

Planning Committee

Appeal Decisions

The following decisions have been made by the Planning Inspectorate on appeals arising from decisions of the City

Application Number **05/01585/LBC**
Appeal Site **83-85 CITADEL ROAD THE HOE PLYMOUTH** **P 38 06/07**
Appeal Proposal Removal of the existing pediment over the stair window and modification of the existing parapet to reflect the parapet of No. 87 Citadel Road

Appeal Category REF
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 20/09/2006
Conditions N/A
Award of Costs N/A Awarded To N/A

Appeal Synopsis

The appeal was dismissed. The main issues were that the proposed alterations would appear an incongruous addition to the post war rebuild of the side elevation of 31 Athenaeum Street and undermine the distinctive contribution the elevation makes other building and street scene. In addition the applicant provided no justification as to why the works were necessary.

Application Number **05/01697/FUL**
Appeal Site **GROUND FLOOR FLAT 227 STUART ROAD STOKE PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Alterations to create french doors in window opening, and increased enclosure of front garden

Appeal Category CON
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 03/10/2006
Conditions N/A
Award of Costs N/A Awarded To N/A

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector concluded that the proposed fence would be incongruous to the character and appearance of the area and over-prominent. The Inspector did not give substantial weighting to the use of Policy AEV20 because the property is not in the conservation area but fronting it, but the Inspector gave more weight to the use of Policy AHR15. The Inspector agreed with Condition 2 and dismissed the appeal on the grounds that the fence would not be in keeping with other properties in the locality.

Application Number **05/01734/LBC**
Appeal Site **32 UNDERWOOD ROAD PLYMPTON PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Replacement front ground- and first-floor sash windows (to be double-glazed)
Appeal Category REF
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 28/09/2006
Conditions N/A
Award of Costs N/A Awarded To N/A

Appeal Synopsis

The appeals inspector makes reference to paragraph C.40 and C.50 of PPG15 stating that where possible repair or like for like replacement is desirable in a building of historic interest. Further to this moves away from double glazed units in favour of weather stripping and draught proofing or internal/ secondary double glazing. In the case of 32 Underwood road it is the inspectors opinion that the windows could be repaired and retained without undue difficulty. The proposed new windows would not constitute a like for like replacement and the visual difference would be marked. The proposed sashes would lack the subtle shadows and varied reflections that occur with windows traditionally constructed with separate panes and projecting glazing bars. The windows are an important feature of the façade of the subject property, which is conspicuous within the street. The proposed windows would be harmful to the character, social interest and appearance of the building. Although double glazed units have been used elsewhere in the conservation area, this does not justify their use here.

Application Number **06/00140/FUL**
Appeal Site **LATITUDE 52 237-239 ALBERT ROAD DEVONPORT PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Change of use and conversion of space set aside for community use (under planning permission notice number 03/00110) to now form an additional 5 residential units
Appeal Category REF
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 04/10/2006
Conditions N/A
Award of Costs N/A Awarded To N/A

Appeal Synopsis

No need for the community or sports facilities has been properly identified, whereas the appeal proposal would provide five further residential units in a good sustainable location and would help to complete this long running redevelopment of a significant building close to a Neighbourhood Renewal Area. Additional parking required by five more small residential units would be quite minimal and may be less than that generated by the permitted sports/ community use. PPG3 indicates that developers should not be required to provide more car parking than they, or potential occupiers may want, and this is particularly so in areas with good access to public transport such as this. Also other small residential schemes have been approved nearby

Note:

Copies of the full decision letters are available to Members in the Ark Royal Room and Plymouth Rooms. Copies are also available to the press and public at the First Stop Reception.