



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by **J Woolcock BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/24/3353157

National Trust, Trelissick Gardens, Feock, Cornwall TR3 6QL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the 1990 Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by National Trust Trelissick Gardens (the Trust) against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - Application Number: PA22/10184.
 - The development proposed is visitor infrastructure development which includes change of use of land to provide increased car parking provision and improved sense of arrival for visitors including reconfiguration of existing main car park at Trelissick, works to the highway to create a safe crossing point and extended 30mph zone and creation of new 225 space car park.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. An amended scheme was considered by Cornwall Council in determining the application. The bullet point above sets out the amended description agreed by the Trust. The description on the application form cites similar development but refers to the creation of a new 250 space car park. I confirmed the correct list of plans and documents for the amended scheme with the parties.
3. The appeal site lies within the Cornwall National Landscape. The existing main car park and proposed highway works lie within the Trelissick Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest grade II* (RPG). The site for the proposed Dicky Lane 225 space car park is located outside the designated RPG but lies within land that is surrounded by the RPG.
4. Cornwall Council refused the application, against officer recommendation for approval, on the grounds that; "The proposed development, by virtue of its scale and form into undeveloped countryside and the specific design of the crossing results in a discordant element and visual intrusion resulting in unacceptable harm to the Cornish National Landscape to which great weight must be given and the setting of the registered garden of Trelissick". The Council found that the proposal was contrary to relevant policy and considered that the harm outweighed the benefits of the scheme.

5. Section 85(A1) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (the 2000 Act) states that in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (now a National Landscape) in England, a relevant authority must seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the National Landscape.¹ I am required in determining the appeal to discharge this duty. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in National Landscapes great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. The NPPF adds that the conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in National Landscapes.
6. The Council's reasons for refusal, with respect to heritage assets, refer only to the setting of the RPG. However, the NPPF defines the RPG as a designated heritage asset and states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. I have, therefore, considered the effects of the proposed development on both the RPG and its setting.
7. In addition to the grade II* listed "Trelissick House and Walls Surrounding", there are other listed buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site, which I saw at my site visit.² These listed buildings and other heritage assets are recorded in the appellant's Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). I am required by section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, in considering development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
8. The Trust states that the appeal scheme's proposed car park and highway alterations are part of a wider spatial plan, which include proposals outside the appeal site to substantially restore and enhance a large part of the property, including the walled garden and the area between a listed Barn and Water Tower that all form key elements within the RPG. The Trust's Design and Access Statement includes the removal of overflow parking from open parkland to the west of the main car park in the elements of the proposed development, as alterations to the existing main car park, not as part of the wider proposals.³ However, the Trust's Statement of Case includes the removal of the overspill car park as a proposed mitigation and enhancement measure beyond the red line appeal site boundary.⁴
9. According to the Trust the implementation of the wider proposals is dependent upon the proposed car park and highway alterations achieving planning permission because the increased parking capacity provided would enable the removal of parking closer to the core group of heritage assets. However, I have

¹ Following amendments made by virtue of section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023, which came into effect on 26 December 2023.

² These include Round Wood quay, the new lodge building to east adjoining wall and gate-piers, the old lodge, the keepers cottage walls and fence to front, the water tower, the kitchen garden walls at about 75m north of Trelissick house, Ferris cottage, Bosankos cottage, Quay cottage, Quay to east and south of Quay cottage and by King Harry Ferry, the barn at approximately 85m north-west of Trelissick House, the barn at approximately 70m north-west of Trelissick House, Cottage at approximately 75m west of Trelissick House, stable block at approximately 50m north-west of Trelissick House, the coach house and stable block at Trelissick House, game larder at approximately 20m to rear of Trelissick House, Pill farmhouse and garden wall, milestone at SW 838 395 NW, which are all grade II listed buildings. There are also Scheduled Monuments at Multiple enclosure fort at Round Wood, and Standing Cross 300m south-east of Trelissick.

³ Appellant's Design and Access Statement at paragraphs 4.7-4.10.

⁴ Appellant's Statement of Case paragraph 5.12.

not been informed about any mechanisms to secure these improvements if planning permission were granted for the appeal scheme.

10. The proposed development includes a new pedestrian path between the proposed Dicky Lane car park and the existing main car park, which would pass via a wooded area to a new pedestrian crossing on the B3289. Drawing No:C06 rev B is titled "Pedestrian Crossing General Arrangement". Paragraph 4.5 of the appellant's Statement of Case states; "The detailed design of the road crossing and landscape design was and could remain as an item to be addressed by a planning condition. The National Trust would welcome this condition to employ a collaborative approach and achieve the optimal outcome for highways safety, landscape and heritage." Suggested Condition 10 provides that notwithstanding the submitted details, the final design and specification of the pedestrian crossing should be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.⁵ I have, therefore, had regard to Drawing No:C06 rev B as illustrative.
11. The proposal includes provision for a permissive route for cycling along West Drive, which is outside the red line boundary of the appeal site but within the ownership of the Trust. This permissive route is the subject of suggested Condition 12. Neighbouring land outside the appeal site, but within the Trust's ownership, is proposed to be used for mitigation and enhancement in accordance with the Trust's Ecological Impact Assessment (suggested Conditions 16, 17 and 18).
12. The development plan for the locality includes the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies (CLP), adopted in 2016, the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document (CEDPD), adopted in 2023, and the Feock Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017-2030 (FNDP), adopted in 2018. I have also taken into account the Cornwall Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2022-2027 (the Management Plan) and the Cornwall Design Guide 2021. I have had regard to the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Main issues

13. The main issues in this appeal are:

- (1) The effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and on the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the Cornwall National Landscape.
- (2) The effects of the proposed development on Trelissick Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest and its setting.

While not a reason for refusal, I have considered the effects on listed buildings and their setting.⁶ I have also assessed whether the benefits of the appeal scheme would outweigh any harm.

⁵ Appellant's Statement of Case at paragraph 7.9 indicates the Trust's agreement with the conditions recommended by the local planning authority's officers in the committee report.

⁶ Third party representations at the application stage include submissions that the impact on buildings of historic importance had not been considered.

Reasons

Character and appearance

14. The Trelissick estate covers approximately 255 hectares of garden, parkland, woodland, farmland and foreshore. The Trust's Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Trelissick (Cookson & Tickner, 2017) identifies the main features of significance within each character area of the property.⁷ Significance is recorded as either "A. National, B. Regional, C. Local, D. Minimal or D/Intrusive". Within the CMP the existing main car park lies within character area F. The proposed car park at Dicky Lane lies within character area D. In terms of significance, the CMP records areas F02 Main car park and D03 Dicky Lane (woodland compartment 8a) as "D/Intrusive".
15. The appeal site is within Landscape Character Area (LCA) CCA20 Truro and Tresillian Valleys. The key characteristics of LCA CCA20 include a complex valley landscape of low rounded hills divided by an intricate system of small twisting valleys. It is relatively well-wooded, with some ancient woodland. It is a scenic landscape with long-distance views possible across the valleys. There are extensive areas of wood pasture and parkland within the estate of Trelissick, which is referred to as part of the historic landscape character.
16. Visual and perceptual qualities for LCA CCA20 cite ornamental gardens and woodland at Trelissick giving the impression of a well-managed landscape and create a distinctive sense of place. Landscape guidance includes conserving the character of the historic parklands and their setting, and supporting appropriate management and restoration of parkland and historic landscapes. The guidance also supports the creation of sustainable recreation opportunities. Pressures and forces for change within LCA CCA20 include demand for facilities for recreation and tourism, along with increasing use of the transport network leading to demand for improvements.
17. A key feature of the landscape resource here is its distinctive rural character. This derives from physical influences, such as the complex valley landscape of low rounded hills and woodland, combined with the designed parkland setting for historic buildings. The Management Plan states that the special qualities of the South Coast Central: The Fal Ria area of the Cornwall National Landscape includes the fine garden and parkland at Trelissick.
18. The existing main car park is informally arranged, with its perceived scale lessened by the curved lines of the access roads and restricted views of the rows of parked cars. The existing trees and vegetation within the car park, combined with the sloping topography, also help to divide the car park into smaller segments, giving it a more natural feel that reflects to some extent its parkland setting. Even so, the existing main car park is described as an intrusive feature in the Trust's CMP. The Dicky Lane part of the appeal site is currently unmanaged and overgrown. It is largely screened by trees and woodland but is also considered intrusive in the CMP.
19. The proposed expansion and rearrangement of the existing main car park would give it a more formal and geometric layout, with regimented tree planting. It would create long straight lines of parked cars extending across the sloping land. The

⁷ The Conservation Management Plan is cited in the Heritage Impact Assessment submitted by the appellant.

Trust's HIA states that the existing scrub/plantation woodland would be removed to accommodate the proposed main car parking area. It adds that the majority of the vegetation and trees are modern planting created to screen the car park. The removal of this screening would expose the full scale of the enlarged parking area to arriving visitors. The proposed planting of trees, hedges and understorey/scrub, even when mature, would be likely to provide only limited relief from the large expanse of parked cars.

20. The proposal for the existing main car park would, by reason of its scale, layout and landscaping, create an urbanising feature in this rural parkland setting. In terms of landscape character, the reconfigured main car park would be significantly more intrusive than the existing main car park. The replacement of overgrown and unmanaged woodland and scrub to create the proposed Dicky Lane car park would be a clear and distinct change to the character of the site. Taking all these factors into account, I consider that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the landscape resource of 'major-moderate' significance.⁸
21. Turning to visual amenity, the imposition of appropriate planning conditions could safeguard retained trees and their root protection areas, including the ancient trees. Furthermore, it was apparent at my site visit that distant views towards the proposed Dicky Lane car park from the north (Viewpoints 10 and 12) could be effectively screened or softened by tree planting. Effective mitigation planting would soften views from other off-site vantage points to both proposed car parks. However, visual receptors here would include recreational users of high sensitivity, who would arrive with an expectation of experiencing an historic rural estate within an area that has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.
22. I consider that the appellant has understated the likely magnitude of change to the visual amenity of the area that would result from the proposed alterations. It seems to me that both the Dicky Lane car park and reconfigured existing main car park would, by reason of their utilitarian design, be perceived more akin to suburban parking areas than as the entrance and introduction to an historic site in a designated National Landscape. Taking all these factors into account, the appeal scheme would have an adverse visual impact of 'major-moderate' significance.
23. The design of the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area of 'major-moderate' significance. The appeal scheme would have a materially harmful effect on the special qualities of the South Coast Central: The Fal Ria area of the Cornwall National Landscape and thus fail to further the purposes for which it was designated, contrary to the expectations of the 2000 Act. I give this harm significant weight against the proposal.

⁸ I have used the terminology in the appellant's assessment for significance as follows: "major, major-moderate, moderate, moderate-minor, low, insignificant".

Trelissick Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest

24. The RPG extends to about 92 ha and comprises some 10 ha of gardens and pleasure grounds, and about 82 ha of parkland and woodland rides.⁹ It also states that the park to the south and west of the house was initially created in the mid-18th century to complement the new house, and that the park was marked on a survey of 1817. It adds that the network of walks, rides and carriage drives through the park and associated woodlands are shown on the estate survey of about 1821, and that the extension of the rides to the north-west and the north-west park took place in the mid and late 19th century. The existing main car park lies to the north-west of the house and within the RPG. The 1878/9 Ordnance Survey Map depicts part of the existing main car park as an orchard.
25. The appellant's HIA states that the visitor car park is located to the west of the visitor hub and has increased incrementally in size over the years, and that the area formed part of the parkland to the north of the drive and included an early orchard.¹⁰ The evidence indicates that the part of the park that is now the existing main car park was an integral part of the designed landscape. The current informal layout of this car park, along with its trees and vegetation, are a useful manifestation of the site's incorporation within a designed parkland and garden of historic interest.
26. As set out in the previous section of this decision the proposed reconfiguration of the existing main car park would, by reason of its design and layout, introduce a discordant and urbanising feature in this historic rural context. It seems to me that the scheme for the existing main car park would be considerably more intrusive in its historic context than is currently so for the existing car park. This would significantly detract from an appreciation of this part of the Trelissick estate as an integral part of a designed landscape of national importance. Mitigation planting would not ameliorate this harm. The proposed alterations to the existing main car park would result in less than substantial harm, towards the higher end of the scale, to the significance of the grade II* RPG.
27. The site of the proposed car park at Dicky Lane lies outside the RPG. The setting of a heritage asset is defined in the NPPF as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Historic England's *The Setting of Heritage Assets* GPA3 notes that extensive heritage assets, such as historic parks and gardens, can include many heritage assets, historic associations between them and their nested and overlapping settings, as well as having a setting of their own. GPA3 also states that the setting of a historic park and garden may include land beyond its boundary which adds to its significance, but which need not be confined to land visible from the site.
28. The Dicky Lane part of the appeal site is currently unmanaged and overgrown, but it was an open field bounded by Cornish hedges that was planted with broadleaved trees and several rows of fruit trees in the 20th century.¹¹ Notwithstanding the more recent planting and its current neglected state, I consider that this part of the appeal site makes a minor contribution to the significance of the RPG by reason of its historic association with the Trelissick estate.

⁹ Official List Entry for Trelissick Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest.

¹⁰ HIA at paragraph 4.13.

¹¹ HIA paragraph 4.11.

29. The long lines of parked cars and regimented layout proposed for the Dicky Lane car park would be an unsympathetic form of development within the setting of the RPG. Even with the proposed off-site mitigation planting, I consider that the utilitarian car park layout would be a discordant feature that would, to some degree, adversely affect how the special historic interest of the RPG was experienced. By reason of its scale, design and layout, the proposed Dicky Lane car park would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the RPG, but towards the lower end of the scale.

Listed buildings

30. Turning next to the group of listed buildings, the appeal scheme would not directly impact the fabric of listed structures, except for a section of wall 1.5 m high, that would be removed to create a new visitor arrival point near to the grade II listed “The Barn at approx. 70m north west of Trelissick House”. There is an existing opening in this wall 1.06 m wide, with a wooden gate, that provides access to a gas tank. The appeal scheme proposes removal of the tank and construction of a new footpath 2.4 m wide, leading from the main car park to a new visitor arrival point. Drawing CT164.01.P25 indicates that this would involve removal of the existing gate and extension of the wall by 0.76 m and removal of the adjoining part of the wall to create a 2.6 m wide opening without a gate.
31. Full construction details for these works have not been submitted, but it was evident at my site visit that the proposed widened opening would have an adverse impact on the curtilage listed wall.¹² The existing narrow opening in the wall and rustic gate is consistent with what was historically a rural space adjacent to a barn, but now used for car parking. The proposed widened opening would, to some extent, erode the sense of enclosure of this space and its historic association with the listed barn. This would result in a moderate level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed barn and wall.
32. The PPG notes that experience of an asset in its setting is influenced by, amongst other things, our understanding of the historic relationship between places.¹³ At Trelissick there is a historic and aesthetic connection between the listed buildings and the RPG that mutually amplifies the experience of the significance of these heritage assets. This is particularly so for the grade II* listed “Trelissick House and Walls Surrounding”, where the designed landscape in which it is set makes an important contribution to its significance. The harm I have identified to the RPG would detract from the setting of Trelissick House and so would have an adverse effect on its significance. This would result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade II* listed “Trelissick House and Walls Surrounding”.
33. The Trust’s HIA states that the proposed pedestrian crossing is within the setting of Keepers Cottage (grade II listed) and that the crossing would have a negative effect on historic character as it would result in change to the setting of Keepers Cottage and the Water Tower (grade II listed).¹⁴ These assets are experienced from the road, and their setting makes an important contribution to their significance. The list entry for the cottage is “The Keepers Cottage Walls and

¹² A Listed Building Consent application submitted by the Trust is undetermined. I make no comment on this application, which is not a matter for me in determining the appeal on its planning merits.

¹³ PPG Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 18a-013-20190723.

¹⁴ HIA paragraphs 5.11 and 5.15.

Fence to Front” and specifically refers to the low rubble wall to front with rail and dowel fence and wooden gate posts. It was apparent at my site visit that the Water Tower, as a landmark at the approach to the historic buildings, draws the attention of those entering the estate.

34. In the absence of a detailed scheme for the proposed pedestrian crossing, I am unable to determine the extent to which the proposed development would detract from the setting of Keepers Cottage, or to assess the degree to which it would diminish the significance of the Water Tower. The negative effect acknowledged in the HIA would result in some harm to the significance of listed buildings. Without full particulars about the proposed pedestrian crossing there is insufficient level of detail to properly understand the potential impact of the proposed development on the significance of Keepers Cottage and the Water Tower.
35. I find that the appeal scheme would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the grade II* Trelissick Registered Park and Garden of Special Historic Interest, to the grade II Barn at approx. 70m north west of Trelissick House and its curtilage listed wall, and to the grade II* listed Trelissick House and Walls Surrounding. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

Other matters

36. There is local concern about traffic delays because of the increased volume of traffic that would access the proposed car parking from the B3289. Potential conflict between vehicles and pedestrians at the proposed crossing was also raised. The B3289 provides access to the King Harry Ferry. Vehicles leaving the ferry periodically travel in procession past the appeal site. However, there is no convincing technical evidence to indicate that increased traffic levels would have an unacceptable impact on local congestion or highway safety. I find no conflict with FNDP Policy GA1 concerning the King Harry Ferry.
37. The description of the proposed development includes extending the existing 30mph zone, but this would require a Traffic Regulation Order. If the appellant considers that this extension would be necessary for the scheme to go ahead then a negatively worded condition to preclude use of the Dicky Lane car park until the 30mph zone was extended would be required. No such condition has been suggested.
38. It seems to me that pedestrian safety at the proposed crossing need not be an insurmountable obstacle because a scheme for the crossing could be designed and operated to safeguard users. Such design considerations might have implications for the effects of the crossing on the significance of nearby listed buildings. Nevertheless, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios, I find that residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would not be severe, and that the proposed development should not be refused on highway grounds.
39. I am satisfied that the submitted Habitats Regulation Assessment screening demonstrates that significant effects on the Fal and Helford Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Falmouth Bay to St Austell Bay Special Protection Area (SPA) are unlikely. Appropriate Assessment is not necessary. Natural England concurs with this conclusion. No harm would be caused to the nearby Lower Fal County Wildlife Site.

40. Appropriate biodiversity net gain could be achieved by the imposition of planning conditions. Suggested Condition 16 would require a minimum 10% net gain in biodiversity within a 30-year period. However, suggested Conditions 16, 17 and 18 all refer to the Ecological Impact Assessment by Cornwall Environmental Consultants, dated 1 November 2023, which states that there would be a 39% gain in habitat units and a 10% gain in hedgerow units with neighbouring land to be used for mitigation and enhancement. Enhancement of local biodiversity, which would primarily result from this off-site mitigation and enhancement, weighs in favour of the proposal.
41. Given the separation distance and intervening vegetation, the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the scheduled monuments in the locality. Archaeological interests could be safeguarded by the imposition of planning conditions.

Planning balance

42. In accordance with NPPF paragraph 215, the less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets that I have identified must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. There is evidence of increasing numbers of people visiting the Trelissick estate.¹⁵ However, there is no compelling evidence to indicate that the appeal scheme is required to secure the optimum viable use for the heritage assets.
43. The PPG notes that public benefits could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental objectives, but should flow from the proposed development and be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just be a private benefit. It is well known that the National Trust was established for the purposes of promoting the permanent preservation for the benefit of the nation of land and buildings of beauty and historic interest. Therefore, benefits arising from the appeal scheme can readily and rightly be judged public benefits.
44. Only slight weight can be attributed to the benefits of the appeal scheme in facilitating some of the Trust's stated intentions for the Trelissick estate. This wider plan includes proposals to restore and enhance the walled garden and the area between the listed Barn and Water Tower, along with the removal of overflow parking from a prominent part of the RPG to the west of the main car park. However, there is no evidence of a binding commitment, such as a legal obligation, to properly secure the delivery of these works if the appeal were allowed.
45. Furthermore, it is not clear which of these other components of the Trust's wider spatial plan for Trelissick will be subject to another planning application.¹⁶ There is insufficient information submitted about what is proposed to impose planning conditions requiring such works. It would not be possible to devise conditions that would comply with the relevant tests for planning conditions to address these wider aspects of the Trust's proposals. I find, therefore, that the Trust's suggested

¹⁵ The appellant's Design and Access Statement records that visitor numbers increased from 126,000 in 2013/14 to 225,000 in 2019/20, with outdoor visitors estimated to be an additional 172,000.

¹⁶ Part 9 Annex 1 of the appellant's Statement of Case. Paragraph 5.14 states "The National Trust are also ready and willing to submit an application for the other proposals illustrated in the artist's impressions".

heritage enhancements weigh very little against the overall harm I have identified to designated heritage assets.

46. Without detailed designs for the proposed pedestrian crossing, it is not possible to determine whether this would be a better alternative to the existing footbridge over the B3289. This aspect of the appeal scheme cannot attract much weight.
47. Public benefits that would result from the proposed development include some contribution to economic objectives in terms of visitors supporting the work of the National Trust and providing some local employment and supporting the local economy, albeit of limited significance because the Trust considers that the proposed development would not itself cause an increase in visitor numbers. Allowing people to enjoy and appreciate Cornwall's heritage and historic landscape, along with encouraging a healthy lifestyle, would have social benefits. The tree planting and biodiversity benefits of the proposed development accord with environmental objectives. More details about public benefits are set out in paragraphs 50 and 51 of this decision.
48. Historic England has no objection to the proposal on heritage grounds and believes that due to the increasing numbers of visitors to the Trelissick estate, improved and reorganised car parking and other facilities are justified. However, even if that is so, it would not be sufficient justification by itself for approving the appeal scheme given the harm I have identified. The Gardens Trust raised an issue about the setting of the registered garden of Trelissick, and while appreciating that mitigation planting was proposed, noted that this would take time to mature.
49. The harm I have identified to listed buildings attracts considerable importance and weight. I have, in accordance with the NPPF, awarded great weight to the conservation of the designated heritage assets. In my judgement, the public benefits of the appeal scheme do not outweigh the less than substantial harm I have identified to heritage assets. The level of harm to some listed buildings remains undetermined in the absence of details about the proposed pedestrian crossing, but any such harm would also weigh against allowing the appeal.
50. In the overall planning balance that applies here, improved facilities for visitors would be beneficial. The revised parking provision would help to reduce queuing and parking on the B3289 that currently occurs at times and so would improve highway and staff safety. Other benefits include improved cycle access/parking, improved disabled parking, better coach drop-off provision, EV charging points and enhanced pedestrian access. These measures would encourage healthy lifestyles. The appeal scheme would also help to deliver socio-economic benefits in securing local employment and generating revenue for the Trust, which should be given some slight weight.
51. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in National Landscapes. The proposed tree planting and biodiversity benefits are significant in this regard and attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal. Slight weight should be attached to the proposals for enhanced interpretation of the heritage assets at Trelissick. However, I have found that the proposal would, overall, harm the cultural heritage of the Cornwall National Landscape because of the adverse impact on designated heritage assets.

52. The significant harm that I have identified to the Cornwall National Landscape attracts great weight. In this overall planning balance, I have given considerable importance and weight to the harm to listed buildings. The NPPF also states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset the greater the weight should be given). The resultant harm from the proposed development would include harm to a grade II* RPG and a grade II* listed building, and I have taken this into account in applying great weight to the identified harm to designated heritage assets.
53. Taking all the above considerations into account, I find that the overall benefits of the appeal scheme would not outweigh the significant harm to the Cornwall National Landscape and the less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets. The planning balance falls against the proposed development. Any harm to the significance of listed buildings from the proposed pedestrian crossing would tip the planning balance even further against the appeal scheme.

Planning policy

54. Allowing the appeal would conflict with CLP Policy 23 because the proposed development is not an appropriate design that recognises and respects landscape character and designated landscapes. The scheme is also at odds with the aims of CLP Policy 24 concerning the historic rural environment, particularly with regard to conserving the design, character, appearance and historic significance of historic parks and gardens. This policy supports proposals that will help to secure a sustainable future for Cornwall's heritage assets, but I am not convinced that the appeal scheme is the only means of achieving this objective. I am not satisfied that all reasonable efforts have been made to mitigate the extent of the harm to the significance of the heritage assets. Conflict with CLP Policy 12 arises because this policy provides that development must ensure Cornwall's enduring distinctiveness and maintain and enhance its distinctive natural and historic character.
55. FNDP Policy HE1 supports development only where it safeguards the historic environment but defers consideration to CLP Policy 24. Conflict with the aim of FNDP Policy LS2 arises because it provides support only for development that safeguards, conserves and enhances the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB (now National Landscape). The appeal scheme would also be contrary to Policy G1 of the FNDP because this seeks to protect local open space from development, including "Treliassick Park/Gardens (National Trust)". FNDP Policy D1 refers to design and cites the Cornwall Design Guide. The proposal would not conserve the natural environment and increase local distinctiveness through high quality and sustainable design, as required by CEDPD Policy C1.
56. The proposal gains some limited support from the aims of CLP Policies 5 and 16 concerning, respectively, tourism facilities and health and well-being. Provision for biodiversity gain in CEDPD Policy G2 also weighs in favour of the proposal. So too, do FNDP Policy GA2 about pedestrian and cycle connections, and FNDP Policy BI03 to improve wildlife areas. However, I find that the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.

57. The proposal would conflict with Policy PD-P11 of the Management Plan for the Cornwall National Landscape because it would not be of scale and layout that provided a clear response to its landscape setting. Further conflict with this policy arises because the appeal scheme would not maintain local distinctiveness or respond to the local landscape context. This is at odds with Policy PD-P1 which requires all development to adopt a “landscape-led” approach, and with Policies LS-P4, LS-P6 and HC-P2 for the management of the historic landscape and rural heritage assets. It would also be at variance with the aims of Policy SCC-P5 to restrict parking provision as part of visitor proposals and the preference for sustainable transport arrangements.
58. The proposal does not benefit from the support for tourism and recreation in Management Plan Policies SCE-P3 and PD-P8 because of its adverse impact on landscape characteristics. However, the appeal scheme would assist in delivering biodiversity enhancements in accordance with Policies NRLM-P1 and PD-P15, as well as health and well-being advantages sought by Policy HWB-P1. Nonetheless, I find overall that the proposed development would conflict with the Management Plan.
59. Appendix ii of the Management Plan sets out key indicators for deciding whether development is ‘major’, to which paragraph 190 of the NPPF would apply. Notwithstanding the harm I have identified, given the nature, scale and setting of the appeal scheme, along with its likely significant impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated, the proposal is not, in my judgement, major development in the National Landscape.
60. The NPPF provides support for rural tourism and local business and community needs. However, the proposed development conflicts with national policy for protected landscapes and heritage assets. The proposal would not maintain a strong sense of place, contrary to the aims of the Cornwall Design Guide. I find that the appeal scheme is not well designed and in accordance with NPPF paragraph 139 should be refused.

Conditions

61. I have considered whether it would be possible to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Cornwall National Landscape by imposing appropriate planning conditions.
62. The Trust suggests that the following matters could possibly be reserved to planning conditions, either amending the Council’s recommended conditions or as new conditions, and potentially in some instances on a ‘notwithstanding what is shown on the submitted plans’ basis;
- additional detail of landscaping (including positions of trees within/about the car parking areas) and boundary treatments,
 - additional detail of layout within the car parking areas (e.g. positions and orientations of spaces, including for larger vehicles),
 - additional details of materials and design of the proposed crossing and related road markings and signage,
 - if considered necessary a condition could stipulate that there shall be no rumble strips,
 - and additional detail of kerbing, surface materials and any markings of areas, possibly including entrances to car parking areas and paths.

63. However, these are features that would need to be assessed to establish compliance with relevant development plan and Management Plan policies. For example, a detailed design for the proposed pedestrian crossing is not before me and so I am unable to ascertain whether the crossing would accord with Management Plan Policy PD-19 concerning conservation and enhancement of the existing character of the local road network within the Cornwall National Landscape. Furthermore, without submission of these details, it would not be possible to properly determine the level of any harm to the significance of listed buildings.
64. It would not be reasonable to grant planning permission for the proposed development and leave the matters suggested by the Trust for subsequent determination by discharge of planning conditions.

Conclusion

65. The proposed development would not conserve the natural beauty of the Cornwall National Landscape. The evidence submitted in this case does not provide clear and convincing justification for the harm to the significance of designated heritage assets. The planning balance falls against allowing the appeal and the proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
66. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J Woolcock

INSPECTOR