



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **S Harrington MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/D/25/3364375

Lowena, Boat Cove Lane, Perranuthnoe, Cornwall TR20 9NW

- 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 Dr R & L Maser & Scouller against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA25/00500.
 - The development proposed is construction of extensions, alterations & associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the location of the site within the Cornwall National Landscape (CNL).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the CNL which benefits from varied landscapes with distinctive characters and natural beauty. The National Planning Policy Framework states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty within National Landscapes. Furthermore, the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023 requires decision makers to actively seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty within National Landscapes.
4. There are a variety of dwellings of differing scale and appearance near the appeal site, including some of contemporary form featuring large areas of glazing which contribute to the character of the settlement of Perranuthoe. Nevertheless, the site is on an elevated plateau and seen in the context of directly adjacent open countryside, within a narrow coastal strip which descends to exposed rock and low-lying headland and contains the Southwest Coastal Footpath.
5. Whilst I observed the site to be particularly prominent from the surrounding protected landscape, the existing dormer bungalow, due to its modest size, hipped roofs and recessive materials does not draw the eye or detract from the scenic and tranquil quality of this part of the surrounding landscape and its distinctive character.
6. The proposal would result in the appeal dwelling considerably increasing in scale and massing. Whilst maintaining an overall appearance of a dormer bungalow and utilising appropriate facing materials, it would be taller than the existing dwelling

and have a significantly larger footprint and lengthened ridge line. Furthermore, the proposal would also feature large, glazed openings on the coastal facing elevations.

7. Such an increase in scale in combination with the eye-catching levels of glazing would inevitably attract the eye and appear harmfully conspicuous in the landscape, despite the presence of nearby dwellings. Moreover, the large areas of glazing would increase levels of light spill into the night sky during occupation at this sensitive edge of settlement location, harming the tranquillity of the area.
8. Proposed developments should positively reflect the value and sensitivity of the area and integrate appropriately and not detract from the protected landscape. It is inevitable, due to the prominent appeal site location adjacent open countryside within the coastal strip that the identified harm, in its totality, would also extend to the scenic beauty of this part of the CNL. As such, I find its overall design would fail to integrate into the distinctive landscape and would fail to conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty within the CNL, to which I give great weight.
9. There are other dwellings in the area such as those highlighted by the appellant (including that allowed within appeal APP/D0840/W/17/3190815) which are of a larger scale and feature large areas of glazing. Nevertheless, I observed the other sites and their relationship with the landscape and nearby dwellings differ from the case before me. The Inspector in the other appeal found that the proposal would sit lower in the landscape than the closest dwellings that it would be seen in context with, and not intrusive in the overall landscape.
10. However, in the case before me due to its spatial relationship with open countryside, and particularly when viewed from the adjacent bridleway, the proposal would be prominent and particularly noticeable in the landscape, notwithstanding nearby residential built form.
11. If the appeal proposal were to be dismissed, the appellant suggests the existing dwelling could be extended and additional glazing installed by way of a permitted development fallback. Given that the appellant has stated an intention to enlarge the dwelling, I consider that there is a real prospect of a fallback development taking place.
12. However, whilst some examples of the types of permitted developments that could take place have been provided, I have no clear plans or indication of the appearance of any final fallback development. Moreover, given the substantive evidence before me, it is not clear if any fallback development would result in a dwelling of similar or more visual massing or prominence than the proposal before me. I am therefore unable to determine if the fallback would have a similar or greater impact on the CNL. As a result, the potential for the permitted development fallback to be implemented is a matter that carries modest weight.
13. To conclude, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the CNL. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies 2, 12, and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030, policies HTA2ii, BDL1 and NLB3 of the Perranuthnoe Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2019-30 and Policy C1(7) of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023. These policies seek, amongst other matters, to ensure development leads to the protection and

enhancement of the distinctive landscape and natural character and conserves the landscape character and natural beauty of the CNL.

14. The proposal would also conflict with policies PD-P1, PD-P2, PD-P11 and LS-P3 of the Cornwall Nationally Protected Landscape Management Plan 2022-2027, insofar as they seek to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the CNL

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations, individually or cumulatively, indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Harrington

INSPECTOR