

# Appeal Decisions between 03/01/2018 and 26/01/2018

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
03/01/2018	17/00913/FUL	2017/0032	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/17/3185163
<b>Ward</b>				
Plymstock Radford				
<b>Address</b>				
27 The Old Wharf Plymouth PL9 7NP				
<b>Application Description</b>				
First floor balcony				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mrs Liz Wells		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for a first floor balcony at the front of the house, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS02 and CS34 and the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document. The Inspector supported the Council view that the proposed balcony would be out of keeping with other balconies in the street by virtue of its design, size and materials. He also agreed that it would be seen as a dominating feature on the front elevation of the host property, which in turn would make the host property jar with others in the area. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
16/01/2018	16/02315/LBC	2017/0025	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/Y/17/3178683
<b>Ward</b>				
St Peters & the Waterfront				
<b>Address</b>				
9 Parade Plymouth PL1 2JL				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Internal & external changes to building				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Miss Amy Thompson		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for the conversion of warehouse to commercial premises (Class A1, A2 &amp; A3) on the ground floor &amp; residential premises (Class C3) on the first, second &amp; roof spaces, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Cores Strategy Policies CS02 and CS03. It was also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Councils Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed buildings and its special architectural and historic interest. The Inspector stated that the development would result in the loss of a considerable amount of internal architectural features and historic fabric that contribute evidential and aesthetic value to the significance of the buildings. The Inspector stated that benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the substantial harm to the heritage asset. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
16/01/2018	16/02312/FUL	2017/0026	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/17/3178676
<b>Ward</b>				
St Peters & the Waterfront				
<b>Address</b>				
9 Parade Plymouth PL1 2JL				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Conversion of warehouse to commercial premises (Class A1, A2 & A3) on the ground floor & residential premises (Class C3) on the first, second & roof spaces				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Miss Amy Thompson		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for the conversion of warehouse to commercial premises (Class A1, A2 &amp; A3) on the ground floor &amp; residential premises (Class C3) on the first, second &amp; roof spaces, as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Cores Strategy Policies CS02 and CS03. It was also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Councils Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Grade II listed buildings and its special architectural and historic interest. The Inspector stated that the development would result in the loss of a considerable amount of internal architectural features and historic fabric that contribute evidential and aesthetic value to the significance of the buildings. The Inspector stated that benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the substantial harm to the heritage asset. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
18/01/2018	17/01168/FUL	2017/0034	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/17/3189581
<b>Ward</b>				
St Budeaux				
<b>Address</b>				
797 Wolseley Road Plymouth PL5 1JN				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Front hardstanding				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mr Chris Cummings		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for a hardstanding at the front of a residential dwelling on a classified road as it was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS28 and CS34 and Policy DEV31 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan. It is also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Council's Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Council's view that development was unacceptable as vehicles must be able to enter and exit the hardstand in a forward gear. Failure to do so would increase highway safety risks to other road users and pedestrians. The Inspector noted that planning permission had been granted for housing opposite the site, but that limited detail was provided by the applicant and that each application must be considered on its own merits. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
19/01/2018	17/01782/FUL	2017/0035	Appeal Split	APP/N1160/D/17/3190354
<b>Ward</b>				
Plymstock Radford				
<b>Address</b>				
58 Shaw Way Plymouth PL9 9XH				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Replacement balcony and side porch/canopy				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mr Mike Stone		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for an application for a balcony with privacy screen and a side porch. The balcony was considered to be contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CS34 and emerging JLP Policy DEV1. This was because of its adverse impact on the streetscene and on neighbour amenity. It was also considered contrary to guidance contained in the Council Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. The inspector supported the Council view that the development, due to its scale, would harm the character of the area and the appearance of the terrace. Regarding neighbour amenity, the inspector noted that the existing open aspect of a habitable room would be compromised with the screen introducing a dominant and enclosing element. The inspector concluded that the proposed side porch would not be harmful to the area and would comply with Policy CS34 and was allowed. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				