

# Planning Appeal Decisions between 12/07/2022 and 05/09/2022

Date of Decision	15/07/2022
Ward	Eggbuckland
Application Number	21/01966/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	14 Allerton Walk Plymouth PL6 5RZ
Proposal	Raised decking area and timber fence above existing garage
Appeal Process	Householder Fast Track
Officers Name	Mr Macauley Potter
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>Planning permission was refused for proposed raised decking and associated timber fence as it was considered to have an adverse impact on the street scene character. This was considered to be contrary to JLP policy: DEV20, guidance contained within the JLP Supplementary Planning Document and Section 12 of the NPPF. The inspector agreed with the decision, noting that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and that there are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>

# Planning Appeal Decisions between 12/07/2022 and 05/09/2022

Date of Decision	27/07/2022
Ward	Honicknowle
Application Number	21/01000/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	4 Lakeside Drive Plymouth PL5 2QH
Proposal	Vehicle hardstand.
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Mr Macauley Potter
Synopsis of Appeals	Planning permission was refused for a vehicle hardstand due to the lack of on-site turning provision. The property is on a classified road. This was considered to be contrary to JLP policies: DEV1, DEV20 and DEV29, guidance contained within the JLP Supplementary Planning Document and Section 9 of the NPPF. The inspector agreed with the decision, noting that the proposal conflicts with the development plan and that there are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.

# Planning Appeal Decisions between 12/07/2022 and 05/09/2022

Date of Decision	28/07/2022
Ward	Budshead
Application Number	22/00090/FUL
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	85 Dunraven Drive Plymouth PL6 6AT
Proposal	1no. front box dormer and replacement of rear flat roof covering
Appeal Process	Householder Fast Track
Officers Name	Mr Macauley Potter
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>Planning permission was refused for a proposed front dormer as it was considered to have an adverse impact on the street scene character. This was considered to be contrary to JLP policy: DEV20, guidance contained within the JLP Supplementary Planning Document and Section 12 of the NPPF. The inspector agreed with the decision, noting that the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and that there are no other considerations which outweigh this conflict. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>

# Planning Appeal Decisions between 12/07/2022 and 05/09/2022

Date of Decision	04/08/2022
Ward	Plymstock Radford
Application Number	21/01811/S73
Decision	Appeal Dismissed
Address of Site	St Annes House Jennycliff Lane Plymouth PL9 9SN
Proposal	Removal of Conditions 4 (restrictions on the use), 6 (no more than 30 people) & 7 (no more than 28 weddings per year) and variation of condition 8 (management plan) of application 20/00418/FUL
Appeal Process	Written Representations
Officers Name	Miss Amy Thompson
Synopsis of Appeals	<p>A section 73 application was refused at St Annes House that sought to remove Conditions 4 (restrictions on the use), 6 (no more than 30 people) &amp; 7 (no more than 28 weddings per year) and variation of condition 8 (management plan) of application 20/00418/FUL. The proposal was considered to be contrary Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan Policies DEV1, DEV2 and DEV29, the Supplementary Planning Document 2020 and the NPPF. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the proposed removal and variation of the conditions would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regards to noise and disturbance. They also supported the Councils view that the proposal would have a detrimental effect upon the safety and free flow of traffic along Jennycliff Lane. The Inspector considered the conditions to be reasonable and necessary in their present form. The appeal was dismissed. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>