# **Planning Committee**

## **Appeal Decisions**

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

Application Number 11/00338/FUL

Appeal Site 114 - 116 RIDGEWAY PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Change of use of first and second floors of building from offices to four, two-bedroomed self-

contained flats, new front access door, and associated rear amenity space (ground floor offices

to be retained)

Case Officer Jon Fox

**Appeal Category** 

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 07/09/2011

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

#### Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector agreed with the Council that the lack of parking in a location peripheral to the city centre and near a road junction would be harmful to highway safety and therefore in conflict with CS28 and CS34.

Application Number 12/00024/FUL

Appeal Site LAND ADJACENT TO 857 WOLSELEY ROAD PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Construction of house and parking bay

Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 17/04/2013

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

### Appeal Synopsis

The planning application for the house was refused because it was considered to harm the character and appearance of the waterfront, have an adverse impact on wildlife, trees and the Special Area of Conservation and put undue pressure on the Council for the felling of protected trees. The inspector considered that the proposal would harm the identity and context of the waterfront and so dismissed the appeal. He did not consider that the site had particular wildlife value and decided the LPA's concern about the future loss of trees was speculative.

Application Number 12/02031/FUL

Appeal Site 3A CLOVELLY VIEW PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Removal of existing first floor balcony on rear elevation and replacing with a larger balcony;

removal of existing rear boundary to create parking space; removal of garage doors on front elevation to be replaced with patio doors and raised decking. Addition of balcony to rear

Case Officer Jess Maslen

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 22/05/2013

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector supported the LPA's opinion that the proposed removal of the rear boundary wall to provide more off-street parking to the property would provide a further impediment to the safe movement of pedestrians and other road users around this already narrow street layout. Although cars do sometimes park on the footway beside this wall, its removal through approval would formalise the arrangement and would fail to ensure public safety through supporting safe and convenient pedestrian and road traffic movement. Thus the proposed development would cause significant harm in relation to highway safety. The Inspector however did not consider that the loss of the wall would have an impact on the character and appearance

#### 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.