

# Planning Committee

## Appeal Decisions

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

Application Number **09/01646/FUL**  
Appeal Site **COPPER BEECHES, 90-92 PLYMSTOCK ROAD PLYMSTOCK PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Extension to existing care home to provide additional en-suite bedrooms, extension to existing dayroom and formation of new laundry and staff room below existing single-storey bedroom wing  
Case Officer Jon Fox

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 21/10/2010  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

### Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector concluded that the proposals would not result in tangible harm to residential amenity to set against the clear need for additional care home spaces in the city so the proposal meets policy CS34 of the Core strategy

Application Number **10/00854/FUL**  
Appeal Site **21 CHADDLEWOOD CLOSE PLYMPTON PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Private motor garage in rear garden, with driveway and with access through existing car port / garage  
Case Officer Kate Saunders

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 01/11/2010  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

### Appeal Synopsis

The inspector concluded that given that the proposal would not cause undue harm on neighbouring properties, was not readily visible from a public viewpoint and the fallback position under permitted development it would not be harmful to the character of the area. The inspector considered that the use of the garage could be controlled through appropriate conditions and therefore allowed the appeal.

Application Number **10/00946/ADV**  
Appeal Site **3 DEVONPORT ROAD PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Illuminated fascia and projecting signs (Approved). Non-illuminated hoarding sign on side wall (Refused)  
Case Officer Olivia Wilson

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 06/12/2010  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The inspector agreed that the sign is large and obtrusive and seriously detracts from the street scene and the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. He also found that the site was sensitive, being a gateway to the Stoke local centre. He took account of Policy CS34 and the Development Guidelines SPD as material considerations and paid special attention to paragraph 23 of PPG19 which refers to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Application Number **10/01238/FUL**  
Appeal Site **23 HEDINGHAM CLOSE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Two-storey side extension incorporating front dormer  
Case Officer Kate Saunders

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 07/12/2010  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The majority of the inspectors report did not relate to the main issue in question the dormer. The inspector noted that a number of dormers are visible in the area although these are on the rear elevation of properties, dormers have become part of the character of the area. The inspector concluded that because of the unusual form of the subject property advice in SPD1 could not be applied in the normal manner and the appeal was therefore allowed.