



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/24/3355765

Trewothack Farm, Gillan, Manaccan, Cornwall, TR12 6HE

- 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 E Hoskin against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/01920.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of four residential caravans with two detached dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the scenic beauty of the Cornwall National Landscape.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a highly rural area, immediately to the north of a collection of buildings which form Trewothack Farm. The site forms part of the Cornwall National Landscape (the NL). Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within NL's. Furthermore, the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 requires decision makers to actively seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty within NL's.
4. The topography of the land means that the site is visible as part of medium to long range views, including from public footpaths. At present the site is lawfully occupied by four caravans. Being of limited height, the caravans inevitably sit fairly low within the landscape. As such, while the site does have a domestic appearance, including the sort of paraphernalia associated with everyday living, the impact on the landscape is somewhat limited. The presence of bunds on the southern and western boundaries of the site also help to partially screen the caravans from certain vantage points.
5. In contrast, the proposed dwellings would be two storeys in height with pitched roofs. As such, their overall mass would be quite substantial, and it is inevitable that they would be far more conspicuous within the landscape than the existing caravans. This would still be the case, even if the number of caravans on site was increased. From longer range viewpoints, the proposed homes would be seen as

being within close proximity to the existing farm buildings. However, this does not reduce the visual harm that would arise from the development, over and above the existing arrangement of four caravans. Indeed, it would be seen as a somewhat contrived incursion into the countryside, and as a result, would clearly be harmful. Given the height of the proposed dwellings, I do not consider that any additional planting, or strengthening of the existing bunds, would mitigate this harm to any meaningful degree.

6. The site is located within Cornwall Character Area CCA 12: North East Lizard Peninsula. One of the identified past pressures in this area has been the provision of modern developments that poorly reflect local character and design. In this instance, the approved plans show that the eastern elevations of the proposed homes would contain substantial areas of glazing at both ground floor and first floor levels. As such, despite the use of stone and slate, the homes would clearly have a modern appearance and would be seen as an incongruous and out of place feature in comparison to the more traditional features of the farm buildings nearby.
7. Furthermore, the homes would have an odd mixture of fenestration alignments, including some narrow vertical windows which would be unattractive to the eye. While such design features may be present in the wider area, it does not represent the predominant character of the surroundings, and as such, would add to the identified harm.
8. It is inevitable that this harm, in its totality, would also extend to the scenic beauty of this part of the NL. The appellant has noted that the site currently benefits from planning permission for the erection of one new dwelling¹. However, given the additional built form, it is obvious that the harm arising from two dwellings would be greater than any harm caused by the approved scheme. Therefore, the existence of this fallback position does not lead me to a different conclusion in this case.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would conflict with Policies 1, 2, 7, 12, 21 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, as well as Policy C1 of the Climate Change Emergency Development Plan Document. Taken together, the relevant aspects of these policies seek to ensure that new development is well designed and that it preserves character and appearance, including protected landscapes. There would also be conflict with Policies PD-P1, PD-P2, PD-P3 and PD-P11 of the Cornwall Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2022-2027 which seek to preserve and enhance the beauty of the NL.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would result in a net loss of two homes overall although it would make use of a site that already has a lawful residential use. It is likely that the proposed dwellings would provide better living conditions for occupiers while also being more energy efficient. In addition, there would be economic benefits during the construction phase. However, given the scale of the proposed development, these benefits would be very limited.
11. The site lies within the zone of influence of the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation. However, the proposal would not result in a net gain in residential dwellings and so no mitigation would be required.

¹ Council ref: PA23/03648

12. The appellant has provided details of an appeal decision² wherein the appointed Inspector noted that schemes have previously been approved that involved the construction of replacement dwellings that were larger than the dwelling being replaced. However, I have set out why the proposal in this instance would be harmful within the context of the site's location, and as such, that decision does not alter my conclusion in this case.

Conclusion

13. The Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable sites. I have no evidence before me to suggest that this position is likely to improve in the short-term. The test set out within Paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework is not invoked, however, because Paragraph 11d(i) and footnote 7 seek to protect both areas and assets of particular importance, which include National Landscapes. In this instance, the harm would be significant and enduring and it provides a strong reason to dismiss the appeal.
14. As such, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR

² APP/D0840/W/18/3193368