Appeal Decisions between 14/06/2019 and 05/07/2019

Decision Date	Original Planning Applica	tion Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
19/06/2019	18/01504/FUL	2018/0030	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/18/3219266
Ward				
Plymstock Duns	tone			
Address				
69 Church Road	Plymstock Plymouth PL9 9A	U		
Application Des	scription			
Erection of 1 dv	velling, domestic garage, cre	eation of vehicular and pedestrian	access and associated works	
Appeal Process	Off	icers Name		
Written Represe	entations Mr	Oliver Gibbins		
Synopsis				
Development Fr Local Plan and th development wo 67 and 69 Churc	amework Core Strategy Poli ne National Planning Policy F ould harm the setting and si h Road which would severe	cies CS03, CS18, CS22 and CS34, p Framework.Having reviewed the ap gnificance of the listed Grade II list	olicies DEV1, DEV10, DEV22, DEV oplication, and visited the site, the ed building. The Inspector also st se disturbance to the occupiers th	nurch Road. The proposal was considered to be contrary to Loca 28 and DEV30 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint e Inspector supported the Councils view that the proposed ated that the proposed access through the gardens of number herefore having a detrimental impact on their living conditions. rded by the Inspector.

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
19/06/2019	18/01505/LBC	2018/0031	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/18/3219267
Vard				
Plymstock Dunst	tone			
ddress				
9 Church Road	Plymstock Plymouth PL9 9AU			
Application Des	scription			
Erection of 1 dv	velling, domestic garage, creation	of vehicular and pedestrian	access and associated works	
Appeal Process	Officers N			
Nritten Represe	entations Mr Oliver	Gibbins		
Synopsis				
Local Developm Framework.Havi	ent Framework Core Strategy Policing reviewed the application, and v	y CS03, policy DEV22 of the isited the site, the Inspecto	e Plymouth and South West Devon . r supported the Councils view that t	Church Road. The proposal was considered to be contrary to Joint Local Plan and the National Planning Policy the proposed development would harm the setting and for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
25/06/2019	18/00830/FUL	2018/0028	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/18/3217910
Ward				
Drake				
Address				
Units 9 & 10 She	rwell House 30 North Hill Plymout	h PL4 8ET		
Application Des	cription			
Retrospective c	ontinuous C4 Use (Houses of Multi	ole Occupation) for apartm	nents 9 and 10	
Appeal Process	Officers N	ame		
Written Represe	ntations Mr Chris K	ing		
Synopsis				
		ion on two counts those h		
The Local Planni	ng Authority (LPA) refused permiss		eing Overconcentration of HIVIOs a	nd Substandard Accommodation. On the first matter, the
			-	in the area, which already has a significant number of such
Inspector agreed	with the LPA, concluding that the	proposed development we	ould result in two additional HMOs	in the area, which already has a significant number of such
Inspector agreed properties. Addi	I with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas	proposed development wo singly unbalanced commur	ould result in two additional HMOs nity to the detriment of the charact	in the area, which already has a significant number of such
Inspector agreed properties. Addi terms of JLP Poli appropriate layo	with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas cies DEV10 and DEV11. On the seco ut to provide good living condition	proposed development we singly unbalanced commur ond matter, and having had s for future occupants, acc	ould result in two additional HMOs hity to the detriment of the charact d a site visit, the Inspector found th	in the area, which already has a significant number of such er of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the at the units would have been of sufficient size and of an
Inspector agreed properties. Addi terms of JLP Poli appropriate layc	I with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas cies DEV10 and DEV11. On the second	proposed development we singly unbalanced commur ond matter, and having had s for future occupants, acc	ould result in two additional HMOs hity to the detriment of the charact d a site visit, the Inspector found th	in the area, which already has a significant number of such er of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the
Inspector agreed properties. Addi terms of JLP Poli appropriate layc	with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas cies DEV10 and DEV11. On the seco ut to provide good living condition	proposed development we singly unbalanced commur ond matter, and having had s for future occupants, acc	ould result in two additional HMOs hity to the detriment of the charact d a site visit, the Inspector found th	in the area, which already has a significant number of such er of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the at the units would have been of sufficient size and of an
Inspector agreed properties. Addi terms of JLP Poli appropriate layc	with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas cies DEV10 and DEV11. On the seco ut to provide good living condition	proposed development we singly unbalanced commur ond matter, and having had s for future occupants, acc	ould result in two additional HMOs hity to the detriment of the charact d a site visit, the Inspector found th	in the area, which already has a significant number of such er of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the at the units would have been of sufficient size and of an
Inspector agreed properties. Addi terms of JLP Poli appropriate layo	with the LPA, concluding that the ng to this would result in an increas cies DEV10 and DEV11. On the seco ut to provide good living condition	proposed development we singly unbalanced commur ond matter, and having had s for future occupants, acc	ould result in two additional HMOs hity to the detriment of the charact d a site visit, the Inspector found th	in the area, which already has a significant number of such er of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the at the units would have been of sufficient size and of an

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
01/07/2019	18/01620/FUL	2019/0005	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/D/19/3222288
Vard				
Budshead				
Address				
33 Budshead R	oad Plymouth PL5 4DW			
Application Des	scription			
Erection of hard	Istanding			
Appeal Process	Officers N	ame		
Appeal Process Written Represe Synopsis				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
01/07/2019	18/01825/FUL	2019/0018	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/19/3223762
Vard				
Drake				
Address				
17 Ford Park Ro	ad Plymouth PL4 6NU			
Application De	cription			
Change of use f	rom dwelling (Class C3) to 5-bed HI	vio (Class C4) (retrospectiv	e)	
Appeal Process	Officers N	ame		
Written Represe	ntations Mr Chris C	ummings		
Synopsis				
• •	-			1 and CS15 of the Local Development Framework Core lso considered contrary to the Development Guidelines