

## Appeal Decisions Received between 01/11/08 and 30/11/08

| Reference Number              | Parish    | Proposal Description and Location   | Appeal Decision               | Comments  |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| 62/0499/08/F                  | YEALMPTON | Extension to Dwelling with First Floor Balcony, 14 Hillside Way, Yealmpton, Plymouth, PL8 2NU   | <b>DISMISSED</b>              | The Inspector concluded that the proposed ground floor extension, by having a flat roof, would be inappropriate and out of keeping with the pronounced pitched roofscape of both the original dwelling and its immediate neighbours, and as such would be contrary to national and local policy. The Inspector also felt that the proposed balcony was close enough to allow overlooking of the next door garden at 5 The Orchard, causing loss of privacy to occupiers at that property. The inspector did not believe that planting would overcome this issue and as such resolved that the balcony would be contrary to Local Plan SHDC1 and PPS1. |
| 56/2705/07/LB & 56/2704/07/AD | TOTNES    | Listed Building consent for the erection of halo back lighting to sign & Advertisement consent for shop sign with rear halo lighting Stags Estate Agency, The Granary, Coronation Road, Totnes, Devon TQ9 5GN | <b>DISMISSED BOTH APPEALS</b> | The Inspector considered that the plastic illuminated lettering and associated logo appear excessive and incongruous, and are harmful to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and to its setting in the Conservation Area.  |
| 62/0478/08/F                  | YEALMPTON | Erection of dwelling to side of existing dwelling – 31 Yealm Park, Yealmpton, Plymouth PL8 2NR  | <b>ALLOWED</b>                | The Inspector considered that the main issues related to (1) the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding street scene and (2) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers through potential overlooking and loss of privacy and increased traffic. On local character, he noted that the application differed in only three respects relating to revised access, a 2m high fence and a hardstanding in the front garden from a previous permission and was not persuaded that the changes would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. In terms of  |

|                     |                    |   |                  |  |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|--|
|                     |                    |   |                  | <p>living conditions, he considered that there would be limited pedestrian and vehicular activity and that this would not materially affect the living conditions of neighbouring residents. His overall conclusion, however, was that the accommodation would not be contrary to Policies CO6, SHDC15 or CS7 and would be in line with national policy to secure the efficient use of previously developed land in sustainable locations such as this. He attached four conditions relating to the commencement of development, matching materials, restrictions on windows and details of the hardstanding to be approved.</p>   |
| <b>46/0519/08/F</b> | <b>SOUTH HUISH</b> | <p>Resubmission of application 46/2554/07/F for a first floor extension to form granny annexe – The Moorings, Hope Cove, Kingsbridge TQ7 3HQ.</p> | <b>DISMISSED</b> | <p>The Inspector considered that there were two main issues relating to (1) whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living accommodation and (2) its impact on the adjoining property. On accommodation, she concluded that because the bedroom would be poorly lit and ventilated and have no outlook at all, it would be unpleasant and result in unsatisfactory living accommodation. In respect of impact on the adjoining property, that whilst the blank end wall would be a more solid structure than the existing conservatory, the relatively small increase in height would not have an overbearing impact. Her overall conclusion, however, was that the accommodation would fail to meet Local Plan Policy SHDC15 in terms of the form and space of the dwelling and the overall quality of the new development.</p> |
|                     |                    |   |                  |  |
|                     |                    |   |                  |  |
|                     |                    |   |                  |  |
|                     |                    |   |                  |  |