## Appeal Decisions between 29/02/2020 and 05/06/2020

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
27/03/2020	19/00386/FUL	2019/0035	Appeal Allowed with Conditions	APP/N1160/D/19/3240857
Ward				
Plymstock Dunst	tone			
Address				
46 Furzehatt Roa	ad Plymouth PL9 8QT			
Application Des	scription			
Extend existing	roof pitch over two-storey side e>	ktension		
Appeal Process	Officers I	Name		
Householder Fas	st Track Mrs Alun	neci Tuima		
Synopsis				
be contrary to P Supplementary I conditions. The I character and ap	olicy DEV20 of the Plymouth and S Planning Document First Review 2 Inspectorate whilst appreciating the popearance of the building. It would	South West Devon Joint Loca 013 and the National Plannin hat a lowered roof may be d	al Plan and contrary to guidance contain ng Policy Framework. Having reviewed t lesirable in some cases, the current prop	ncongruous impact on street scene. It was considered to ed in the Councils Development Guidelines he application, the Inspector has allowed the appeal with osal adds to an existing extension which detracts from th ical appearance, without unbalancing the relationship

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
0/03/2020	19/01022/FUL	2019/0036	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/19/3241885
Vard				
toke				
ddress				
57 Stuart Road	Plymouth PL1 5LG			
Application De	scription			
Front hardstand	ding			
• -	~ ~ ~			
Appeal Process	Officers			
louseholder Fa	st Track Mrs Alu	meci Tuima		
ynopsis				
and South West he National Pla applicant has co	Devon Joint Local Plan and contr nning Policy Framework. Having	rary to guidance contained in reviewed the application, th ne public interest to permit a	the Councils Development Guideli e Inspector has dismissed the appe proposal that would potentially jec	was considered to be contrary to Policy DEV29 of the Plymon nes Supplementary Planning Document First Review (2013) a eal. The Inspectorate whilst being empathetic with the opardise the safety of other highway users. An application for

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
30/03/2020	19/00945/FUL	2019/0037	Appeal Split	APP/N1160/W/19/3241884
Ward				
Plympton Chadd	llewood			
Address				
2 Wain Park Plyr	nouth PL7 2HU			
Application Des	scription			
	detached Garage with storage and A n. New lean to roof to rear extensio			replace existing Garage to be converted into internal
Appeal Process	Officers Na	ame		
Written Represe	ntations Mr Dan Th	orning		
Synopsis				
environment) an Inspector dismis character and ap also noted that p planning permiss area; and that it	nd DEV28 (Trees, woodlands and he sed the appeal insofar as it relates to ppearance of the area contrary to P proposal did not adhere to the Deve sion for the lean-to extension and r	dgerows) of the Joint Loca to the front garage and an olicy DEV20 of the JLP and clopment Guidelines SPD, aised decking stating that	I Plan. Officers had no objections to nexe. The Inspector states that the I that it would result in the loss or o which seeks to resist garages in from it would be acceptable in the conte	policies DEV20 (Place shaping and the quality of the built to the proposed lean-to extension and timber decking. The e garage and annexe would have a harmful effect on the deterioration of trees contrary to Policy DEV28. The Inspector int gardens. However, the Inspector allowed and granted ext of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and a. No applications were made for costs by either side and no

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
20/05/2020	19/01369/FUL	2020/0001	Appeal Allowed with Conditions	APP/N1160/D/20/3244634
Ward				
Peverell				
Address				
6 Gifford Terra	ce Road Plymouth PL3 4JE			
Application De	scription			
Part single and	part two-storey rear extension and	d roof terrace		
Appeal Process	Officers N	lame		
Householder Fa	st Track Mr Mike	Stone		
Synopsis				
lanning permis	sion was refused for a two storey	rear extension with balcony	y on the grounds of overlooking, adverse ir	mpact on the streetscene and overbearing appearance.
his was conside	ered to be contrary to JLP Policies	DEV1 and DEV20 and guida	nce contained in the Development Guideli	nes Supplementary Planning Document First Review an
he National Pla	nning Policy Framework.The Inspe	ctor concluded that the leve	el of overlooking from the balcony would r	not be worse than from existing windows. He felt that
				nificantly harmful and mitigated by the extension being
			by either side and no costs were awarded	
			,	

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
21/05/2020	19/01468/OUT	2020/0003	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/20/3245406
Ward				
Plymstock Radfo	ord			
Address				
72 Billacombe R	oad Plymouth PL9 7EX			
Application De	scription			
Outline plannin	g permission for 2x semi-detached o	dwellings with all matters	reserved	
Appeal Process	Officers Na	ame		
Written Represe	entations Miss Amy	Thompson		
Synopsis				
	g permission was refused two semi Devon Joint Local Plan Policies DEV	-		be Road. The proposal was considered to be contrary Plymouth

Decision Date	Original Planning Applica	tion Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
26/05/2020		2020/0002	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/20/3245614
Vard				
Plymstock Radfo	ord			
Address				
and At 13 West.	field Avenue Plymouth PL9	9PE		
Application Des	scription			
Permission in p	rinciple for 2 to 3 dwellings			
Appeal Process	Off	ficers Name		
Written Represe	entations Mi	ss Amy Thompson		
Synopsis				
y nopsis				
	inciple for 2 to 3 dwellings w	vas refused at land at 13 Westfie	ld Avenue. The proposal was consid	ered to be contrary Plymouth and South West Devon Joint
Permission in pr	es DEV1, DEV10, DEV26, DE	V27, DEV28 and DEV29 of the Ply	mouth and South West Devon Joint	Local Plan and paragraphs 108, 109 110, 122, 127 and 175 of
Permission in pr Local Plan Polici The National Pla	es DEV1, DEV10, DEV26, DE nning Policy Framework 201	V27, DEV28 and DEV29 of the Ply L9.Having reviewed the applicatio	mouth and South West Devon Joint n, and visited the site, the Inspector	Local Plan and paragraphs 108, 109 110, 122, 127 and 175 of supported the Councils view that the proposed development
Permission in pr local Plan Polici he National Pla vould result in a	es DEV1, DEV10, DEV26, DE nning Policy Framework 201 an uncharacteristic cluster o	V27, DEV28 and DEV29 of the Ply L9.Having reviewed the applicatio f dwellings in closer proximity to	mouth and South West Devon Joint n, and visited the site, the Inspector each other than most in the area ar	Local Plan and paragraphs 108, 109 110, 122, 127 and 175 of supported the Councils view that the proposed development d due to their proximity and overhanging canopies, there
Permission in pr ocal Plan Polici he National Pla would result in a would be pressu	es DEV1, DEV10, DEV26, DE nning Policy Framework 201 an uncharacteristic cluster o ire to cut back or even remo	V27, DEV28 and DEV29 of the Ply L9.Having reviewed the applicatio f dwellings in closer proximity to ove trees with high amenity value	mouth and South West Devon Joint n, and visited the site, the Inspector each other than most in the area ar . The Inspector however did not sup	Local Plan and paragraphs 108, 109 110, 122, 127 and 175 of supported the Councils view that the proposed development d due to their proximity and overhanging canopies, there port the councils view that the development would have a
Permission in pr Local Plan Policion the National Plan would result in a would be pressun narmful impact	es DEV1, DEV10, DEV26, DE nning Policy Framework 201 an uncharacteristic cluster o ire to cut back or even remo on the living conditions of n	V27, DEV28 and DEV29 of the Ply L9.Having reviewed the applicatio f dwellings in closer proximity to ove trees with high amenity value earby neighbours or would lead t	mouth and South West Devon Joint n, and visited the site, the Inspector each other than most in the area ar . The Inspector however did not sup	Local Plan and paragraphs 108, 109 110, 122, 127 and 175 of supported the Councils view that the proposed development d due to their proximity and overhanging canopies, there

Decision Date	<b>Original Planning Application</b>	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
03/06/2020	19/01530/FUL	2019/0039	Appeal Allowed with Conditions	APP/N1160/W/19/3243502
Ward				
St Peters & the \	Waterfront			
Address				
L Bath Place Plyr	mouth PL1 3NH			
Application Des	scription			
	ormer motorcycle repair workshop ssion of 18/01472/FUL)	to 4x 1-bed flats (Class C3)	), 1x commercial unit (Class A1/A2) on the	e ground floor and an additional storey to form a third
Appeal Process	Officers Na	ame		
Written Represe	entations Miss Amy	Thompson		
Synopsis				
and an additiona DEV10, Paragrap National Plannin would result in s adequate living e inhibiting windo	al storey to form a third floor at 1 Ba oh 2.2.23, 2.2.31, 2.2.24, 2.8.15 and g Policy Framework 2019.Having re substandard accommodation due to environment for future occupiers do ws and its location in a built up env	ath Place. The proposal was d 2.8.23 of the retained De viewed the application, and the close relationship wit ue to poor levels of outloo ironment the development	as considered to be contrary Plymouth an evelopment Guidelines Supplementary Pla nd visited the site, the Inspector did not su th the existing neighbouring properties an ok and light. The Inspector considered that nt would not result in an unacceptable livin	), 1x commercial unit (Class A1/A2) on the ground floor d South West Devon Joint Local Plan Policies DEV1 and anning Document and paragraph 117 and 127 of the upport the Councils view that the proposed developmen d restricted outlook and would fail to provide an t due to the dual aspect of the flat, the use of vision ng environment for the occupiers. The appeal was ither side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.