



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: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3369346

Land north of Little Trolvis Farm, Longdowns, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9DR

- 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 F and R Andrew against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/09424.
 - The development proposed is erection of an agricultural storage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of agricultural storage building at Land north of Trolvis Farm, Longdowns, Penryn, Cornwall, TR10 9DR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA24/09424 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's 4436 02C; 4436 04B; 4436 05C; 4436 06A.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as shown on the application form.
 - 4) No development shall commence until details of a landscaping scheme to include new bunding, earth/stone works and planting, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:
 - A statement setting out the design objectives for the scheme and how these will be delivered;
 - Bunding, earth and stone works showing existing and proposed finished levels of contours;
 - Means of enclosure and retaining structures;
 - Boundary treatments;
 - Biodiversity net gain mitigation and new tree planting;
 - Vehicle and parking layouts;
 - Other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
 - Hard surfacing materials;

- Proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc, including alignments, levels, access points and supports as relevant);
- Lighting, floodlighting and CCTV;
- An implementation programme.

The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details before any part of the development is brought into use in accordance with the agreed implementation programme. The completed scheme shall be managed and maintained in accordance with an approved scheme of management and maintenance.

Main Issues

2. The reason for refusal raises two issues namely, (a) whether the location of the appeal site would be suitable for the development, and (b) the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Suitability of location

3. The Council refer to policies 1, 2 and 12 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030 (CLP). These require, amongst other matters, that new development provides a sustainable approach to accommodating growth, taking account of, in particular, location, layout and design that maintains the dispersed development pattern of Cornwall. Policy 2, in particular, seeks to manage the scale and location of all new development and to direct it to appropriate locations whilst at the same time supporting the expansion of the indigenous business of agriculture. Policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document (DPD) has also been referred to, which, amongst other matters, requires new development to be sustainable.
4. There is no specific CLP policy in relation to new agricultural buildings. Even so, part 1 of policy 5 (also referred to by the Council) does provide some helpful and general guidance in that it relates to new business and employment uses, including those uses proposed in the open countryside. The policy requires development to be of a scale appropriate to their location or to demonstrate an overriding locational and business need to be in that location. Paragraph 2.7 states that supporting the continued growth of the agricultural industry will be critical to Cornwall's future long term prosperity.
5. These policies are consistent with those in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) including paragraph 88 which states that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses in rural areas and the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses.
6. The appeal site comprises part of an open field and is largely covered by surplus granite rocks and earthworks from the quarry (Trolvis Quarry), to the north east. An existing track runs along the southern and north western boundary of the appeal site and leads in a south easterly and then southerly direction, above Little Trolvis Farm, to a junction with the A394. As I observed on my visit, towards the appeal

sites southern corner is a ship container, various tractors and trailers, hay cutting equipment, a Portaloo and open storage.

7. I understand that the appeal site previously formed part of Little Trolvis Farm (LTF) but that the farmhouse, associated buildings and some 5 acres of land were sold by the Appellants family in 2024. The Appellant has retained some 13 acres, including the appeal site, which largely comprise the open fields that surround it to the north west and south east. All the fields are used to produce hay for sale.
8. The appeal proposal involves the construction of a detached agricultural storage building. The new building would have a utilitarian appearance using a traditional pallet of materials and would be 18 metres long and 9 metres wide, with a pitched roof extending to a ridge height of 6.4 metres. The existing granite rocks would be re-sited to create a level base for the new building and then re-moulded with new planting to form a screen to the south west of the building. The existing earth bank (escarpment) to the north east of the new building would also be re-moulded with, I understand, new planting. Access to the new building and an area of what appears to be hardstanding would be from that part of the track that runs along the north western boundary of the site.
9. Whilst the appeal site is located within the open countryside the utilitarian design of the new building would replicate that of similar agricultural buildings commonly found in rural locations. The proposed scale and height of the new building would be modest and of an appropriate scale for the site and its open countryside setting. I accept that there are no permanent agricultural buildings on the Appellants holding but the proposal would be viewed in the context of the farmhouse and large agricultural buildings that form LTF. Also, within the context of the buildings and structures to Trolvis Quarry. Whilst agricultural buildings are normally clustered together around a farmhouse, it is also not uncommon to find them sited on their own, particularly, as in this case, where they form part of a holding that is not supported by an existing farmhouse or associated farm buildings.
10. I do acknowledge that the appeal site and holding results from the sale of LTF and part of its land, but I can only determine the appeal on the basis of the proposal that is before me, which seeks planning permission for a storage building to support the running and management of the 13 acre holding. The Appellants Statement of Case (ASOC) confirms that the new building would be used to store machinery and tractors, which, as I observed on site, are currently stored in the open. Also, for the storage of the hay crop. The new building would provide protection from inclement weather and greater security for the machinery/tractors. It would also allow all the open storage to be stored inside the building improving the visual clutter that currently exists.
11. The ASOC also refers to the history of previous planning applications and Prior Notification applications for an agricultural building on the holding since 2023, none of which have been successful. Even so, it is clear from these that the Council's Chief Land Agent & Valuer (CLA&V) has advised that with the sale of LTF an agricultural building of an appropriate size would be required and justified to manage the Appellants remaining holding. I note that the CLA&V did not comment on the appealed application and that the Council's Statement of Case (CSOC) offers no other substantive evidence on the issue of need.

12. In response to the CLA&V's advice the Appellants also reduced the size of the new building to that considered sufficient to support and manage the holding. The ASOC also includes a report dated 25 March 2025 prepared by John Coad & Sons, Chartered surveyors and Land Agents. This concludes that an agricultural building of the size proposed is required to store machinery and the hay crop. Also, to cater for the agricultural needs of the Appellants farming enterprise. The Council have not responded to or challenged this report's findings.
13. Based, therefore, on the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary from the Council, I am satisfied that there is sufficient justification for the proposed building on the appeal site. Also, that there is a need and a requirement for the size and scale of the agricultural storage building proposed to support and manage the Appellants farming enterprise.
14. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal complies with policies 1, 2, 5 and 12 of the CLP, policy C1 of the DPD and the corresponding policies of the NPPF.

Character and appearance

15. Policies 1, 2, 5 and 12 of the CLP require new development to be of a high quality, to ensure that Cornwall's enduring distinctiveness is maintained and enhanced and that its natural character and landscapes are conserved. Policy 23 of the CLP also requires development to protect and where possible enhance Cornwall's natural environment and assets according to their significance. The same approach is set out in policy C1 of the DPD.
16. The appeal site comprises part of a larger open field and is largely covered by surplus granite rocks and earthworks from Trolvis Quarry. The granite rocks would be re-sited to create a level base for the new building and re-moulded with new planting to form a screen to its south west. An existing earth bank to the north east of the new building would also be re-moulded with planting. Access to the new building and an area of what appears to be hardstanding would be from that part of the track that runs along the north western boundary of the site.
17. Within this context and whilst the appeal site is located within the open countryside, the utilitarian design of the new building would replicate the appearance of similar agricultural buildings commonly found in rural locations and indeed within the wider area. The proposed building itself would be modest in terms of its scale and height. From public vantage points, including those on the A394, it would be viewed within the context of the farmhouse and large agricultural buildings that form LTF and the buildings and other structures in Trolvis Quarry.
18. I accept that the appeal site is located within undulating historic farm land but it is also a site that is currently an eyesore and has a negative visual impact on the local landscape due to the presence of large mounds of granite rock and open storage. The granite rock, in particular, is highly visible from the A394 and from Long Downs lane, to the east. The appeal proposal would both improve and enhance the visual appearance of the site through the re-siting and re-moulding of the granite rocks, as well as the earth bank and through the introduction of new planting. In addition to providing an effective screen for the new building there is no reason as to why these works could not, through the submission and approval of a detailed scheme of landscaping, significantly improve the visual appearance of the site and enhance

its landscape setting. As such, I disagree with the Council and do not consider that the proposed bunding and planting would represent a jarring or discordant feature.

19. Whilst there would remain views of the proposed building from some public vantage points due to the sites elevated position, this would be of a building with a simple traditional appearance and pallet of materials. As such, the impact of the building on the local landscape would be limited and in certain views, as I confirmed above, the proposal would represent a positive improvement on existing.
20. As I observed on site, views from parts of the A394 are dominated by the large light grey agricultural building to LTF, which sits in the foreground to the appeal site and is of a much larger scale and far more visually prominent than the proposed building would be. In the background and at a more elevated position are the buildings and structures to Trolvis Quarry. In both instances, the new bunding, earth bank and planting would largely screen the proposal and at the same time improve the contribution it makes to the local landscape.
21. In reaching the above findings, I have had regard to the appeal site location within the Cornwall Character Area, CCA10 Carmenellis (CCA). Whilst the site displays some of the key characteristics of that area, including undulating farmland used for pasture, fields enclosed by Cornish Hedging and scattered farmsteads and other buildings, for the reasons given above, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in any harm to the CCA.
22. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the area and would thus comply with the aims and objectives of policies 1, 2, 5, 12 and 23 of the CLP, policy C1 of the DPD and with paragraphs 8, 135 and 187 of the NPPF.

Conditions

23. The Council has suggested various standard conditions which I have considered against the advice in the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the 'Use of planning conditions'. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is reasonable and necessary in the interests of securing a high quality development. I have also added a condition requiring the materials to be as shown on the application form.
24. The Appellants Final Comments highlighted that the Council had not suggested a landscaping condition but went on to invite other conditions that might be considered appropriate. I have, therefore, also added a landscaping condition, with emphasis on the details of the proposed bunding and planting, to ensure that these works are of a high quality and maintain/enhance the landscape setting on the site.

Conclusions

25. 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