



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3367185

Development: Single-storey front extension. Revised design to existing dormer windows/roofs and the addition of 1no. dormer roof at 2 Cliffside Fore Street, Port Isaac, Cornwall PL29 3RE.

Application Ref is PA24/07218.

Decision – dismissed

Reasons

Issue - effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, and the National Landscape.

1. The proposed front extension would occupy the full width of the main part of the dwelling. The existing proportionate porch would be replaced with a dominant form. The proposed extension would erode the modest design of the house, which currently is suited to the local vernacular, largely consisting of traditional fisherman's cottages. Moreover, the extent of glazing proposed would emphasise the scale and disharmonious design of the scheme that has more contemporary than traditional features. The existing porch would be replaced with a tall window that would no longer function as the building's entrance, eroding the design logic of this feature. These matters further demonstrate a design that would be out of keeping and in contrast with the simple form of the existing dwelling.
2. Local dwellings are of various designs and styles. Whilst most convey the appearance of modest cottages, with small porches and front projection features, the adjacent dwelling has a relatively prominent front gable feature. However, this feature is to one side of the dwelling and does not dominate the frontage. Other examples, of extended and/or prominent dwellings within the village, provide only limited support for the proposal and these other examples do not substantially contribute to the prevailing character of the area.
3. Furthermore, the reconfigured front dormer windows would be squat in comparison to the existing windows and would not respect the proportions of local windows that harbour a more vertical emphasis, typical of Cornish architecture. Also, despite the proposed use of matching materials, the proposal would materially erode the appearance of the dwelling and the positive contribution it makes to the local area.

4. The site is highly visible from the coastal footpath that passes its frontage. Long views of the site, in viewpoints including across the bay within the LVIA, demonstrate that wide views of the proposal would be distant. Despite this point, harm to the landscape character would still occur to a limited extent. Accordingly, although conveying a minor adverse visual effect in wider views, the proposal would harm the historical, cultural and landscape context of the site due to its obtrusive design. It would thereby not conserve or enhance the landscape and would fail to further the purpose of the National Landscape.
5. The proposal would provide private benefits to the occupiers of the dwelling with an improved internal reconfiguration. Also, more natural light would gain access to the building. Nonetheless, these private benefits are of limited weight in providing support for the scheme. Also, no harm would be conveyed to the living conditions of adjacent residential occupiers or in terms of parking provision. However, an absence of harm in these respects can only be considered as a neutral factor in the planning balance.
6. Therefore, taking the above points together, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area and would be contrary to the policies cited in the decision notice.

Issue – effect on the Port Isaac Conservation Area

7. The traditional style of housing within the conservation area mostly consists of fisherman style housing. These consist of cottages with simple stone constructions, slate roofs, plain facades and simple slate canopies over doors. The combined vernacular creates a relatively coherent built form that is a key significance of the conservation area.
8. The proposed extension and alterations would not respect the general proportions of the dwelling, and its windows. Furthermore, the proposal would not maintain the conformity of established building lines, adding significant mass to the frontage beyond the main façade's building line, in conflict with the objectives of the Coastal Headland character area within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). Consequently, having a high visibility from the local and wider area, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area, failing to preserve or enhance its significance.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, contrary to the policies cited in the decision notice, including NP policy 6E. The scheme would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and nothing outweighs this.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR