



Application Number **09/01631/FUL**  
Appeal Site **4 NEWNHAM ROAD PLYMPTON PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Continue use of front of site to display cars for sale  
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 13/01/2011  
Conditions  
Award of Costs

Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector considered that the existing accesses could be safely used, and that there would not be inappropriate parking on the roadside, which is clearly controlled with double yellow lines. The adjacent free public car park could provide customer parking, and traffic movements are unlikely to exceed that which could be associated with the authorised use of the site as a café.

Application Number **10/00306/FUL**  
Appeal Site **6 PATNA PLACE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Change of use and conversion of premises from offices to two flats, including demolition of rear out-building and erection of external rear stairway.  
Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 24/01/2011  
Conditions  
Award of Costs

Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The inspector did not agree with the LPA that the provision of the rear external staircase would harm neighbours amenity, be visually unacceptable or restrict amenity area to an unacceptable degree.

Application Number **10/00588/FUL**  
Appeal Site **90 EMBANKMENT ROAD PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Part perforated roller shutter to replace existing solid roller shutter  
Case Officer Louis Dulling

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 01/11/2010  
Conditions  
Award of Costs

Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The inspector attached considerable weight to the Development Guidelines SPD which provides detailed guidance on this matter. The inspector concluded that the development was clearly contrary to advice in the SPD and detracted considerably from the street frontage and set an undesirable precedent. It was noted that there were other similar developments along the street however these were older and would have been installed prior to the adoption of the SPD and therefore did not set a precedent.

Application Number **10/00715/FUL**  
Appeal Site **3 HILLSIDE AVENUE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Change of use to house in multiple occupation (8 bedrooms)  
Case Officer Jon Fox

Appeal Category REF  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 24/01/2011  
Conditions  
Award of Costs

Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

In this case the application had been recommended for approval by officers and was refused by the planning committee. The Inspector concluded that occupation by 8 persons (as opposed to the 6 using the property in the past) would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers or have any significant effect on the parking situation. With regard to the character of the area, the Inspector recognised that the area has a relatively high concentration of student properties and that the proposals would not result in the loss of a family dwelling and he concluded that the increase from 6 to 8 occupiers in this HMO would have no significant effect on the character of the surrounding area. The Inspector restricts the use of the property to 8 persons, but considered that the use need not be restricted to students only because its location is close to the railway station and city centre as well as the university and is also in a parking permit scheme area. The accommodation is also considered to be appropriate for other single persons.

Application Number **10/00745/LBC**  
Appeal Site **27 WYNDHAM SQUARE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Two single-storey rear extensions with covered roof terrace and external staircase (removal of existing rear extensions and first-floor conservatory), rear dormer and two rooflights (removal of existing rear dormer), formation of vehicle hardstanding in rear garden, including part demolition of rear boundary wall and installation of gates and other internal and external alterations

Case Officer

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type  
Appeal Decision Dismissed  
Appeal Decision Date 05/01/2011  
Conditions  
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector dismissed the appeal, noting that whilst he agreed that the reduction of the southwest extension and the open veranda would be a distinct improvement, the enlargement of the southeast extension and the associated replacement of the steps would undermine the significance of no.27 Wyndham Square as a valuable heritage asset. The Inspector concluded that these particular parts of the proposed works would conflict with the aims of the LDF Core Strategy policies CS02 and CS03 and they would not preserve the house as a building of special architectural and historic interest.

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 **10/01326/FUL**  
Appeal Site **4 FIRST AVENUE BILLACOMBE PLYMOUTH**  
Appeal Proposal Single storey rear extension, formation of rooms in roofspace of extended dwelling, with rear first floor window and side rooflights, and change of front hip to gable, and rear external decking area (revised version of 10/00261/FUL)  
Case Officer Stuart Anderson

Appeal Category  
Appeal Type Written Representations  
Appeal Decision Allowed  
Appeal Decision Date 12/01/2011  
Conditions  
Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

Inspector agreed that the gable roof is clearly different to the consistent design of the fully hipped short row of old bungalows that straddle the appeal property. However, when carefully viewed in the wider context of First Avenue as a whole, he did not find the gable design to be unacceptable. He did not consider the roof to be excessively high or bulky, or to be out of keeping. Also, he noted that the gable roof does not extend beyond the building line of the front elevation, the bay window design is retained in the front elevation, and there is a significant variety of building styles and roof designs in the street where alterations have probably been made to original roof designs, there being a strong echo between the subject roof and some other houses such as number 12. He also considered that the fully hipped roof severely limits internal space and scope for alteration.

#### Note:

Copies of the full decision letters are available to Members in the Ark Royal Room and Plymouth Rooms. Copies are also available to the press and public at the First Stop Reception.