
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **Nick Davies BSc(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3363960

Shippen Barn, St Pinnock, Cornwall PL14 4NA

- 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 Gary Martin against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA25/00458.
 - The development proposed is construction of detached dwelling as alternative scheme to previously approved (under PA24/06030).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of detached dwelling as alternative scheme to previously approved (under PA24/06030) at Shippen Barn, St Pinnock, Cornwall PL14 4NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA25/00458, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. Planning permission was granted¹ at the site for *erection of new dwelling and change of use of land to residential following prior approval (PA23/02625)* on 16 October 2024 (the Permitted Scheme).
3. During the course of the appeal, planning permission was granted² for *construction of detached self-build dwelling as alternative scheme to previously approved (under PA24/06030)* on 9 June 2005 (the Second Permitted Scheme). It appeared from my visit that this permission was being implemented.
4. The Permitted Scheme and the Second Permitted Scheme are capable of implementation at the time that I am determining the appeal. If I were to dismiss the appeal, it is more than a theoretical possibility that one of them would be implemented. They therefore represent established fallback positions, and are a material consideration, to which I ascribe considerable weight in my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site lies in a rural location, just outside the hamlet of St Pinnock, and within the Looe and Seaton Valleys Area of Great Landscape Value (the AGLV).

¹ Local Planning Authority reference: PA24/06030

² Local Planning Authority reference: PA25/02907

The area is characterised by an undulating patchwork of fields, accessed by narrow winding country lanes, lined by high hedges. As a result of the topography and vegetation, the landscape is intimate. Isolated buildings are briefly glimpsed through field gates, and roofs are sporadically visible over the hedges, but there are limited views of the wider landscape. The appeal site is adjacent to one of these lanes, screened by the roadside boundary hedge to the north and rising land to the south. It is not, therefore, a prominent component of the landscape.

7. There is a utilitarian agricultural building on the site, which has the benefit of planning permission for conversion to a dwelling. However, the Permitted Scheme and the Second Permitted Scheme both involve the construction of a new dwelling to the south, in lieu of the conversion. The Permitted Scheme is for a single storey dwelling with low eaves and a relatively shallow-pitched roof. The Council's delegated report stated that this proposal would be reflective of the current rural character of the landscape, and I have no reason to disagree. The Second Permitted Scheme is for a building of similar footprint and roof pitch, but with a raised eaves level, and rooflights in the rear elevation, allowing first floor accommodation.
8. The appeal proposal is for a dwelling of the same footprint as the two previous schemes, but with a steeper roof, springing from the lower eaves level of the Permitted Scheme. It would have two pitched roof dormers in each of the roof slopes, and a gabled canopy roof over the front door.
9. The ridge height of the appeal proposal would be 350mm higher than that of the Second Permitted Scheme. This small increase in height would not result in the roof of the dwelling being visible from any additional viewpoints, and would not make it noticeably more prominent in the limited area from which it would be seen. Indeed, the reduced eaves height, in comparison with the Second Permitted Scheme, means that the front wall of the building would be less visually imposing when viewed from the road directly in front of the site. Consequently, the proposal would not have a greater visual presence in the landscape than the permitted fallback position.
10. It is contended that the dormer windows and porch canopy would be overly domestic features, which would give the building an urban character that would not reflect its rural setting. However, the proposed dormers would be subservient features in the overall roofslope, and would be timber clad with natural slate roofs to match the rest of the building. The porch canopy would be open-sided and centrally located, and overall, the building would retain a simple coherent form, with rustic external materials. Its design would not, therefore, result in it being incongruous in a rural setting.
11. I saw that the closest building, at The Barn, has a simple unadorned roofslope, as do the traditional buildings in St Pinnock. In the vicinity of the appeal site, however, I saw a range of other buildings, including large modern agricultural structures, storage containers, and dwellings of various designs. I also saw that some of the houses on the hillside in Trevelmond to the northeast have dormer windows. However, the character of this part of the AGLV is derived from its topography and natural beauty, rather than any consistency in the roof forms of the sporadic buildings that it contains.

12. The dwelling would not be readily seen in juxtaposition with any of these existing buildings, and would not be visible from a wide area. Due to the high boundary hedges to the east and along the roadside, the dormer windows would only be evident from a short stretch of the road that passes the site, and the porch canopy would only be seen through the access point. I acknowledge that the effectiveness of screening by hedges varies with seasons and pruning regimes, but the surrounding topography also dictates that the site is not a prominent feature in the landscape. The proposed dwelling would not be seen from a wide area and, from where it is visible, its visual impact would be little different to either of the permitted schemes.
13. My attention has been drawn to an appeal decision³ for a new dwelling in a rural area where the inclusion of dormer windows contributed to the Inspector dismissing the appeal. I have not been provided with a copy of the drawings for that proposal, but the Inspector refers to a U-shaped footprint, a varied roof with dormer windows and projecting gables, and an elaborate design. It would, therefore, appear to have little in common with the simple building that is the subject of the appeal before me. I have therefore given little weight to this appeal decision.
14. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, accord with Policies 1, 2, 7, 12 and 23 of the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010 – 2030, Policy C1 of the Climate Emergency Development Plan Document 2023, and Policy CL9 of the Caradon Local Plan First Alteration 2007. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that proposals are of high-quality design, are of an appropriate scale and character to their location, and maintain the character and distinctive landscape qualities of the AGLV.

Conditions

15. In accordance with the legislation, I have imposed a condition limiting the period within which the development must commence. I have also included a condition specifying the relevant plans, as this provides certainty. The Council has submitted a schedule of suggested conditions to cover other matters, and the appellant has not contested any of these. Nevertheless, I have considered them against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. Where I have agreed that they meet the relevant tests, I have altered some of them, in the interests of clarity and precision, to better reflect the guidance.
16. Conditions requiring energy and water efficiency are necessary to ensure compliance with development plan policies. Conditions requiring development to proceed in accordance with ecological recommendations, and to provide bird nesting facilities are reasonable in the interests of biodiversity. The provision of a Cornish bund hedge along the western boundary of the site would help to assimilate the dwelling into the landscape, so I have imposed a condition requiring its provision.
17. The proposed dwelling occupies a countryside location, where a new dwelling has only been allowed as an alternative to the previously permitted conversion of an agricultural building. Consequently, it is necessary to impose a condition to ensure

³ Appeal Decision APP/D0840/W/22/3312821

that the agricultural building is demolished, to avoid both permissions being implemented.

18. The application form does not identify the proposal as being for self-build or custom build housing, and I have not been provided with any justification for a condition requiring that it should be, so I have not imposed one.
19. The appellant has invited me to consider imposing a condition that would remove the front dormers from the permission. In view of my conclusions on the impact of the submitted proposal on the character and appearance of the area, such a condition would not be necessary or reasonable, so I have not imposed it.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Davies

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 0-01 (Existing Location Plan); 0-02 (Existing Block Plan); 01-01 (Proposed Location Plan); 01-02 (Proposed Block Plan); 01-03 (Proposed Ground Floor GA Plan); 01-03 (Proposed First Floor GA Plan); 01-04 (Proposed Elevations); 01-05 (Proposed Elevations 2); 01-06 (Proposed Section); 01-07 (BNG Plan); P01 (Typical hedgebank and wildflower detail).
- 3) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the energy and water efficiency measures and renewable energy provision detailed in the approved Energy Statement, by WM Diagnostics, have been fully implemented and the solar photovoltaic array and air source heat pump have been installed and completed in accordance with the details included on the plans hereby approved. The energy and water efficiency measures and renewable energy provision shall thereafter be permanently retained.
- 4) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the Building Regulations optional requirement of a water consumption rate of no more than 110 litres per person per day has been complied with.
- 5) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the proposed Eco Sparrow tower has been installed in accordance with the details shown on drawing number 01-04 and Appendix 6 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat & Protected Species Survey by EcoLogic Consultant Ecologists LLP (Ref 220412 Rev00A) dated 22 July 2024. The tower shall thereafter be permanently retained.
- 6) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the proposed Cornish bund hedge planted with wildflower mixed species, has been

completed in accordance with the details shown on drawing numbers 01-02 and P01. This boundary treatment shall thereafter be permanently retained.

- 7) The dwelling hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the “Existing shed Approved for conversion under Class Q” as shown on drawing number 01-02 has been demolished and removed in its entirety. If the development granted under PA23/02625 is carried out, for the conversion of this existing building to a dwelling, then the dwelling hereby approved shall not be constructed.
- 8) The development shall proceed in accordance with all the recommendations set out in Section 6 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Bat & Protected Species Survey by EcoLogic Consultant Ecologists LLP (Ref 220412 Rev00A) dated 22 July 2024.

END OF SCHEDULE