposed is two storey extension and alterations to the existing property (including parking provision).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a well-established residential area featuring single and two storey dwellings of varying appearance. However, the dwellings in the area do exhibit some common traditional architectural features, notably pitch roofs. These traditional architectural features form a distinctive part of the suburban character and local identity of the immediate area.
4. Notwithstanding, the appeal property is a notable exception due to its flat roof design. However, given its low height, use of similar facing materials to neighbouring dwellings and position towards the end of a terrace of two storey dwellings the property is inconspicuous, particularly when viewed from the adjacent public highway. Furthermore, the low height allows views over the property, and in combination with the relatively large area of garden results in the appeal site providing a sense of openness and relief from adjacent relatively dense development.
5. The proposal would introduce two storey-built form onto the appeal site, which would attract the eye due to its contemporary appearance and external facing materials. Given the proliferation of traditional design features such as pitch roofs in the area, the proposed contemporary design would appear visually jarring and incongruous. Moreover, the proposal would result in a dwelling of significantly greater visual massing and bulk. Such massing and bulk would be visually intrusive, particularly given the prominent position of the appeal property adjacent and above the public highway.

6. As such, the proposal conflicts with guidance provided in the Cornwall Design Guide 2021 (CDG) which, amongst other matters, seeks development to feel part of the existing settlement, with its design integrating with existing built forms and the character of the area.
7. Furthermore, Policy LE4 of the Newquay Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2030 (NP) seeks to protect important views and vistas from being spoiled by encroaching development. Whilst the proposal does not impact on any of the viewpoints expressly mentioned within the Policy, the Policy is clear that it is not limited to those listed viewpoints. The CDG also guides that proposals should protect and enhance key views.
8. In this regard, long views towards the sea, and valued landscapes such as Trevelgue Head and Port Island are available from the highway over the site, particularly in the proximity of the junction of Porth Bean Road and Cross Close. Due to the density of surrounding development preventing other clear views of the sea and landscape, the importance of the remaining view over the appeal site is increased. The proposed height and position of the two-storey element of the proposal would significantly encroach into this vista, adversely impacting this important view.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with policies 1, 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-30, NP Policies G2, D1, D2, H1 and LE4. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development features high quality design that fits well and enhances the existing character of the area and avoid harmful impacts on important views.
10. The Council's decision notice also refers to NP policies LE2 and H2. NP Policy LE2 identifies locally valued landscapes, whilst NP Policy H2 seeks to address the issue of developments in areas that have particular landscape sensitivity and are highly visible from public vantage points.
11. However, nothing within the substantive evidence before me leads me to find that the appeal site is within a sensitive landscape area, nor, notwithstanding its prominence from Porth Bean Road, that it is visible from a key vantage point. Moreover, given the distance from valued landscapes, the proposal would not harm the visual or recreational value of a valued landscape. In these regards I find no conflict with NP Policies LE2 or H2.

### **Other Matters**

12. I am told the appeal building falls below the national space standards for a one-person single storey dwelling. The proposal would result in additional living space for the occupants providing improved living conditions and a more sustainable energy efficient dwelling. The proposal would also provide an off-street parking space with electric charge facility. Whilst these will be undoubted benefits to future occupiers, I see no reason why these could not be achieved in a less harmful manner, and I therefore afford these benefits modest weight.
13. Finally, even if I were to agree that there would be no unacceptable effects on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, this is a neutral factor and would not weigh in favour of the scheme.

## **Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations, individually or cumulatively, indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*S Harrington*

INSPECTOR