

Appeal Decisions Received between 01/09/08 and 30/09/08

Reference Number	Parish	Proposal Description and Location	Appeal Decision	Comments
15/2377/07/F	DARTMOUTH	Retrospective application for removal of condition 4 of approval 9/15/1577//05/F dated 18 November 2005 (Boat & Trailer Store) to allow storage of boat, trailer and/or car –51 Churchfields, Dartmouth, TQ6 9HJ	ALLOWED (subject to new condition)	The Inspector did not consider that the use of the building for the parking of a car would be detrimental to highway safety or residential amenity. In allowing the appeal, a new condition was imposed ensuring the appeal building is restricted to domestic use in connection with the adjoining dwellinghouse and not used for habitable accommodation or for industrial or commercial purposes.
34/2059/07/F	MARLDON	Resubmission of 34/2394/06/F for extension and alterations – 3 Belfield Rise, Marldon, Paignton, TQ4 1NX	ALLOWED	The Inspector concluded that the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular reference to privacy, would not be significantly worse when compared with a previously approved scheme.
07/2069/07/F	BRIXTON	Erection of two-storey dwelling. Kingsland Residential Home, Brixton, Plymouth, PL8 2AX.	DISMISSED	<p>The Inspector considered that the living conditions of existing and future occupiers would be satisfactory but that the proposed dwelling sited outside the development boundary would be unacceptable in principle. He made reference to the permission that had been granted on an adjoining site at 'Venn Farm' but noted the Council's explanation that the dwellings themselves lie within the development boundary although the access is outside. Similarly, reference was made to an extension to 'The Lawns' nursing home which was not refused because it lie outside the development boundary. He accepted the Council's explanation that the proposal was for an extension to an existing business and the countryside policy permits alterations and extensions to existing properties.</p> <p>He further considered the fact that the development would be unobtrusive is not in itself good reason to permit the erection of the proposed dwelling contrary to the development plan.</p>
