



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by **G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3371014

Apple Tree Cottage, Laity Moor, Ponsanooth, Truro, Cornwall, TR3 7HR

- 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 Allan against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA25/01904.
 - The development proposed is proposed rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed rear extension at Apple Tree Cottage, Laity Moor, Ponsanooth, Truro, Cornwall, TR3 7HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA25/01904 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions listed below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. ALLAN/001 (Location Plan); ALLAN/002 (Existing and Proposed Site Plan); ALLAN/006 (Proposed Elevations); ALLAN/007 (Proposed Ground Floor Plan); ALLAN/008 (Proposed First Floor Plans) .
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as shown on the approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Appellant has raised concerns in relation to the lack of consultations at the application stage and alleged failure of Officers to undertake a site visit. These are not matters that I can comment on in relation to an appeal that has been submitted under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). If the Appellant has not done so already I suggest they take up these concerns directly with the Council through their normal complaints procedure.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the appeal sites location within the St Gluvias Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in an area known as Laity Moor which contains various sporadic dwellings and farmsteads spread over a wide area. The property on the appeal site is detached and two storeys and is located to the west of an existing lane. The host property sits within a spacious plot, with off street parking and a well landscape garden on the front sitting behind a stone wall to the lane boundary. At the rear is a large garden with the western and northern boundaries bounded by a stream. To the south of the host property is a large single storey building with a flat roof and rendered walls that appears to be a garage/annex. This building projects beyond the main rear wall of the host. To the north is a single storey summerhouse that sits beyond the main rear wall of the host.
5. To the north and west of the appeal site are open fields. To the east and on the other side of the lane are further open fields. To the south is what appears to be the extended garden to Laity Cottage, with that property itself located further to the south west. The southern and western boundaries of the appeal site are formed by mature trees and planting, with a number of mature trees also to be found on its northern boundary.
6. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a two storey rear extension which would be marginally set in from the sides, include two balconies at first floor level and have a depth of some 5.7 metres. Its ridge height would be marginally less than that on the front ridge to the existing 'm' shaped roof. An existing first floor balcony, on stilts, would be demolished to accommodate the new extension.
7. The Council contend that the scale, massing and design of the proposed extension would result in a harmful visual impact on the rural countryside location and AGLV. They also contend that it would have a dominating 'm' feature roof design that would be prominent within the local landscape, with large amounts of glazing that would have a harmful urbanising effect on an attractive traditional cottage.
8. Whilst the Council's Delegated Report (CDR) explains its objection further my attention has not been drawn to any specific policy or design guidance that the Council seek to apply when determining applications for domestic extensions. Whilst the Council refer to policies 2, 12 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (CLP) these are generic policies that are applied to all new development proposals. Combined, these policies seek, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development is of a high quality; maintains and respects the special character and local distinctiveness of Cornwall; is of a scale, density, height and mass that responds to its landscape or townscape setting; and protects and where possible enhances the character of the natural environment and its assets according to their importance. These policies are consistent with paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the emphasis on not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
9. Within the above context, I am satisfied that the scale, massing and design of the proposal would be appropriate for this location and its setting. The new extension would be at the rear and whilst it would involve a large addition, it would not be out of scale or disproportionate to the scale and mass of the existing host. It would be set in marginally from the sides with its ridge sitting just below that of the ridge to the front part of the existing 'm' shaped roof. The depth of the extension would be modest and its scale mitigated by the proposed balconies, with voids below, either

side of a projecting two storey gabled gallery/snug. The introduction of timber cladding and a mono pitched roof to the side of the proposed boot room would further break up the appearance and scale of the new extension. The use of high quality glazing would also add to the quality of the design and would not, as the Council contend, have an urbanising effect. Even so, the host property is not, in my view, of a traditional cottage design, as the Council suggest and neither is it locally distinctive.

10. Overall, the proposal would represent a sympathetic addition to the host property that integrates well with its design, scale and layout. As I confirmed earlier, the size of the existing plot is substantial and is more than capable of accommodating an extension of the size proposed. The spaciousness and openness of the appeal site and in particular its large rear garden would not be harmed or compromised to any material extent. As such, the proposal would not be visually prominent or have any dominating effect on the host or its setting. I am also satisfied that the extension of the 'm' shaped roof would not appear out of character to the host, in particular as its ridge would be marginally below that on the front.
11. As I also observed on site, the new extension would largely be screened from any public vantage points, with views of the main front (principal) elevation of the host, that faces onto the lane, remaining largely unchanged. There would be no views of the proposal from the south or west due to the orientation of the host and the well established mature trees and planting to those boundaries. I accept that the planting on the northern boundary is less extensive but there would still only be glimpsed views from the lane, which would be over existing hedging and largely of the side elevation to the new extension. These views would be framed by the mature trees and against a green backdrop of the trees/planting on the western and southern boundaries to the appeal site. As such, the impact of the proposal on the site's rural and landscape setting, and the AGLV would be limited
12. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would not lead to any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would, therefore, be compliant with policies 2, 12 and 23 of the CLP, and paragraphs 131 and 135 of the NPPF.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Having considered this against the advice in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the 'Use of planning conditions', this condition is in my view reasonable and necessary in the interests of securing a high quality development. I have also added a condition requiring the external materials to be as shown on the approved plans.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having taken all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR