

# Planning Committee

## Appeal Decisions

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

Application Number **08/01958/FUL**  
Appeal Site **88 ASHFORD CRESCENT MANNAMEAD PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Single-storey extension at lower ground floor level, for use as part of granny annex proposed by conversion of existing private motor garage and store  
Case Officer Kirsty Barrett

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 01/10/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector considered the development would be significantly greater in width and of different character to the existing principle elevation and therefore would be a prominent and obtrusive feature that would significantly disturb the regular rhythm of the streetscene, and would not accord with CS34. Inspector also ruled that the development would lead to increased on-street parking which would place additional pressure on the already congested conditions and therefore development would also be contrary to CS28 and SPG1.

Application Number **08/01984/LBC**  
Appeal Site **13 ALFRED STREET HOE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Replacement of 4 timber sash windows with UPVC sash windows  
Case Officer Kirsty Barrett

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 10/12/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector agrees with reasoning of PPG15 C.49 and with regard to UPVC being thicker in profile than timber and would therefore be more visible. Inspector ruled that the timber windows would not respect the historic fabric and detailing of the Listed Building and therefore concluded that the proposal would not preserve special architectural details and the historical interest and therefore contrary to policies CS02, CS03, CS34 and PPG15

Application Number **08/02167/FUL**  
Appeal Site **47 ALMA ROAD PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Change of use and conversion of garage/gymnasium to one bedroom residential unit with integral garage and erection of detached two storey dwelling house and detached private motor  
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 30/11/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector considered that although it would be a small unit of accommodation, the proposed one bedroom unit would be adequate for a single person. The proposed two storey dwelling would also offer an adequate standard of amenity, subject to the removal of permitted development rights. He considered that the privacy of surrounding properties would not be affected. Also, the loss of the existing car parking spaces along the lane, which were originally provided to serve the children's nursery in the adjoining villa to the north, was no longer an issue on the case as the nursery now has an extensive car parking area within its own curtilage. He imposed a number of conditions, mainly relating to car parking and removal of permitted development rights.

Application Number **08/02265/FUL**  
Appeal Site **300 RINGMORE WAY WEST PARK PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Retention of extended rear balcony area with raising of part of rear garden level and boundary  
Case Officer Kirsty Barrett

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 17/11/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector allowed for increase in decking area subject to a condition that a screen to the boundary be erected no more than 1.8 metres. Inspector concluded that the proposed screen to the boundary of the decking area would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or outlook and therefore would not conflict with Policy CS34 or SPG guidance note 2.

Application Number **09/00034/OUT**  
Appeal Site **WOODLANDS, RIDGE ROAD PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Outline application to develop part of garden by erection of a dwelling.  
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 27/11/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector agreed that a new dwelling on this site would not be sustainably located in relation to public transport, employment opportunities and other services. Inspector concluded that the creation of a new residential unit in this location would not result in a sustainable pattern of development and would be in conflict with policies CS01, CS16 and CS28, Strategic Objective 3 and PPS7.

Application Number **09/00138/FUL**  
Appeal Site **STORE REAR OF 190 ALBERT ROAD DEVONPORT PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Change of use and conversion of store building to form two self-contained flats  
Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 17/12/2009  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The main issue was whether the proposed flats would be acceptable without any parking in a location that is heavily parked. The inspector considered that the development was likely to be inhabited by people without vehicles and was in a sustainable location and was therefore acceptable without parking.

Application Number **09/00835/FUL**  
Appeal Site **HELLENSLEIGH, COBB LANE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Conversion of detached private motor garage to annex  
Case Officer Simon Osborne

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 24/11/2009

Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The inspector considered that the use of the proposed annex as a separate dwelling unit could be prevented by the imposition of an appropriate condition and therefore felt the proposal would not lead to unacceptable loss of privacy to existing and future occupiers. The inspector did not feel the proposal would harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area.