Planning Committee

Appeal Decisions

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

Application Number 13/01198/FUL

Appeal Site NORBURY COURT, 10 CRAIGIE DRIVE PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Installation of photovoltaic panels on the colonnade in front of Norbury Court

Case Officer Olivia Wilson

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 11/09/2014

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The main consideration was whether the benefits of renewable energy production would outweigh any harm to the Grade II* listed buildings. The relevant policies are CS03, CS20, and government guidance on on renewable and low carbon energy. He concluded that the scheme would help to educe the energy costs associated with the operation of the building which would in turn help secure the building's viability for office use and contribute to the long term conservation of Norbury Court. It would also assist in meeting national targets for renewable energy. His view was that the solar panels would not be unduly prominent and would not involve any harmful loss or disturbance to any important historic fabric. The works would be temporary and reversible. In this instance, the harmful impact would be very minor and limited to a 25 year period. The benefits therefore outweigh the limited harm.

Application Number 13/01201/LBC

Appeal Site NORBURY COURT.10 CRAIGIE DRIVE PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Installation of photo voltaic panels on the colonnade in front of Norbury Court

Case Officer Olivia Wilson

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 11/09/2014

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The main consideration was whether the benefits of renewable energy production would outweigh any harm to the Grade II* listed buildings. The relevant policies are CS03, CS20, and government guidance on on renewable and low carbon energy. He concluded that the scheme would help to educe the energy costs associated with the operation of the building which would in turn help secure the building's viability for office use and contribute to the long term conservation of Norbury Court. It would also assist in meeting national targets for renewable energy. His view was that the solar panels would not be unduly prominent and would not involve any harmful loss or disturbance to any important historic fabric. The works would be temporary and reversible. In this instance, the harmful impact would be very minor and limited to a 25 year period. The benefits therefore outweigh the limited harm.

Application Number 13/02214/FUL

Appeal Site LAND AT THIRLMERE GARDENS PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Construction of 14 dwellings with access from Thirlmere Gardens and associated parking and landscaping

Case Officer Olivia Wilson

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 16/02/2015

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The main consideration was whether the scheme's effects on 1) the character, appearance and identity of the neighbourhood, 2) protected species and 3) protected trees outweigh—the presumption is favour of granting planning permission for new dwellings as set out in NPPF para 14. The Inspector did not consider that Policy CS18 was applicable as the site did not appear to be identified in a development plan document as a greenscape area. However, he agreed that the site retains an informal woodland appearance provides a visual

break between the lower and upper parts of Thirlmere Gardens. The introduction of development on the site would materially harm the area's character and appearance, contrary to policies CS01 and CS02. He also considered that the design of the dwellings would be at odds with the prevailing character of the surrounding area, also contrary to CS01 and CS02. He also considered that the proposal is contrary to policy CS19 as insufficient information has been submitted to establish the presence or otherwise of protected bats. Finally, he considered that the proposal would unacceptably harm protected trees, contrary to policy CS18.