



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 6 May 2026

Site visit made on 6 May 2026

by **S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D0840/W/25/3364240

The Pond, Trewen Land, The Mill, Launceston, Cornwall PL15 8QF

- 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 Kevin Coombes against the decision of Cornwall Council.
 - The application Ref is PA24/09348.
 - The development proposed is change of use of land to residential and the siting of a static caravan on concrete base with parking for one car.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In addition to a barn which occupied the appeal site prior to its purchase by the appellant, there are currently a number of additional structures on the site in connection with its occupation by the appellant together with his extended family. These include 2 touring caravans, 2 single storey timber buildings used as 'day rooms' in connection with the caravans, and several sheds, including structures housing dogs and chickens. The Council has confirmed that the existing residential use of the appeal site and the associated caravans and structures are not lawful.
3. The planning appeals procedural guidance¹ is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and there are no provisions within the Rules for amendments to be submitted. Moreover, it states that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the local planning authority, and by interested parties at the application stage.
4. The appellant has not submitted any amended plans, although he did confirm at the Hearing that he is seeking a touring caravan rather than a static caravan as stated in the description of development. Moreover, whilst the existing development on the site does not reflect the appeal scheme and comprises a notably more intensive residential use of the site involving additional members of the appellant's family, there is a high degree of overlap between the two.
5. As such, for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the scheme that was before the Council at the time of the determination of the

¹ Procedural Guide. Planning Appeals – England. For appeals relating to applications dated on or before 31 March 2026. The Planning Inspectorate 18 February 2026

planning application and the description of development and plans listed on the Council's refusal notice.

6. In coming to this course of action, I have had regard to the substantive and procedural tests in *Holborn Studios Ltd*², noting the substantial difference between the existing on-site development and that which was the subject of the planning application, and also recognising that some interested parties commented upon the planning application, who would not have been made aware of any revisions,
7. The cross-sections A-A and B-B included as part of refused drawing Ref 1424-1a Rev B appear to suggest that the proposed structure may include footings, and as such, may not comprise a 'caravan'.
8. For the avoidance of doubt, notwithstanding these cross-sectional elements of the drawing, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the proposal comprising the stationing of a 'static caravan'.
9. This takes into account that a caravan is not a building, and that the term 'caravan' is defined under S29(1) of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 (CSCDA60) as any structure designed or adapted for human habitation which is capable of being moved from one place to another. This can be by towing or lifting and may include chalet-type units provided they fit within the above definition and meet the size and all other requirements set out within the CSCDA60 and the Caravan Sites Act 1968.

Main Issues

10. The main issues are:

- Whether the appeal site is a suitable location for the proposal, having particular regard to the development plan spatial strategy for new housing;
- The effect of the proposal on the landscape character and appearance of the area; and
- Whether the proposal would deliver statutory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) requirements.

Location

11. The appeal site lies to the west of Launceston and south of the hamlet of Trewen, within open countryside outside the designated settlement boundary. It comprises a yard located west of a narrow unnamed rural lane which runs between Trewen and Trethinna, and it benefits from a gated vehicular access onto this lane.
12. The information before me is that the site was previously used as a builder's yard for the storage of equipment and building materials. It is predominantly laid to hardstanding and includes a timber barn building. Timber fencing, trees and mature soft landscaping largely screen it in wider views from the public realm.
13. Policies 1, 2 and 3 of the *Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies 2010-2030* (2016) (the Local Plan) set out the Council's focus for development at the most sustainable locations in the plan area and the hierarchical strategy for the delivery of housing

² *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823

across Cornwall, with growth being centred upon the named, larger settlements within the county.

14. Paragraph 2.33 of the Local Plan defines the open countryside as *the area outside of the physical boundaries of existing settlements (where they have a clear form and shape)*. Having regard to the distance between the appeal site and the nearest groups of properties at Trewen and Trethinna, I consider that the site is located within open countryside outside of any settlement, for the purposes of the Council's hierarchical strategy set out in Local Plan Policy 3. Accordingly, the development of new dwellings in this location is restricted by this policy.
15. Policy 3 does allow a limited amount of new housing where it comprises the rounding off of settlements, the use of previously developed land within or immediately adjoining that settlement and infill development that fills a gap in an otherwise continuous built frontage. However, given the location of the site some distance away from the nearest dwellings and rural settlement of Trewen and within a rural setting where it is surrounded by pasture and woodland, the appeal site is not related to a distinct built-up area that could be described as a settlement. As such, these exceptions do not apply in this instance. Moreover, the land is not identified as a housing site through a Neighbourhood Plan, nor does it comprise an exception site under Local Plan Policy 9.
16. Local Plan Policy 7 only permits new dwellings in the countryside where there are special circumstances including rural worker dwellings, the re-use of existing buildings, replacement dwellings, and the subdivision of existing residential properties. None of these apply to the appeal scheme.
17. Having regard to the history of the site as a builder's yard with the associated built development that this entailed and noting that the appellant has stated that it was in an untidy state at the time of purchase, Local Plan Policy 21 supports the use of previously developed or despoiled land for new development. However, this is subject to the site being sustainably located. In this instance, I find that the appeal site does not comprise an accessible location with respect to the availability of community facilities and services and that there would be a requirement to travel to larger settlements further afield such as Launceston to access a range of services and facilities.
18. Moreover, the appeal site is accessed via a narrow, unlit rural lane with no pavements so that accessibility by means of transport other than a car, such as walking or cycling, from the appeal site to the closest facilities and services or public transport is poor, particularly during inclement weather and hours of darkness. As such, Policy 21 does not facilitate the appeal scheme.
19. Notwithstanding that the proposed caravan would be a temporary structure, the appeal scheme still constitutes residential development for the purposes of planning policy. The aforesaid development plan policies do not differentiate between temporary and permanent forms of residential accommodation.
20. The appellant has referred to other residential development which has been approved elsewhere within the locality of the appeal site. Whilst specific addresses and site planning histories have not been provided, it appears likely, based upon the evidence before me and the Council's response on this matter at the Hearing, that these properties were approved under different development plan policies in respect

of the conversion of existing residential and/or farm buildings to residential and/or holiday accommodation use.

21. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the appeal site is not a suitable location for the proposal, having particular regard to the development plan's spatial strategy for new housing as set out in Local Plan Policies 1, 2, 3, 7, 9 and 21. These policies, amongst other aims, seek to ensure that development is suitably located having regard to the Council's adopted spatial pattern of development and that it protects the open countryside from inappropriate development.
22. These policies are generally consistent with the sustainable development aims of the *National Planning Policy Framework 2024* (the Framework), including directing new development to the most accessible locations, promoting a prosperous rural economy and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Character and appearance

23. The site lies within a designated Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV), which Saved Policy ENV1 of the *North Cornwall District Local Plan (1999)* (September 2007) (the NCDLP) recognises as having particular importance for the protection of landscape character.
24. In terms of its character, the site falls within the Landscape Character Area CCA40 – Bodmin Moor Fringe and Inny Valley in accordance with the Council's *Cornwall and Isles of Scilly Landscape Character Study* (August 2023). The land use within this area is described as mainly pastoral farmland with improved grassland and some arable. This includes widespread predominantly long and narrow and small-scale medieval field patterns, together with contrasting patches of rough ground and larger areas of strongly rectilinear recently enclosed land. Field boundaries typically comprise Cornish hedges with hedgerows and sometimes trees above them. Outside of the main settlement of Callington, there are dispersed small hamlets and farmsteads and one of the stated valued landscape attributes, which would be most sensitive to change, is its sparsely settled character.
25. The landscape character area is described as being perceived as an intimate and ancient landscape, especially away from the main transport corridors, where sunken lanes and small pastoral fields bound by Cornish hedges create a strong rural character. Pockets of tranquillity are identified as existing within intimate valleys and dark night skies are experienced across much of this character area, particularly away from the A30 and the settlement around Callington.
26. The site lies in a tranquil rural location away from the nearest groupings of properties at Trewen to the north and Trethinna to the south. It occupies an isolated position along an unlit narrow single width country lane which lacks pavements and is bounded by mature hedges and trees. Built development along this part of the lane is limited and sporadic and interspersed amongst undeveloped countryside. As such, the lane is notably verdant, rural and tranquil.
27. Aside from existing residential development on the site which does not have the benefit of planning permission, the appeal site has a typically rural appearance including an open-fronted timber barn which is visible from the lane. It is bounded by maturely landscaped boundaries and fits comfortably within the surrounding open pasture and woodland landscape.

28. One of the identified current and future pressures on this landscape is identified as ongoing pressure for residential development and improvement of transport corridors, imparting a slightly 'urban' character on the rural landscape.
29. The nearest neighbouring residential property at Trewen Mill, lies approximately 75 metres south of the site and is in an isolated position in relation to the aforesaid hamlets to the north and south. The historic listed mill house and its associated outbuildings do not alter the prevailing tranquil and rural prevailing countryside character of the locality.
30. Siting the proposed static caravan in the northwest corner of the site, in the position shown on the refused drawing Ref 1609/Sht100/PA would mean that it would be well screened from outside the appeal site, including from the public realm of the public highway within the vicinity of the site. This is due to its low-lying structure together with the presence of mature boundary hedging and trees.
31. Moreover, the proposed new concrete hardstanding intended to provide a base for the caravan, as well as the provision of a single parking space, would take up a small proportion of the overall site area.
32. Were I minded to allow the appeal, the siting of these elements of the scheme could be controlled by means of a planning condition to ensure that they remained set back within the site so that their visual impact upon the wider rural area remained limited. I have also noted the appellant's intention to clad the caravan so that it would have the appearance of a shepherd's hut.
33. These considerations are favourable having regard to visual impact. However, the appeal scheme includes the change of use of the appeal site land to residential and, as such, it would not be unreasonable to expect that other parts of the site would contain domestic paraphernalia associated with the residential use of the site, such as sheds, garden furniture, barbeques, outdoor seating areas such as decking and patios, paths and a formalised garden layout, in addition to the use of the existing open barn as an ancillary domestic structure.
34. These would potentially cover a large area of the site so that they would be readily apparent from the road via views through the site access. Such ancillary residential works and structures, combined with additional traffic movements, noise, and lighting during the hours of darkness, would result in a harmful erosion of the aforesaid prevailing intrinsic landscape character of the locality.
35. The evidence before me is that prior to the appellant's purchase of the site, it had been used as a builder's yard, which the appellant subsequently tidied and cleared of unsightly builder's rubble and materials that had previously been stored therein. The appellant also introduced new planting to improve the visual appearance of the site.
36. Whilst this is noted, should the condition of the land been such that it adversely affected the amenity of the area, the Council would have had authority to serve notice to remedy this³. There is no substantive evidence before me that the site was causing material harm to the visual amenities of the locality and as such, the actions of the appellant in this respect would have resulted in limited

³ Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act)

improvements which would not in itself justify the proposed residential development of the site.

37. Moreover, the Council has confirmed that no planning or lawful development certificate applications have been made in respect of a builder's yard use of the site. As such, in assessing whether there would be harm to the landscape character of the area as a result of the appeal scheme, I am unable to apportion significant weight to a comparison of the proposal with that of any previous impact resulting from the former builder's yard use.
38. I acknowledge that most of the appeal site is currently covered by hardstanding which has introduced a large amount of built development onto the site. The Council has submitted aerial photographs indicating that this was put in place sometime between 2021 and 2023, prior to the purchase of the site by the appellant. However, the Council are unclear as to whether this hard surfacing is lawful or not.
39. It is not for me, under this Section 78 appeal to determine whether development on the appeal site has been carried out lawfully. This would be for the appellant to determine through other mechanisms. As such, I have determined the appeal on the basis of what has been applied for, which does not include hardstanding other than in connection with the proposed siting of the caravan and creation of a parking space.
40. For the above reasons I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the landscape character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not accord with Local Plan Policies 2, 12 and 23 and Saved Policy ENV1 of the NCDLP, in so much as these policies, amongst other things, seek to protect intrinsic landscape character, openness and local distinctiveness in rural areas, including recognising the particular importance of protecting landscape character in designated Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV).
41. This accords with the aims of Chapters 12 and 15 of the Framework which seek to achieve well-designed places and to conserve and enhance the natural environment.

BNG

42. BNG is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Act⁴. Under this framework every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that the biodiversity gain objective is met. This requires development to deliver at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value relative to the pre-development biodiversity value of the on-site habitat. This increase can be achieved through on-site biodiversity gains, registered off-site biodiversity gains or statutory biodiversity credits.
43. The biodiversity gain condition is a pre-commencement condition, and once planning permission has been granted, a Biodiversity Gain Plan must be submitted and approved by the local planning authority before commencement of the development.
44. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) indicates that it would generally be inappropriate to refuse an application on grounds that the biodiversity gain

⁴ Section 7A (Biodiversity Gain in England) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

objective will not be met. However, the PPG also states that decision makers may need to consider more broadly whether the biodiversity gain condition is capable of being successfully discharged.

45. The Council's second reason for refusal stems from concern that the appellant has not demonstrated that the scheme is exempt from BNG, and accordingly, has not shown how the development would provide the required net gain of at least 10%.
46. There are exemptions to the aforesaid BNG requirements which are set out in the PPG and *the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024*. These include retrospective planning permissions made under section 73A, and this exemption is recognised by the Council as being a relevant consideration.
47. The appellant stated on the planning application form that the application was not made retrospectively. He also confirmed at the Hearing that the appeal scheme had not commenced at the time of the planning application. Accordingly, the Council is not satisfied that an exemption applies in this case.
48. Moreover, although the appellant has referred to additional soft landscaping that he has planted on the site, including new trees and raised beds, and confirmed that no trees would be cut down, he has not submitted the BNG minimum national information requirements, including the statutory small sites biodiversity metric, to allow consideration of existing habitat baselines to enable understanding about the pre-development biodiversity value of the development's onsite habitat at this stage, as stated in the PPG.⁵
49. Rather, the appellant's stated reasons for believing that the appeal scheme is exempt, as set out on the planning application form, is that *'the development is below the threshold'* and *'the whole site is just hardstanding currently'*. No additional statement has been submitted with the planning application or the appeal, nor did the appellant elaborate when invited to do so during the Hearing.
50. Notwithstanding this, and noting that the appellant was not professionally represented throughout the planning application and appeal processes, it is fair and reasonable to assume that in this case, given the hard surfacing that existed over most of the appeal site at the time of the planning application, the most applicable possible BNG exception is the 'de minimis' exemption. This is development that does not impact upon a priority habitat and impacts less than 25 square metres of on-site habitat, and 5 metres of linear habitats such as hedgerows.
51. Notwithstanding this, based on the evidence before me, I am unable to conclude beyond reasonable doubt that the appeal scheme accords with the de minimus exemption. This is because, whilst the design of the caravan would not necessarily be fixed, the submitted drawings indicate that its dimensions would exceed 25 square metres. Moreover, it is not clear from the information before me as to what extent the proposed concrete base for the caravan would be sited on existing hard surfacing, which in itself may or may not be lawful.
52. As such, whilst this matter may be capable of future clarification, for the purposes of this appeal decision, there is insufficient information before me to satisfactorily demonstrate that the statutory biodiversity gain objectives would be

⁵ Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 74-002-20240214 and Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 74-011-20240214

met. The proposal therefore conflicts with the requirements of the amendments to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as set out in the Environment Act 2021 and Policy G2 of the *Cornwall Council Climate Emergency Development Plan Document* (February 2023) which requires all development proposals (except those defined as exempt in secondary legislation) to achieve a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain over the pre-development site value as measured by the latest version of the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric.

Other Matters

53. The appellant has referred to the human right to live peacefully and safe and considers there to be exceptional circumstances in this instance which would warrant allowing the appeal scheme on the basis that otherwise the appellant and his family would become homeless.
54. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, as set out within Schedule 1 of the Human Rights Act 1998 (the HRA) provides that everyone has a right to enjoy a home peacefully and public authorities, such as a local planning authority, should not stop a person from living in their home without very good reason.
55. The evidence before me is that the appellant had previously been living with his partner and youngest daughter, as well as his oldest daughter and her partner and their 2 children in a rented property approximately 25 miles away from the appeal site. The property was in a poor state of repair and after the appellant complained to the landlord regarding septic tank issues, they were served with a no-fault eviction notice under Section 21 of the Housing Act 1988 on 27 March 2025. This resulted in all these family members moving to the appeal site, which according to the appellant, was the only available option which would enable all the family to stay together, as well as keep their therapy dogs.
56. I saw during my site visit that the site currently remains occupied in this manner and includes the stationing of caravans and single storey ancillary timber structures, dog kennelling, and parking and garden/outdoor living spaces sufficient to provide for two households. This represents a more intensive residential use of the appeal site which does not accord with the appeal scheme before me. Accordingly, my consideration of how much weight to apportion to the appellant's rights under Article 8 is restricted to the extent to which it relates specifically to the appeal scheme.
57. The appellant bought the site in May 2024 and submitted the planning application in December 2024 with the stated intention at that time of living on the appeal site in a caravan in the future. The appellant has confirmed that the application was submitted when he had no indication that he would later be evicted from his rental property. The proposed plans indicate that a single caravan is proposed, and the appellant confirmed at the Hearing that it would be occupied by the appellant and his partner, as his younger daughter had since moved into accommodation elsewhere away from the appeal site.
58. The appellant's view is that should the appeal be dismissed, he and his partner will have nowhere to live. He confirmed that they tried to find another private

rental property at the time of the eviction notice but that no suitable properties were available due to factors including unaffordable rental cost, inability to provide a guarantor due to no credit history and inability to work, as well as a requirement to accommodate their dogs.

59. I sympathise with the appellant's situation. However, it was explained to me at the Hearing, by the community lawyers present, that the serving of a 'no-fault' Section 21 notice did not automatically mean that the appellant and his family necessarily had to vacate the property within the 2 months stipulated in the notice. This is because there were various legal options available to them to challenge the notice, including through the courts. Moreover, my understanding is that the landlord could have been made accountable for carrying out the necessary repairs to the property. The appellant confirmed that he was unaware of the alternative options available to him at the time.
60. Moreover, there is no substantive evidence before me that, since moving onto the appeal site, the appellant actively sought to find suitable alternative living accommodation elsewhere. In particular, it is reasonable to have expected the appellant to have registered with the Council's 'Homechoice' housing register in order to bid for a suitable property.
61. Having regard to the above, and noting that the appeal scheme is limited to providing a home for the appellant and his partner and does not apply to the other family members who currently occupy the appeal site, I am not persuaded on the basis of the evidence before me, that there are currently no other rental properties elsewhere which would be suitable for the appellant and his partner.
62. I acknowledge that, in the event that the appeal is dismissed there is a reasonable possibility of the Council serving an enforcement notice to seek the removal of the appellant's caravan. The Council has confirmed that the period set for compliance could be extended under Section 173A(1)(b) of the 1990 Act and that this could be set to allow a reasonable amount of time for the appellant to actively seek suitable alternative accommodation.
63. With all the above in mind, dismissing the appeal would interfere with the appellant's right to enjoy peaceful enjoyment of their home as set out in Article 8 of the HRA. However, this is a qualified right and interference in this instance would accord with the law and be in pursuance of balancing the fundamental rights of the individual against the interests of protecting the environment, which is a legitimate public interest to which I attach considerable weight. In this instance, the protection of the public interest cannot be achieved by means that are less interfering with the appellant's rights under the HRA.
64. I have been made aware that both the appellant and his partner have a number of ongoing health conditions, and I appreciate that it is their preference to live in a quiet undisturbed location such as the appeal site. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence, such as medical records and/or specialist medical advice to explain the severity of the health conditions and why they justify living in the open countryside nor why they necessitate the requirement for therapy dogs. Consequently, I give this limited weight in the balance.

65. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, (the Act) requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for 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.
66. In determining the planning application, the Council has not found any harm to the significance and setting of the Grade II listed building known as Trewen Mill which is located approximately 75 metres south of the appeal site.
67. Based on my site visit, which included consideration of the separation distance between the appeal proposal and this listed building, together with the intervening rural buildings and mature landscaping and trees, the size and character of the appeal site, and the amount of proposed development, I have no reason to disagree with the Council in respect of this matter. The appeal scheme would be sufficiently distant and screened from the setting of this two-storey 18th Century stone and slate dwelling, so as not to harm its significance.

Planning Balance

68. The Council has confirmed that it cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites as required by the Framework, and that the Council's supply stands at 3.9 years of deliverable housing land.
69. As such, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework applies, which states that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date. Paragraph 11d) states that permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance, provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed, or the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places, and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
70. Paragraph 8 of the Framework defines the three dimensions of sustainable development as performing economic, social and environmental objectives. In terms of social benefits, a single dwelling would make a small contribution towards the Council's housing supply.
71. There would be economic and social benefits as a result of its future occupation, including support for facilities, services and businesses. These considerations weigh in favour of the development, and I afford them moderate weight, having regard to the modest size of the proposal.
72. The Council has raised no objection to the appeal scheme in respect of matters including parking and highway safety, living conditions of future occupiers and neighbours, flood risk, drainage and heritage. In terms of the planning balance, a lack of identified harms is a neutral factor.
73. Moreover, whilst the Framework encourages the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and requires the Council to approach decisions in a positive and creative way, these matters are not unqualified.

74. Weighed against the benefits of the proposal, the location of the appeal site would not provide a suitable site for housing development, and the proposal would not give a genuine choice for future occupiers to travel to facilities and services other than by the private car. As such, the proposal would seriously undermine the Council's spatial strategy, which aligns with that of the Framework, and notwithstanding that the appellant proposes to incorporate sustainable on-site design measures, the social and environmental objectives of sustainable development in respect of accessible services and moving to a low carbon economy would not be met.
75. In addition, for the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect upon the landscape character and appearance of the area and has not satisfied the statutory BNG requirements. This would conflict with the environmental objective of the Framework of protecting and enhancing our natural environment.
76. Accordingly, having carefully considered the balance of factors, I consider that, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, the significant harms that would arise from the proposal in respect of undermining the Council's spatial strategy for development, the lack of accessibility of the site to facilities and services and harm to the natural environment, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

77. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and that there are no other material considerations, including the Framework, the appellant's human rights under the HRA, and their health considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
78. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Leonard

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

- Calvin Keenan - a relative of the appellant
- Delia Taylor – partner of the appellant

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

- Jim Lee – Appeals Officer Cornwall Council

THIRD PARTIES:

- Mair Howard and Brenda Morton – Community Lawyers in Blazey
- Mark Stevens – neighbour at Trewen Mill