

Planning Appeals decided between 05/02/2017 and 21/04/2017 = 4

App no	Decision	Address	Proposal	Case Officer	Appeal Type	Decision Date	Synopsis
16/01519/FUL	ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS	175 HAM DRIVE, PLYMOUTH, PL2 3RR	Two storey side extension	Alumeci Tuima	Written Representations	06/02/2017	Planning permission was refused for the two storey side extension 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 has allowed the appeal given its proposed integration to the main dwelling at ground floor level. The Inspector also notes that it is sufficient in terms of amenity space and privacy and would therefore not result in a substandard living environment. No application for costs were submitted or awarded by either the applicant or the Council.
16/00942/FUL	ALLOWED	28 MOUNT GOULD ROAD, PLYMOUTH, PL4 7PT	Railings on existing roof terrace (retrospective)	Chris Cummings	Written Representations	08/03/2017	Planning permission was refused for a retrospective application for installation of railings on an existing roof terrace, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS02 and CS34. It was also considered to be contrary to guidance contained in the Council's Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review, Paragraphs 56 to 58 and 64 to 66 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies 30 and 39 of the emerging, PLYMOUTH, Plan. Having reviewed the application and visited the site, the Inspector allowed the appeal, disagreeing with the Council's view, stating that the planning history of the site provides evidence that the flat roof has been used as a roof terrace for some time and that the railings do not 'formalise' the use as a balcony, or directly result in a material increase in the intensity of use that harms the living conditions of nearby properties. The Inspector also stated that there are various examples of railings enclosing balconies in the surrounding area and the design of the railings limited their visual impact on the characteristics of the area. No application for costs was made by the appellant.
16/01114/FUL	DISMISSED	12A MILLER COURT, PLYMOUTH, PL1 3LQ	Erection of dwelling at first floor above garage.	Amy Thompson	Written Representations	21/03/2017	Planning permission was refused for the erection of a dwelling that would have accommodation at first floor level above a garage. The proposal was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS28 (Local Transport Considerations) and CS34 (Planning Application Considerations), Policy 30 (Safeguarding Environment Quality, Function and Amenity) of the, PLYMOUTH, Plan, and Paragraph 17.4, 32, 35, 56, 57 & 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that the access to the site is neither safe nor suitable and would lead to an increased demand for on-street parking, resulting in a degree of inconvenience to nearby residents. The Inspector acknowledged that the proposal would have some benefits but they do not outweigh the clear adverse impacts of the development and is therefore does not represent sustainable development. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.
16/01196/FUL	DISMISSED	THE LOUNGE, 7 STOPFORD PLACE, PLYMOUTH, PL1 4QT	Extraction duct (retrospective)	Chris Cummings	Written Representations	22/03/2017	Planning permission was refused for a retrospective extraction duct as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS02 and CS03. It was also considered contrary to Paragraphs 129 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 28(1) of the emerging, PLYMOUTH, Plan. Having reviewed the application and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that 'the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Stoke Conservation Area and that the public benefits associated with it do not outweigh the clear harm caused'. Action is now being taken by Officers to ensure the owner removes the extraction unit. No application for costs was made by the appellant.