

Planning Committee

Appeal Decisions

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

Application Number **11/01938/FUL**
Appeal Site **65 EXETER STREET PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Change of use from A1 to A5, erection of new shop front and installation of extraction equipment and air compressors
Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 29/11/2012

Conditions
Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector considered that the combination of the central location and the fact that majority of orders would be delivered would not result in severe highway safety or parking problems.

Application Number **12/00568/FUL**
Appeal Site **PARKVIEW HOUSE, TRELAWNEY LANE PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Change of use and conversion of office building to form three residential units, and erection of four semi-detached dwellings on existing car parking area
Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Informal Hearing
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 05/12/2012

Conditions
Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The application was refused due to the poor design, harm to neighbours amenity, loss of employment land and lack of conclusion regarding the mitigation of the impacts of development. The impact on the neighbouring houses was the only issue that the inspector agreed with and the appeal was dismissed on the grounds that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on outlook. Costs were awarded against the council in respect of the loss of employment land and the lack of completion of the Section 106. agreement.

Application Number **12/00612/FUL**
Appeal Site **129 EMBANKMENT ROAD PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Increase height of existing rear extension and provide balcony on resultant flat roof
Case Officer Mike Stone

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 12/12/2012
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector agreed with the LPA's view that the proposed rear balcony would harm the character and appearance of the area and the subject property. He also agreed that the proposed development would harm neighbours' living conditions by reason of a loss of privacy and increase in overlooking. In reaching his decision the inspector said that he had given full weight to Policy CS34 and to paragraph 214 of the NPPF. He said that he had attached considerable weight to the Development Guidelines SPD.

Application Number **12/00871/FUL**
Appeal Site **34 ENDSLEIGH ROAD PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal First floor balcony to south gable
Case Officer Mike Stone

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 13/12/2012
Conditions
Award of Costs

Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector felt that, because of the lack of side widows at the neighbouring property and their large rear garden the impact of the balcony would be confined to a relatively small area. The proposed balcony would have a relatively lightweight structure and the deck would be at the neighbour's eaves height and forward of their rear elevation. On balance he felt that the proposed balcony would not appear so imposing and overbearing as to cause a harmful loss of outlook from the neighbours rear garden.

Application Number **12/01082/FUL**
Appeal Site **22 ST JOHNS DRIVE PLYMOUTH**
Appeal Proposal Roof alterations including hip to gable extension and rear dormer
Case Officer Adam Williams

Appeal Category
Appeal Type Written Representations
Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 13/12/2012

Conditions
Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The inspector supported the case officer's view that the proposed hip to gable conversion would be unacceptable in terms of massing and bulk and would unbalance the pair of semis. He also agreed that the enlarged roof would be unacceptable in terms of its visual impact and the presence of other houses in the street that have been enlarged this way should not be seen as setting a precedent.

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.