
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2025

by **A Oyebade MSc FCILT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1160/W/25/3366601

11 St Marys Road, Plymouth PL7 4PT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Chad Franklin against the decision of Plymouth City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00019/OUT.
 - The development proposed is outline application for the erection of 1no self-build dwelling with all matters reserved for future submission.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The application was submitted in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis, treating supporting plans as illustrative.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The properties in this area including the host building are generally on large plots of land, complemented with big gardens and driveways. The landscaped area forming the location of the proposed development and that abutting the neighbouring dwelling at 13 St Marys Road sets the host building and the property at 13 St Marys Road back from the adjacent Larkham Close to create a sense of openness.
5. In addition, since the dominance of the associated vegetation makes the properties on Larkham Close somewhat inconspicuous, the outlook of the skyline through this road, when observed from St Marys Road provides a pleasant backdrop to the street scene and a sense of spaciousness to the area. I have also observed a similar setting at the dwellings situated at the entrances of the adjacent junctions of St Marys Road with Larkham Lane, Shearwood Close, Wren Gardens and Reynolds Road.
6. These features give the street scene a strong rhythm and open and spacious feel. The proposed development would substantially dominate this area of land, thereby disrupting the marked rhythm of the built form of Larkham Close and view of the horizon through it, as described above. A dwelling on the site would erode the existing gap in the road frontages of St Marys Road and Larkham Close, and the

site would appear to be overdeveloped and out of character with the spacious character of the street scene. The proposal would also disrupt the regularity of the built form, including the symmetry and openness of the corner plots that contribute positively to the character of the area.

7. Consequently, notwithstanding any soft landscaping and boundary treatment, the appeal development would not maintain important features of the prevailing pattern of residential developments in the area. Its discordant presence would also be clearly noticeable in views along St Marys Road.
8. I have considered the 4 consented sites that were quoted by the appellant as like this proposed development at 6a and 14 St Marys Road, 1 Larkham Close and 19 Meadow Park. Both cited new dwellings on St Marys Road preserve the generous parts of the existing landscaped areas, culminating in minimal impact on the established spacious streetscape at their varied locations.
9. The land at 1 Larkham Close has the benefit of the rear garden of the host building at 11 St Marys Road on one side and the large, landscaped area fronting 1 Larkham Close on its other side, thereby continuing the established openness at this location. The site at 19 Meadow Park is in a similar position as that at 1 Larkham Close, with the rear garden of 19 Meadow Park on one side combined with the landscaped area at the frontage of 1 Westfield Avenue giving a sense of openness. These examples are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal development, which I have in any event evaluated on its own planning merits.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, in this regard, it would conflict with Policies DEV10, DEV20, SPT1 and SPT2 of the Plymouth and Southwest Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034 (adopted 2019). Together these policies emphasise that housing development should be of a high quality in terms of its design and resilience and will only be permitted where it does not adversely affect the character and amenities of the area, respects and maintains local distinctiveness and provide a positive sense of place and identity

Other Considerations and Planning Balance

11. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the Council's officer report identifying only a 2.53 years' supply. Paragraph 11d (ii) of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) explains that in these circumstances, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the Framework policies.
12. The appeal site is relatively close to a range of services and facilities, and the proposal would make a positive contribution to the housing supply with associated social and economic benefits during the period of construction and once the dwelling is occupied. However, the scale of the development proposed means the contribution of one additional dwelling to meeting housing supply through a more efficient use of land in an urban area and the related benefits would be limited.
13. The appellant has also indicated that no technical objections were raised in relation to access, highways, drainage, ecology, or neighbouring amenity, but the lack of harm in these aspects has been afforded a neutral weight.

14. Moreover, the appellant's statement that the self-build property would contribute to the number in the Borough, has been noted. I have considered paragraph 63 (and its relevant footnote) of the Framework. However, there is no mechanism before me in the form of a planning obligation to secure the development as a self-build. Reliance on just the description of development would not be sufficient to ensure that the dwelling would be constructed as such. Therefore, while the Framework refers to meeting the housing needs of different groups in the community, the weight that I can give to the proposal being a self-build house is very limited.
15. The appellant also refers to the house being for their own family and so would support retention of family connections in line with social sustainability. However, permissions generally run with the land. Additionally, there is no clear evidence before me that would indicate that this is an exceptional occasion where a personal permission would be justified.
16. In the circumstances of this case, I have concluded that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area which would be long lasting. The adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the Framework policies taken as a whole. The proposed development would not therefore benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development, found at paragraph 11 of the Framework.

Conclusion

17. Overall, none of the other considerations material to the proposed development indicate that this appeal decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Oyebade

INSPECTOR