

App no	Decision	Address	Proposal	Case Officer	Appeal Type	Decision Date	Synopsis
16/01474/FUL	DISMISSED	DOLPHIN HOUSE, SUTTON HARBOUR, PLYMOUTH, PL4 0DW	Roller shutter door to face	Liz Wells	Written Representations	28/06/2017	<p>Planning permission was refused for a roller shutter door to the face of the building, serving the undercroft car park, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS28 and CS03 and the National Planning Policy Framework for being 1. Detrimental to public safety and interference with the free flow of traffic on the highway, and 2. For failing to preserve and enhance the building in the Barbican Conservation Area. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that the development would be detrimental to the Conservation Area (policy CS03). The benefit of the proposal was predominantly private ones for the occupiers of the flats which did not weigh against the harm. He gave some weight to the fact that the development is being sought to prevent litter and anti-social behaviour within the dark recess to the front of the existing roller shutter door but this does not justify the harm to the conservation area arising from the installation of the roller shutter on the external face of the building. The Inspector considered any obstruction to the public highway would be brief and given the lightly trafficked nature of Sutton Wharf and the infrequency with which the car park entrance is used, they did not consider that there would be a significant adverse effect on the free flow of traffic or public safety in general (policy CS28). The Council made an application for award for costs on the basis that the appellant failed to take the opportunities provided by the Council to amend the scheme. The Inspector did not consider unreasonable behaviour had been demonstrated, and refused the application for costs.</p> <p>Planning permission was refused for a roller shutter door to the face of the building, serving the undercroft car park, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS28 and CS03 and the National Planning Policy Framework for being 1. Detrimental to public safety and interference with the free flow of traffic on the highway, and 2. For failing to preserve and enhance the building in the Barbican Conservation Area. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that the development would be detrimental to the Conservation Area (policy CS03). The benefit of the proposal was predominantly private ones for the occupiers of the flats which did not weigh against the harm. He gave some weight to the fact that the development is being sought to prevent litter and anti-social behaviour within the dark recess to the front of the existing roller shutter door but this does not justify the harm to the conservation area arising from the installation of the roller shutter on the external face of the building. The Inspector considered any obstruction to the public highway would be brief and given the lightly trafficked nature of Sutton Wharf and the infrequency with which the car park entrance is used, they did not consider that there would be a significant adverse effect on the free flow of traffic or public safety in general (policy CS28). The Council made an application for award for costs on the basis that the appellant failed to take the opportunities provided by the Council to amend the scheme. The Inspector did not consider unreasonable behaviour had been demonstrated, and refused the application for costs.</p>