



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2024

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/D/24/3340269

78 Furzehatt Road, Plymstock, Plymouth PL9 8QT

- 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 Ian Waites against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/01611/FUL dated 20 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is extend existing wall out by 3000mm to allow for off road parking and charging points for EVs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted plans were revised during the course of the application and my decision is based on the plans as determined by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - a) the effect of the proposal on the street scene, and
 - b) the effect of the proposal on highway visibility and safety.

Reasons

Issue a) Street scene

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the north side of Furzehatt Road within a predominantly residential area. The property is served by a driveway from the road which extends across a deep grass verge leading to the property, with a single garage set back behind the side of the house and parking area at the front of the house. There is a low boundary wall separating the front boundary of the dwelling from the grass verge which I am advised by the Council is Highway Maintained at Public Expense. A similar arrangement is found for the properties on either side of the appeal property, although further to the east, and reflecting the relationship between the dwellings and the highway, the properties directly abound the footway and highway, with no intervening grass verge.

5. The proposal would seek to extend the front boundary forward, some 3m over the grass verge and create a new boundary wall in order to deepen the front garden area for parking.
6. Although there are some differences in the front boundary treatments, and at the time of my site visit some vehicles were parked forward of the front boundaries, there is a clear distinction between the private driveways and front gardens and forecourts and the deep grass verge. The grass verge is an attractive feature which adds to the spaciousness and openness of the street scene.
7. The extension of the boundary wall forwards and the encroachment of the parking area onto part of the grass verge would interrupt this distinctive pattern of development along this part of Furzehatt Road. The intrusion of the boundary wall forward across part of the grass verge would appear visually incongruous and it would detract from the street scene.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would materially harm the street scene. This would conflict with Policy DEV20 of the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan (Joint Local Plan), the Plymouth and South West Devon Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and in particular paragraphs 13.62 and 13.66 and Table 13, and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Issue b) Highways Visibility and Safety

9. The appeal property lies to the east of the junction of Dolphin Court Road onto Furzehatt Road. I have taken into account the concerns of the Highway Authority but given the distance between the appeal property and the junction as well as the remaining area of open grass verge that would remain in front of the extended wall, I do not consider that the proposal would materially interfere with highway visibility at the junction of Dolphin Court Road and Furzehatt Road.
10. Similarly, and given the remaining extent of open grass verge between the proposed wall and enclosure and the highway, I do not consider that the proposal would materially interfere with sight lines for the immediate neighbours when exiting their properties.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not materially harm highway visibility or highway safety. There would be no conflict with Policy DEV29 of the Joint Local Plan, the SPD, and in particular paragraphs 13.64, 13.66 and 13.89, and the Framework, including paragraph 114, all of which, amongst other matters, seek to secure safe access for all highway users.
12. However, my conclusion in this regard does not outweigh the material harm I have concluded to the street scene under my first main issue.

Other Considerations

13. I have noted that the Appellant wishes to introduce provision for EV charging points which is to be supported. However, there is no information before me as to why this could not be achieved within the existing driveway and front garden area.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR