

Planning Committee

Appeal Decisions

The following decisions have been made by the Planning Inspectorate on appeals arising from decisions of the City

Application Number **08/01645/FUL**
Appeal Site **89 FLETEMOOR ROAD ST BUDEAUX PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Two-storey rear extension and front porch
Case Officer Thomas Westrope

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Split
Appeal Decision Date 17/11/2009
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector upheld this appeal in part by issuing a split decision for the two-storey rear extension (dismissed) and the porch (allowed). The Local Planning Authority (LPA) raised no objection to the porch; however, it is not possible for this type of decision to be issued by the LPA. The inspector did not agree that the proposal would impact the neighbours daylight or sunlight due to the orientation of the properties, although, using the 45 degree guidance, he reasoned that the proposal would have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property.

Application Number **08/01703/OUT**
Appeal Site **ODOORN LODGE RIVERFORD, ESTOVER CLOSE PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Outline application to develop part of garden by erection of detached dwelling
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 11/11/2009
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

Inspector agreed that the proposed development would result in the loss of visually important greenscape area. She also agreed that the site is unsustainable, being far from jobs, services, and bus routes. The site is accessed along a steeply sloping unlit private single track road where there are no footways or passing places, which would discourage walking and encourage car usage.

Application Number **08/02175/FUL**
Appeal Site **86 MILEHOUSE ROAD STOKE PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Develop part of rear garden by erection of a two-storey dwellinghouse
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category REF
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 11/11/2009
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

Inspector felt that the impact on the amenities of 86 Milehouse Road would be limited. However, she felt that the proposal would add to the problem of parking congestion, as it is proposed that occupiers of the proposed dwelling would utilise one of the spaces in the double garage that was granted planning permission for the occupiers of 86 Milehouse Road (see planning application 08/01457/FUL), thus removing a parking space for the use of occupiers of number 86.

Application Number **09/00103/FUL**
Appeal Site **33A SYDNEY STREET PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Change of use, conversion and extension of workshop/store building to form two-storey dwelling
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 03/11/2009
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector agreed with the issues raised by the LPA. The proposed development would affect the amenities of adjoining occupiers, and would provide a substandard form of accommodation for future occupiers.

Application Number **09/00301/FUL**
Appeal Site **GROUND FLOOR 60 MUTLEY PLAIN MUTLEY PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Continuation of use of premises as a solarium and retail unit
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category NOT
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 04/11/2009
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector commented that the vending machine and products available for purchase are clearly related to the main use of the premises as a solarium and directed at its users. The retail activity at the premises is clearly subordinate to the solarium use. He concluded that the solarium use harms the retail function of the Mutley Plain District Centre. The costs award against the LPA was refused, as the inspector felt that the LPA had not behaved unreasonably in refusing to have a meeting with the appellant, as the issue on the case was clear from the previous refusal and previously dismissed appeal, and the appellant would therefore not have learned anything new from a meeting.