



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2025

by **Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3363751

Bogee Farm, Rumford, Wadebridge, Cornwall PL27 7SQ

- 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 Joseph Simpson of KSW Projects Ltd against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/09073.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing barn and proposed 2 new dwellings - in lieu of the part Q approval PA23/06441.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development set out in the header above has been taken from the appeal form as this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the setting of a Grade II listed building; and,
 - Whether the appeal site is a suitable location for new residential development, with particular regard to its countryside location.

Reasons

Character, Appearance and the Setting of a Listed Building

4. The appeal site comprises part of Bogee Farm, including primarily, a large portion of the farmyard, an area of hardstanding and the grain silo. It is within a rural area predominantly characterised by open fields with sporadic agricultural development. Immediately adjacent to the appeal site is Bogee Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building¹. This is a detached two-storey dwelling from the mid-19th century that backs onto the farmyard. To the rear of the dwelling is a small backyard bound by a stone wall and served by a small outbuilding. The significance of this building stems in part from its age, as well as its legible relationship with, and connection to, the other farm buildings. Although some of these buildings have been converted, their historic use is still clear.

¹ Bogee Farmhouse including front garden and backyard walls and gates (list entry number 1289519)

5. From the information before me I understand that the grain silo was constructed in the 1950s and is therefore not curtilage listed. It is of a non-standard construction type and appears to be pre-fabricated. Given the building's age, manner of construction and former use, it nevertheless contributes modestly to the interest of Bogee Farmhouse and the legibility of the farm's development over time. However, it also sits between the farmhouse and farmyard creating a visual and physical separator. This separation, and the blocking of views to the farmhouse from the farmyard, does not contribute positively to the appreciation of the farmhouse's significance and interest. The removal of the grain silo as part of this proposal would ultimately weigh neutrally on the listed building and its significance.

6. The proposed semi-detached dwellings would be of a simple and linear form finished in stonework suggestive of traditional agricultural buildings. However, the detailing proposed on the front and rear elevations, particularly the rear glazing and the arrangement of openings on the front elevation are not sympathetic to the appearance of traditional agricultural buildings. The suggestion of such a building is further eroded by the M-shaped roof arrangement which is not particularly agricultural. Collectively the dwellings are more akin to development more typically found within urban areas.

7. Although the proposed bulk and height of the dwellings would be greater than the grain silo's, I find the building to still be commensurate with the surrounding agricultural buildings. Similarly, the close proximity of the proposed dwellings to the adjacent existing buildings would not so significantly erode the spacious pattern of development around the farmyard as to be unacceptable.

8. The design of the proposal would, nevertheless, erode the agricultural character of the farmyard to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I am mindful of the development's scale and that it would likely be seen from a distance, amongst buildings where any effect would be softened. Nevertheless, within the immediate area the effect of the proposal would be present and would also adversely affect the setting of the listed building to the harm of the building's significance and interest.

9. Against this background, and given the scale of the development, I find that a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset would occur. Although less than substantial, the Framework is clear that great weight should be given to any asset's conservation. Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

10. As an extant permission is present for the provision of two dwellings, this proposal would not provide any additional benefit towards the provision of housing within the district. There would be additional works associated with the demolition of the grain silo and the erection of the new dwellings. The proposal would also provide two two-bedroom dwellings and could accommodate larger families. It is likely therefore that there would be some additional economic and social benefits from the works and occupiers associated with this scheme. Given the extant permission these would provide only a modest public benefit, which in the circumstances of this appeal, do not outweigh the harm to the designated heritage asset.

11. The proposed dwellings' design and appearance would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and would not conserve or enhance the significance and interest of the listed building. The proposal therefore conflicts with

Policies P12 and P24 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (the LP). These, amongst other matters, require proposals to be of a high quality design that sustains designated heritage assets and the distinctiveness and historic character of Cornwall. The proposal also conflicts with Paragraphs 212 and 215 of the Framework which set out the great weight that should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and the need for any less than substantial harm to be weighed against public benefits.

Suitability of location

12. The appeal site is located outside of any settlements but within a small cluster of development formed by a farmstead. The appeal site is, therefore, within the open countryside where the Council's policies, including Policy 7 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (the LP), seek to limit residential development. As part of this LP Policy 7 sets out a number of exceptions where residential development can be supported within the countryside. It is clear that the appeal proposal does not directly comply with any of these exceptions.

13. However, prior approval has previously been granted (Ref: PA23/0644) for the conversion of the grain silo to a pair of residential dwellings. Although this development has not commenced, it has not been suggested by either party that this decision is no longer extant. It could, therefore, be carried out any time. The proposal before me would, instead of converting this grain silo, demolish the building and replace it with a pair of semi-detached dwellings in an alternative location.

14. The first exception set out under LP Policy 7 allows for replacement dwellings that are broadly comparable to the size, scale and bulk of the dwelling being replaced, and that are of an appropriate scale and character to their location. Although the dwellings are not yet present to be replaced, given the permission noted above, there is a more than theoretical potential for the development to be carried out.

15. The grain silo is within the bounds of the appeal site and, proposed to be demolished as part of this scheme. As such, in the event that the appeal was to be allowed, a suitable mechanism could be secured to prevent both developments from being carried out. In light of this, the proposal would be tantamount to the replacement of the already permitted dwellings, rather than the erection of new dwellings.

16. The appeal site is not within an area where future occupiers could walk to nearby settlements to meet their typical needs and, from the information before me it appears there is not a good level of access to public transport. Future occupiers would, therefore, be reliant upon private motor vehicles to reach services, facilities and other daily needs. However, any such harm stemming from this reliance would already be present through the permission to convert the grain silo. I note that the proposed dwellings have an additional bedroom each, but this would not cause any meaningful impact on the number of movements or any associated harm.

17. I therefore find that the special circumstances set out under LP Policy 7 would be met and that the location of the appeal site is, in this instance, therefore suitable for residential development. The proposal complies with LP Policies 1, 2 and 7 as set out above. The proposal would also comply with Policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document regarding sustainable development and limiting the reliance on private motor vehicles.

Conclusion

18. There is no dispute that that Council is unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply and I note the appellant's reference to the appeal decision reference APP/C1055/W/24/3356476. However, the Framework provides a clear reason for refusing the development, that is; harm to a designated heritage asset, and therefore the proposal does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

19. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR