

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/17/3181456

30 Ridge Road, Plympton, Plymouth, PL7 1UF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Keating against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0959/FUL, dated 2 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double garage with office space above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the Appellant against Plymouth City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

4. Reasons

5. The appeal site has planning permission for one mobile home and two touring caravans for residential use with occupation restricted to gypsies and travellers. It is located on the edge of the suburban area of Plympton and in close proximity to the A38 trunk road. The land is generally enclosed by mature hedges and trees and is located a little off Ridge Road. There is another similar site located across the lane, a neighbouring property at Hardwick Nurseries, and other sporadic development locally. The proposal is as described above with location planned for the eastern corner of the site, set away from the boundary hedges by about 3.5 metres. The structure would be a block and render finish with slate roof. It is intended for the personal use of the Appellant and would have a footprint of 80 square metres with an upper floor over this partly set within a pitched roof.
 6. The Appellant states that the surrounding area falls within the Saltram Countryside Park that is identified in the North Plymstock Area Action Plan (2007). It is noted that this is a local designation that seeks to safeguard the green open areas on the fringe of Plymouth and manage development to prevent any conflict with the function of the space. To my mind the wider area
-

encompassing the appeal site is attractive and rural and I would deem it to be important that this aesthetic quality and ambience is maintained.

7. By any measure the proposed building within this curtilage would be substantial in scale both in its own right and comparatively with the principal residential accommodation. The Appellant may be right that an ancillary facility, which might encompass a garage and, perhaps, an office, might be seen as a reasonable proposition but in my opinion the large scale of this structure would be excessive within its context. It would be harmful to the rural, open, qualities of the locality and would be visually intrusive. Planning conditions proposed by the Appellant relating to personal use, the prevention of business or commercial activity, and the selection of external materials would not overcome my concerns on the matter of impact on the locality's character and appearance. The building at this scale would be incompatible with its context.
8. The Appellant and the Council both indicate that Policy CS34 of the City of Plymouth Local Development Framework 2007 (LDF) is the most pertinent development plan policy. It seeks well designed new development that should, amongst other matters, protect and be compatible with its surroundings, be of suitable scale, not unduly impact visually, and make a positive contribution to the landscape of an area. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to this policy.
9. I would add that I recognise that two dwellings have been permitted nearby under Council ref 15/01545/FUL. However I do not know the full details relating to that case, there is some locational difference, and the current scheme is not directly comparable physically or functionally. Furthermore, in any event, I must determine the case before me on its own merits. I have also considered the previous appeal decisions (APP/N1160/A/09/2118869 et al) relating to this appeal site. The 2010 Inspector did not of course consider the merits or otherwise of additional structures within the site albeit he did have regard to the scale of the then planned development and the need for final agreement on its form having regard to his wish to protect residential amenity and local rural character.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. The Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within the Framework and I am of the opinion that the appeal scheme would run contrary to the document's aim of conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
11. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

Overall conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR