

Appeal Decisions between 03/09/2019 and 30/09/2019

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
06/09/2019	19/00179/PIP	2019/0017	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/19/3226557
Ward				
Efford and Lipson				
Address				
Land Adjacent To Chesterfield Road Plymouth PL3 6BD				
Application Description				
Permission in principle for 2 to 6 dwellings				
Appeal Process		Officers Name		
Written Representations		Mr Jon Fox		
Synopsis				
The Inspector agreed that the proposed development would be overbearing when viewed from properties below, and that those properties would experience an unreasonable loss of privacy contrary to policy DEV1 of the JLP.				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
17/09/2019	19/00530/FUL	2019/0027	Appeal Allowed	APP/N1160/D/19/3233755
Ward				
Compton				
Address				
67 Eggbuckland Road Plymouth PL3 5JR				
Application Description				
Single storey rear extension and demolition of existing garage				
Appeal Process		Officers Name		
Written Representations		Mr Chris Cummings		
Synopsis				
<p>Planning permission was refused for a single storey rear extension as it was considered to create an unacceptable level of impact to outlook, daylight and sunlight of the neighbouring dwelling of no.69 Eggbuckland Road due to the height, length and boundary position. This was considered contrary to Policies DEV1 and DEV2 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan, the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document First Review and the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector did not agree with the Council's view and allowed the appeal. The height increase was considered by the Inspector to be relatively moderate at a 1 metre to 1.5 metres increase and that the existing outlook of the neighbouring property is already impacted by a high wall, shed and brick building which would not be significantly altered by the extension. It was also considered that there would not be any significant impact on levels of sunlight reaching the patio area, due to the surrounding wall and structures, and this was further mitigated by the wide garden at the site. It was noted that the proposal breached the 45 degree guideline set out in the Development Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document. The guidelines set out that they can be relaxed in some cases due to orientation, ground level differences or high boundary walls, which were considered to be factors applicable in this case that permitted relaxation of the guidance. No applications for costs were made by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				

Decision Date	Original Planning Application	Appeal Reference	Inspectors Decision	Inspectors Reference Number
26/09/2019	18/01692/FUL	2019/0022	Appeal Dismissed	APP/N1160/W/19/3230342
Ward				
Compton				
Address				
Flat 5, 8 Seymour Road Mannamead Plymouth PL3 5AS				
Application Description				
Replacement of existing windows with uPVC				
Appeal Process		Officers Name		
Written Representations		Mr Mike Stone		
Synopsis				
<p>Planning permission was refused for permission to replace timber-framed windows with uPVC windows in a flat that is part of a large Victorian villa converted into apartments in the Mannamead Conservation Area. The proposal was considered to be contrary to JLP Policy DEV21 and to guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. Having reviewed the application, and visited the site, the Inspector supported the Councils view that the development would result in harm to the conservation area and that there would be no balancing public benefit resulting from the work. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, it would not accord with Policy DEV21 of the JLP and would be inconsistent with the conservation requirements of the NPPF. The Inspector noted that he had taken in to consideration other matters such as the continued maintenance costs and the use of uPVC in other houses in the conservation area. No applications were made for costs by either side and no costs were awarded by the Inspector.</p>				