Appeal Decisions between 01/03/2021 and 25/03/2021

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
17/03/2021	20/00777/FUL	2020/0025	Appeal Allowed with Conditions	APP/N1160/D/20/3264862
Ward				
St Budeaux				
Address				
10 Admiralty Ro	ad St Budeaux Plymouth PL5 1NJ			
Application De	scription			
Creation of first	floor balcony over flat roof			
Appeal Process	Officers N	ame		
Householder Fa	st Track Miss Josep	hine Maddick		
Synopsis				
				ad. The proposal was considered to be contrary Plymout
				Planning Document (SPD)2020 and the National Plannir
				Is view that the proposal presented as intrusiven creating
		_		sing their garden space nearby. The Inspector considered
	-			n the basis of its limited scale and its position, set in from
				sive feature. Its effect on adjoining occupiers levels of
				direct views from the proposed balcony over the site's
-	towards the estuary and countrysic	le to the north. The appea	l was upheld. No applications were made	e for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by
the Inspector.				
l				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number			
8/03/2021	20/01052/FUL	2020/0024	Appeal Allowed	APP/N1160/D/20/3264476			
Vard							
Plymstock Dunst	cone						
Address							
89 Reservoir Roa	ad Plymstock Plymouth PL9 8ND						
Application Des	cription						
Single storey fro	ont extension and window alteration	ons					
Appeal Process	Officers N	Officers Name					
Householder Fas	t Track Ms Abbey	Ms Abbey Edwards					
ynopsis							
	refused on design grounds, specifi	cally the visual impact the p	proposed porch extension would ha	ve on the appearance of the pair of semis and the character			
Application was				ve on the appearance of the pair of semis and the character 0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo			
Application was and appearance	of the surrounding area. The prop	osal was found to be non co	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2				
Application was and appearance SPD (2020) and t	of the surrounding area. The prop the NPPF. The Planning Inspectora	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visua	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo			
Application was and appearance SPD (2020) and t proposal would	of the surrounding area. The prop he NPPF. The Planning Inspectora not read as an incongruous additio	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties n and would not harm the	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visual character and appearance of the su	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo symmetry and are not particularly uniform. As such, the rrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with			
and appearance SPD (2020) and t proposal would Policy DEV20 of	of the surrounding area. The prop he NPPF. The Planning Inspectora not read as an incongruous additio	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties n and would not harm the It is acknowledged that the	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visual character and appearance of the su proposal does not strictly adhere	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo symmetry and are not particularly uniform. As such, the			
Application was and appearance SPD (2020) and t proposal would Policy DEV20 of	of the surrounding area. The prop the NPPF. The Planning Inspectora not read as an incongruous additio the Joint Local Plan and the NPPF.	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties n and would not harm the It is acknowledged that the	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visual character and appearance of the su proposal does not strictly adhere	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo symmetry and are not particularly uniform. As such, the rrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with			
Application was and appearance SPD (2020) and t proposal would Policy DEV20 of	of the surrounding area. The prop the NPPF. The Planning Inspectora not read as an incongruous additio the Joint Local Plan and the NPPF.	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties n and would not harm the It is acknowledged that the	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visual character and appearance of the su proposal does not strictly adhere	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Devo symmetry and are not particularly uniform. As such, the rrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with			
Application was and appearance SPD (2020) and t proposal would Policy DEV20 of	of the surrounding area. The prop the NPPF. The Planning Inspectora not read as an incongruous additio the Joint Local Plan and the NPPF.	osal was found to be non co te considers the properties n and would not harm the It is acknowledged that the	ompliant with Policies DEV10, DEV2 in this location are limited in visual character and appearance of the su proposal does not strictly adhere	0, the guidance contained within the Plymouth and SW Deve symmetry and are not particularly uniform. As such, the rrounding area. The proposal is considered to accord with			