

# Appeal Decisions between 03/11/2020 and 30/11/2020

<b>Date of Decision</b>	03/11/2020
<b>Ward</b>	Plymstock Radford
<b>Application Number</b>	19/01144/FUL
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
<b>Address of Site</b>	St Annes House Jennycliff Lane Plymouth PL9 9SN
<b>Proposal</b>	Use as wedding venue and holiday accommodation, including marquee, portable toilets and ancillary owners accommodation.
<b>Appeal Process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Officers Name</b>	Mrs Karen Gallacher
<b>Synopsis of Appeals</b>	<p>The application was refused on four grounds, inadequate parking, likely noise impacts, impact on landscape character and the effect on the listed building. The Inspector did not support the parking refusal reason and noted that in addition to the parking on site there was likely to be availability at Jennycliff carpark, and despite the lack of footway, walking to the application site would not be dangerous. The inspector considered there was no conflict with Policy DEV29. However, the inspector supported the other three grounds of refusal and considered that the marquee and portable toilets would diminish the green and open qualities of this prominent coastal site, result in less than substantial harm to the setting of St Annes House and cause unacceptable noise disturbance during the evening to adjacent residential properties. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policies DEV1, DEV2, DEV21, DEV23, DEV24 and DEV27 of the Plymouth and South West Devon JLP. No application for costs was made by either side and none were awarded by the Inspector</p>

# Appeal Decisions between 03/11/2020 and 30/11/2020

<b>Date of Decision</b>	19/11/2020
<b>Ward</b>	Budshead
<b>Application Number</b>	20/00048/FUL
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Appeal Allowed with Conditions</b>
<b>Address of Site</b>	130 Tavistock Road Plymouth PL6 5EJ
<b>Proposal</b>	Erection of garage and store (part retrospective)
<b>Appeal Process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Officers Name</b>	Mr Chris Cummings
<b>Synopsis of Appeals</b>	<p>Planning permission was refused for a part-retrospective garage/store as it was considered to generate a dominant and overbearing presence contrary to Policies DEV1 and DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, guidance set out in the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application and visited the site, the Inspector agreed that the proposal would create a dominant and overbearing presence and would be detrimental to the living conditions of 128 Tavistock Road. However, the Inspector took into account a previous approval at the site for an asymmetrical roof and considered that in comparison there would be only marginal in visual impacts and outlook to the neighbouring property. The Inspector also noted that the appealed scheme offered a single roof design and was more visually attractive than the previous approval design. For these reasons the Inspector considered the appeal scheme offered substantive positive benefits over the previously approved scheme and allowed the appeal. No application for costs was made by either side and none were awarded by the Inspector.</p>

# Appeal Decisions between 03/11/2020 and 30/11/2020

<b>Date of Decision</b>	30/11/2020
<b>Ward</b>	St Budeaux
<b>Application Number</b>	20/00323/FUL
<b>Decision</b>	<b>Appeal Dismissed</b>
<b>Address of Site</b>	696 Wolseley Road Plymouth PL5 1JL
<b>Proposal</b>	Link attached garage and balcony.
<b>Appeal Process</b>	Written Representations
<b>Officers Name</b>	Mr Macauley Potter
<b>Synopsis of Appeals</b>	<p>Planning permission was refused for the construction of a link attached garage and balcony. The garage (in isolation) was considered to be contrary to Policy DEV29 (Transport Considerations) of the 2019 Plymouth &amp; South West Devon Joint Local Plan, the Plymouth and South West Devon Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2020) and paragraph 109 of the NPPF (2019). Policies DEV1 and DEV20 were also referenced in the reason for refusal however the Inspector did not agree that these policies had been breached by the proposal. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector agreed with the Council as it was considered that the proposal would have an acceptably harmful effect on highway safety. The appeal was therefore dismissed. An application for costs was made by the applicant but was refused by the Inspector.</p>