Planning Committee

Appeal Decisions

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

Application Number 15/00621/FUL

Appeal Site LAND ADJACENT TO 859 WOLSELEY ROAD PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Erection of 4 storey dwelling with integral garage

Case Officer Karen Gallacher

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 06/02/2016

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The planning inspector agreed that the application for a 4 storey house, on the wooded foreshore of Kinterbury Creek, was unacceptable and contrary to Core Strategy policies CS02 (Design), CS20 (Sustainable Resource Use) and CS18 (Plymouth's Green Space), because it would erode the coastal landscape, result in the loss of trees of high coastal amenity value and the design would be visually harmful to the character of the area.

The application had also been refused because insufficient information had been submitted in respect of species protection and enhancement, but following the refusal the applicant had submitted information, which the inspector considered overcame this reason for refusal.

Application Number 15/01408/TPO

Appeal Site 40 OWEN DRIVE PLYMOUTH
Appeal Proposal Silver birch - Fell to ground level

Case Officer Chris Knapman

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Informal Hearing

Appeal Decision Allowed
Appeal Decision Date 26/07/2016

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

The Inspector considers the tree has limited amenity value. Although she supported the council's view that it had some group value, that it was healthy and that debris was a natural consequence of living in proximity to trees, she considered that its poor form and shading justifies its removal and considers its loss will have limited impact on amenity/character of the area.

Application Number 15/01442/FUL

Appeal Site 12 RICHMOND ROAD PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Retrospective application for a 2 storey rear extension and raised decking

Case Officer Amy Thompson

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 04/04/2016

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

Planning permission was refused for a two storey rear extension and rear decking, the decking was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS02 (Design) and CS34 (Planning Application Considerations). It was also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Council's Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that, given the raised decking's position, it results in considerable harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property, specifically overlooking and loss of privacy. It is also noted by the Inspector that given the size and siting of the raised decking alongside the boundary, it would have a domineering and imposing presence to the adjoining neighbours.

Application Number 15/01861/FUL

Appeal Site 58 COOMBE WAY PLYMOUTH

Appeal Proposal Retention of raised deck with garden store below

Case Officer Amy Thompson

Appeal Category

Appeal Type Written Representations

Appeal Decision Dismissed
Appeal Decision Date 04/04/2016

Conditions

Award of Costs Awarded To

Appeal Synopsis

Planning permission was refused for the retention of rear decking with store below, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS02 (Design) and CS34 (Planning Application Considerations). It was also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Council's Design Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document and Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that, given the design and size of the decking and store, it would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring properties, specifically privacy and outlook. The Inspector also noted that given the characteristics and the topography of the area, the decking and store would appear overtly large and domineering.

Note:

Copies of the full decision letters are available at http://www.plymouth.gov.uk/planningapplicationsv4/welcome.asp.