
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: 02 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/24/3357928

Development: Proposed Lounge and Dining Room Extension at 20 Penstrasse Place, Tywardreath, PAR PL24 2QL

Application Ref is PA24/05365.

Decision - dismissed

Reasons

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

1. The proposal would extend the bungalow well beyond the front building line established by No's 18-24. Existing forward extensions, referred to within the evidence, were not observed within the immediate area of the appeal site. Instead, during my visit, the character was seen to be relatively uniform without prominent forward projections. As such, the proposal would be out of character with surrounding development and not add to the quality of the area. Consequently, the proposal would be obtrusive within this open plan estate, despite the small front walls and landscape planting noted within some local frontages.
2. The proposed extension's design takes considered cues from the existing dwelling and would be proportionate to it, with matching materials. However, these factors would not outweigh the identified harm to the streetscene. Furthermore, whilst the amended scheme has lowered its ridge height, this revision has only marginally reduced the proposal's overall dominance.
3. The scheme would protect neighbour's privacy and would not materially reduce the plot's access to outdoor space. However, an absence of harm in these respects can only be considered as neutral factors in the planning balance. The National Planning Policy Framework supports sustainable development including development being of good design. As I have found the proposal would not be sympathetic to local character, the Framework would not provide support for the scheme.
4. The proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and be contrary to the policies cited in the decision notice. The scheme would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and nothing outweighs this.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR