

## PLANNING APPEALS

App no	Decision	Address	Proposal	Case Officer	Appeal Type	Decision Date	Synopsis
16/01212/F UL	ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS	41-43 CHAPEL STREETDEVONPORT, PLYMOUTH, PL1 4DU	Conversion of former hotel to provide 10no residential units and café (Class A3) at ground floor	Chris King	Written Representations	28/07/2017	The Inspector acknowledges the role of Core Strategy polices CS28 and CS34 and the Development Guidelines SPD when assessing parking demand and provision, but goes on to state that the SPD is only a 'starting point' and wider assessment of the it is actual impact of the proposed development on parking availability in the surrounding area to judge whether there would be material harm to highway safety should be undertaken. The appellat submitted a parking survey demonstrating to the Inspector that there were available spaces 200m form the site to meet the demands of the development. The Local Planning Authority discredited these surveys with its own evidence however in the Inspectors view this was insufficient. The Inspector considered that the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety or would materially impact on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers. As such, they found no conflict with Polices CS28 or CS34 which seek to guard against such harm., PLYMOUTH, and South West Devon Joint Local Plan polices have not been considered as part of this appeal decision as they were not referred to when determining the planning application.
17/00703/F UL	ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS	15 KIT HILL CRESCENT, PLYMOUTH, PL5 1EW	Residential annexe in rear garden.	Mike Stone	Written Representations	15/08/2017	Planning permission was refused for a detached residential annexe as it was felt to have the possibility of creating a separate sub-standard unit of accommodation. The Council considered this to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CS34 and Policy DEV10 of the draft , PLYMOUTH, and South West Devon Joint Local Plan. It was also considered contrary to guidance on residential annexes contained in the Council Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (First Review) and the National Planning Policy Framework. The Councils view was that a standard condition on ancillary use would not give the planning authority the necessary control over the future use of the property. Having reviewed the application, the Inspector accepted that the principles of the SPD were broadly applicable, but felt that, with appropriate controls through the use of conditions, the proposal would not create a self-contained unit and was not therefore in conflict with the SPD, or with Policy CS34.No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.