

## IVYBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

### Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning & Infrastructure Committee held in the Town Hall on Monday 28 November 2022 at 6pm

**Present:** Cllr A Rea, Cllr L Budd, Cllr T Munro, Cllr A Spencer,  
Cllr J Brown

**In attendance:** Julie Gilbert (Assistant Town Clerk)

**The public participation session took place from 6pm to 6.08pm**

PL22/038 **APOLOGIES:** No apologies were received.

PL22/039 **INTERESTS TO BE DECLARED:** No interests were declared.

PL22/040 **MINUTES:** The Minutes of the Planning & Infrastructure Committee meetings held on 7 November were confirmed as a correct record and were duly signed.

PL22/042 The committee agreed to bring forward Item PL22/042 3686/22/HHO Householder application for single storey rear extension with associated external works including new/replacement boundary fence – 41 Brook Road, Ivybridge, PL21 0AX

<http://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/223686>

***OBJECTION - Members had previously supported this application however they had not been fully aware of the detrimental impact the proposals would have to No 43 Brook Road at the time of making their previous representations.***

***Taking the resident of No 43's comments into consideration they felt that the proposal would constitute over development and be overbearing. No 43 has already suffered from loss of daylight and sunlight and overshadowing from the previous first floor side extension at No 41, and this will be further compounded with the proposed extension, having a negative adverse impact to the amenity of No 43.***

***It is understood that the garden area of No 41 has been extended beyond the curtilage of the dwelling showing a larger garden area on the site plan than it should. This could be misleading when assessing whether half the area of land around the original house will be covered by extensions, and could possibly affect the outcome.***

*Two members of the public left the meeting at 6.20pm*

PL22/041 **TREE AND HEDGE MATTERS:** The following applications for tree works were considered:

3906/22/TPO T1: Sycamore - Fell due to the tree has grown out of the rear boundary hedge bank – 23 Haytor Drive, Ivybridge, PL21 0TN.

<http://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/223906>

**SUPPORT**

PL22/042 **PLANNING:** The following planning applications were considered:

3458/22/HHO Householder application to build a timber frame room on existing outbuilding – 4 St John's Road, Ivybridge, PL21 9AX.

<http://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/223458>

***OBJECTION – The previous application was recommended for refusal by the Local Planning Authority due to 1. The proposed extension, owing to its scale, flat roof design and weatherboard cladding is contrary to Joint Local Plan policies, and 2. The proposed extension, by reason of its height and proximity to neighbours' windows would have an overbearing impact on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.***

***Members noted that some improvements had been made, namely the cladding proposal had been removed and replaced with roughcast painted white and the introduction of a pitched roof, however the proximity to neighbours' windows would still have an overbearing presence on the neighbouring properties therefore they felt unable to support the application.***

3735/22/HHO Householder application for conversion of attached garage to room with ensuite – 16 Paddock Drive, Ivybridge, PL21 0UB.

<http://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/223735>

**NO COMMENT**

4020/22/ARC Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 4 (Windows/Doors), 5 (Schedule of Roof Works) and 7 (Roof Details) of planning consent 2211/22/LBC – Victoria House, Western Road, Ivybridge, PL21 9AN.

<http://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/224020>

***NO COMMENT – Members did not feel that they had the technical expertise to consider fully the proposals required to discharge the conditions for windows, doors and roof details, and therefore decided not to comment***

The meeting closed at 6.43pm

Signed: .....

Date: 19 December 2022

### **Public Participation Session 6pm – 6.08pm**

The resident from 43 Brook Road was in attendance to object to the planning application for 41 Brook Road, Ivybridge, PL21 0AX, Planning application 3686/22/HHO Single storey rear extension, new/replacement boundary fence. The resident read out the following statement:

*“I live at 43 Brook Road; and am really concerned about the above planning application.*

- *To properly appreciate my position it is necessary to understand the planning history.*
- *Number 41 already lies entirely to the south east of my property.*
- *The neighbour relationship, is a far worse starting point than if the properties were on the same building line.*
- *Previous extensions to number 41 have created a two-storey building immediately on the boundary.*
- *The previous extensions to number 41 dramatically reduced the daylight and sunlight entering our home and garden; we lost all morning sunlight into the rear living area of our home.*
- *The loss of sunlight and daylight and feeling of number 41 being dominant and overbearing has had a severe impact on the enjoyment of our home and wellbeing. We find the existing building to be extremely oppressive.*

*To try and regain some daylight to the living area of our home, we designed and built our extension to mitigate some of the loss of amenity and in such a way as to have no impact on our neighbours.*

*The proposals to further extend number 41 so close to the boundary will greatly increase the loss of amenity we have endured since the previous extensions to number 41 were constructed. We consider the current proposals to be very unneighbourly.*

*When the estate was built, permitted development rights were removed. PD rights were removed from the properties to protect neighbour amenity from inappropriate extensions such as those proposed under the current planning application.*

*A 3 metre high wall so close to her boundary running for a distance of well over 5 metres beyond the two storey building on our boundary will be very dominant and overbearing.*

*These negative impacts would not be so great if the properties were positioned so that their main rear walls were on the same line, but this is not the case.*

*We question, given previous extensions to the property, why such a large extension spanning over 7 metres across the rear of the property is needed. Why do the plans show that the property will have two living rooms on the ground floor?*

*We feel that there is scope for the proposed extension to be set well back from the boundary and still provide a very reasonable sized extension to the property. At present a very large extension is proposed on a property that has already been substantially extended in the past.*

*Issues of overdevelopment and design are questioned but understandably we are most concerned about the direct negative impacts of the proposals on the enjoyment of our home and garden.*

*Their garden appears much larger due to a landgrab at the rear of the property.”*

The resident thanked the committee for listening to her comments. The public were in turn thanked by the Chair for attending and providing their comments, and were then invited to remain in the meeting and listen to the discussion if they wished.