

Appeal Decisions between 01/10/2019 and 26/11/2019

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
10/10/2019	19/00285/FUL	2019/0024	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/19/3232875
Ward				
Moorview				
Address				
11 Grimspound Close Plymouth PL6 8NY				
Application Description				
Front extension				
Appeal Process		Officers Name		
Written Representations		Miss Josephine Maddick		
Synopsis				
<p>Planning permission was refused for a front extension, it was considered to be contrary to Local Plan policies DEV1 and DEV20. It was also considered contrary to guidance in the Councils Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the development would result in an incongruous addition. The Inspector noted that as the slope of the land drops away it would necessitate a supporting base wall at the front of the extension. The extension would appear relatively high in relation to the main face of the building and it would dominate the principal elevation. The inspector recognised that the extension would provide suitable accommodation for the resident family, but noted that this point would not justify the size and appearance of proposal. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
05/11/2019	18/01935/FUL	2019/0025	Appeal Allowed	APP/N1160/W/19/3233178
Ward				
Moorview				
Address				
Land At St Annes Road Plymouth PL6 7LW				
Application Description				
Erection of 4 bed detached dwelling with integral garage, parking and amenity areas				
Appeal Process		Officers Name		
Written Representations		Miss Amy Thompson		
Synopsis				
<p>The application for planning permission for the erection of a 4-bed dwellinghouse with associated integral garage, parking and amenity area had an Officer recommendation of approval, however was refused at Planning Committee as it was contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS28 and CS34. It was also considered contrary to the Council's Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application and visited the site, the Inspector disagreed with the Council's view that the proposal created unacceptable highway impacts and was overdevelopment of the area. The Inspector concluded that it was not clear what highway harm would be caused by the dwelling, noting that on their site visit there were ample spaces available in the car park, however visitors were still parking on the public highway instead with little impact on large vehicles being able to pass by. The Development Guidelines SPD sets out maximum parking standards and there would be no conflict with any potential loss of spaces for the nearby flats that use the car park. The Inspector also noted that the site is large enough to accommodate a dwelling and would not be intensive development or harm the character or appearance of the area. It was noted that although two trees are to be removed, they are relatively small and do not make a significant contribution to the character or appearance of the area. The Inspector also advised that the proposal would provide suitable living accommodation for occupants and due to the positioning of the dwelling would not significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, overbearing or daylight. An application for costs was made against the Council and was awarded by the Inspector due to the lack of robust support for the reasons for refusal, which ran contrary to the Officers report.</p>				