

# Appeal Decisions between 06/01/2019 and 04/02/2019

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
24/01/2019	18/01016/FUL	2018/0021	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/18/3214367
<b>Ward</b>				
Devonport				
<b>Address</b>				
14 Bakers Place Richmond Walk Plymouth PL1 4LX				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Dormer balcony extension				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mrs Alumeci Tuima		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for the construction of two large balcony/dormer additions to the front-facing roof slope. The balcony/dormer extensions were considered to be contrary to policies CS02 (Design) and CS34 (4 and 6) (General Considerations) of the adopted Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework (April 2007), policies DEV20 of the emerging Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2013) and paragraph 64 of the NPPF. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector agreed with the Council and dismissed the appeal as he considered the proposed balcony/dormer extensions would be out of keeping with the property by virtue of their large size and visual prominence. The resulting dwelling would look unusual, and would not contribute positively to the streetscene. Furthermore, the Inspector noted that there were no similar large balcony/dormers in the street of a similar scale and design. An application for award of costs were submitted by the appellant who claimed that the Council had unreasonably refused the planning application, and that in their view the Council should have allowed time for the application to be amended. The Inspector disagreed with the applicant pointing out it was not unreasonable of the Council to determine the application as it stood, given the scale of changes that would have been required to make the development acceptable, particularly as it had already communicated its concerns to the applicant, and offered the opportunity to withdraw the application, and engage in negotiations on an amended scheme. No appeal costs were therefore awarded.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
24/01/2019	18/01017/FUL	2018/0022	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/18/3214369
<b>Ward</b>				
Devonport				
<b>Address</b>				
12 Bakers Place Richmond Walk Plymouth PL1 4LX				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Dormer balcony extension				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mrs Alumeci Tuima		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for the construction of two large balcony/dormer additions to the front-facing roof slope. The balcony/dormer extensions were considered to be contrary to policies CS02 (Design) and CS34 (4 and 6) (General Considerations) of the adopted Core Strategy of the Local Development Framework (April 2007), policies DEV20 of the emerging Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2013) and paragraph 64 of the NPPF. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector agreed with the Council and dismissed the appeal as he considered the proposed balcony/dormer extensions would be out of keeping with the property by virtue of their large size and visual prominence. The resulting dwelling would look unusual, and would not contribute positively to the streetscene. Furthermore, the Inspector noted that there were no similar large balcony/dormers in the street of a similar scale and design. An application for award of costs were submitted by the appellant who claimed that the Council had unreasonably refused the planning application, and that in their view the Council should have allowed time for the application to be amended. The Inspector disagreed with the applicant pointing out it was not unreasonable of the Council to determine the application as it stood, given the scale of changes that would have been required to make the development acceptable, particularly as it had already communicated its concerns to the applicant, and offered the opportunity to withdraw the application, and engage in negotiations on an amended scheme. No appeal costs were therefore awarded.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
29/01/2019	18/00853/FUL	2018/0023	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/18/3214444
<b>Ward</b>				
Peverell				
<b>Address</b>				
3 Venn Way Plymouth PL3 5PN				
<b>Application Description</b>				
Demolition of conservatory and construction of new conservatory with room-in-roof and basement				
<b>Appeal Process</b>		<b>Officers Name</b>		
Written Representations		Mr Mike Stone		
<b>Synopsis</b>				
<p>Planning permission was refused for a two-storey rear extension as it was considered to appear dominant and overbearing when viewed from the neighbours garden. This would have been contrary to Local Development Framework Core Strategy policy CS34.3 and 6 and emerging Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan policies DEV1 and DEV20. It was also felt to be contrary to paragraph 2.2.30 of the Development Guidelines SPD and paragraph 130 of the NPPF (2018). The application was the third attempt by the appellant to gain approval for a two-storey extension, all previous versions were refused. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the combination of the extent, proximity to the boundary, and height of the extension would result in it having an overbearing impact on the occupants of 5 Venn Way. It was therefore contrary to policy CS34. The inspector noted that the appellant could have built a large outbuilding under permitted development but the bulk of this would have been less than the proposed scheme. He also commented that the appellant could have allowed a high hedge or tree screen to grow up. This would have been closer to the appellants property and it would have been in their interests to keep it at a reasonable height to protect their own living conditions, so again, it would not have had the same dominant impact. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				