

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	07/02/2022
Ward	St Budeaux
Application Number	20/01079/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	Land To The West Of 857 Wolseley Road Plymouth PL5 1JR
Proposal	New dwelling
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Mr Simon Osborne
Synopsis of Appeals	The inspector agreed that the landscape and visual impacts of the dwelling and associated loss of trees would have an adverse impact on the character of the area and conflict with policies DEV23, DEV27, and DEV28.

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	11/02/2022
Ward	Plymstock Radford
Application Number	20/01442/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	St Annes House Jennycliff Lane Plymouth PL9 9SN
Proposal	Continue use of part of site as cafe including erection of marquees to cover seating area and mobile kitchen unit and use of part for mobile toilet unit and additional parking area. Formation of additional parking area for cafe and overall development scheme.
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Mrs Karen Gallacher
Synopsis of Appeals	The inspector agreed that the marquee would harm the appearance and character of the area and was contrary to policies DEV23 (Landscape Character), DEV24 (Undeveloped and Heritage Coast) and DEV27 (Green and Play Space). They also agreed that the marquee would be contrary to policy DEV21 (Historic Environment) because its siting, size and appearance would detract from the setting of the listed building. The inspector did not agree that the use of the proposed car park would conflict with policies DEV1 (Health and Amenity) and DEV2 (Air, Water, Noise, Land and Light) and harm neighbours amenity. They also did not agree that the level of parking was unacceptable and would conflict with DEV29 (Transport).

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	11/02/2022
Ward	Plymstock Radford
Application Number	20/01454/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	St Annes House Jennycliff Lane Plymouth PL9 9SN
Proposal	Retention of marquee over swimming pool and erection of covered walkway to link to main house. Installation of Male and Female WCs in bar/ servery and storage building. Additional parking area for users.
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Mrs Karen Gallacher
Synopsis of Appeals	The inspector agreed that the marquee conflicted with policies DEV23 (Landscape Character), DEV24 (Undeveloped and Heritage Coast) and DEV27 (Green and Play Spaces) because it would contrast awkwardly with the local landscape and visual amenity of the area. They also agreed that the marquee would be contrary to policy DEV21 (Historic Environment) because it would be obtrusive and detract from the architectural qualities of the listed building, in a way that was not outweighed by public benefit.

Date of Decision	11/02/2022
Ward	Plymstock Radford
Application Number	20/01455/LBC
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	St Annes House Jennycliff Lane Plymouth PL9 9SN
Proposal	Retention of marquee over swimming pool and erection of covered walkway to link to main house. Installation of Male and Female WCs in bar/ servery and storage building. Additional parking area for users.
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Mrs Karen Gallacher
Synopsis of Appeals	The inspector agreed that proposal was contrary to policy DEV21 (Historic Environment) and would contrast awkwardly with the distinctive qualities and traditional appearance of St. Annes House and fail to preserve its setting.

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	16/02/2022
Ward	Plympton St Mary
Application Number	21/01030/FUL
Decision	Appeal Allowed with Conditions
Address of Site	1 Mallard Close Plymouth PL7 2LF
Proposal	Retrospective outbuilding.
Appeal Process	Householder Fast Track
Officers Name	Mr Macauley Potter
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>The Inspector did not agree that the retrospective outbuilding resulted in a poor and incongruous design which adversely affected the existing character of the street scene. Contrary to the Council's assessment, the Inspector concluded that the building's appearance and position to the side of 1 Mallard Close, would not be in conflict with the objectives of Policy DEV20 of the Joint Local Plan, or Policy PSM1 of the Plympton St Mary Neighbourhood Plan, nor the associated supplementary planning guidance. The appeal was therefore allowed subject to two recommended conditions relating to ancillary use (residential) and the completion of the material finish (prior to first use).</p>

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	16/02/2022
Ward	Stoke
Application Number	21/01556/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	65 Melville Terrace Lane Plymouth PL2 3DB
Proposal	First floor front extension
Appeal Process	Householder Fast Track
Officers Name	Mr Sam Lewis
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>Planning permission was refused for a first floor front extension as it was considered to be contrary to JLP policy DEV20. This was due to concerns relating to the design of the extension, which was considered to be an incongruous and dominant addition to the front of property. Following an appeal made by the applicant, the Inspector agreed with Officers that the proposal would not accord with DEV20 due to the fact that the extension would dominate the streetscene and be a bulky addition to the front of the property.No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>

Planning Appeal Decisions between 01/02/2022 and 07/03/2022

Date of Decision	28/02/2022
Ward	Plympton St Mary
Application Number	21/01416/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	102 Lucas Lane Plymouth PL7 4EY
Proposal	Single storey detached annex (re-submission of 21/00129/FUL)
Appeal Process	Householder Fast Track
Officers Name	Mr Jon Fox
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>The Inspector did not have a problem with the detached nature of the building, as such, but agreed that the size, scale and position of the proposed building, in relation to the plot size, would not function as a subordinate annexe to the existing dwelling, despite having the shared parking and garden characteristics of an annexe. The size of the building would the Inspector agreed be contrived and squeezed in, and therefore out of character. Parking for a two bedroom annexe would also be inadequate. Therefore the Inspector supported policies DEV10, DEV20 and DEV29.</p>