

IVYBRIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning & Infrastructure Committee held in the Town Hall on Monday 24 May 2021 at 6pm

Present: Cllrs R Jago (Chair), T Bowden, T Munro, T Rea and
A Spencer

In attendance: Mrs J Gilbert (Assistant Town Clerk)

The chair proposed that the public participation be moved from the beginning of the meeting, and the sequence of the planning applications be changed from that laid out in the agenda. The Members agreed with the chair's proposal and the meeting order was changed.

PL21/008 **APOLOGIES:** No apologies were received.

PL21/009 **INTERESTS TO BE DECLARED:** Cllr Spencer declared an interest in Item PL21/011 – 1131/21/HHO 26 Slipperstone Drive, Ivybridge, PL21 9UN, due to the application site bordering the rear boundary of his property.

PL21/010 **MINUTES:** The Minutes of the Planning & Infrastructure Committee meeting held on 10 May 2021 were confirmed as a correct record and were duly signed (previously circulated).

PL21/011 **PLANNING:** The following planning applications were considered:

1190/21/HHO Householder application for conversion of store within garage to provide therapy room – Whitegate, Station Road, Ivybridge, PL21 0AH.

<https://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/211190>

SUPPORT

1362/21/HHO Householder application for replacement conservatory – 42 Berkeley Way, Ivybridge, PL21 0YD.

<https://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/211362>

SUPPORT

***The public participation session took place from
6.05pm to 6.08pm***

Cllr Spencer left the meeting at 6.05pm as he had declared an interest in Item PL21/011 1131/21/HHO and took no part in the discussion.

PL21/011 **PLANNING:** The following planning application was considered:

1131/21/HHO Householder application for proposed two storey side extension and new porch – 26 Slipperstone Drive, Ivybridge, PL21 9UN.

<https://apps.southhams.gov.uk/PlanningSearchMVC/Home/Details/211131>

OBJECTION

The committee shared many of the concerns raised by the resident of 7 Clayman's Pathway. They also wished to relay the issue of poor site notification, as no notices were displayed in Clayman's Pathway, however the proposed extension would adversely affect a number of properties in that street. On this occasion it would have been prudent to have displayed additional notification in Clayman's Pathway as well as Slipperstone Close in order to alert householders that could be potentially affected.

Members considered the proposed extension to constitute overdevelopment due to its density and massing. The proposal would have a visual impact, and appeared dominant and far exceeded half the width of the original house.

The committee agreed that this two storey extension was overbearing due its height and close proximity to the boundaries of the properties to the rear, namely 7 and 9 Clayman's Pathway, creating overlooking and loss of privacy and would thus have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity.

It had been noted that surface attenuation tanks would be implemented, however concerns were also raised about the large impermeable area of the roof elevations, and whether the drainage capacity would be sufficient for the attenuated water runoff in a critical drainage area.

For these reasons the Members of the Committee present unanimously objected to the application. One Member of the Committee had declared an interest and was absent from the discussion and took no part in the decision.

The meeting closed at 6.15pm

Signed:

Date: 7 June 2021

Public Participation 6.05pm to 6.08pm

Mrs Kirstie Spencer, 7 Clayman's Pathway, was in attendance to object to planning application 1131/21/HHO Householder application for proposed two storey side extension and new porch – 26 Slipperstone Drive, Ivybridge, PL21 9UN.

Mrs Spencer thanked the committee for allowing her to speak and for considering her case.

She confirmed that she had already logged an online objection to South Hams District Council regarding the above planning application. Mrs Spencer was also representing Sally and Matt Jarvis at number 9 Clayman's Pathway (they had also logged an objection online).

She had objected to the permitted 'material consideration' as outlined in the South Hams and West Devon Planning Guide, particularly under the heading of 'impact on neighbours'.

She wished to state ahead of outlining her objections two additional points:

1. Although the application affects a number of neighbouring properties in Clayman's Pathway, the statutory notifications were not displayed in Clayman's Pathway and she had heard via word of mouth from friends living in Slipperstone Drive.
2. On page 7 of the Planning Guide, applicants are "encouraged to discuss the application with owners and occupiers of neighbouring properties to ensure that the proposal does not adversely affect their amenity". At no time did the applicants make any attempt to contact or discuss the application with her or number 9 Clayman's Pathway.

Material Considerations logged in her objections:

Layout and density of buildings

Change to layout and directional facing of the property from north east to north and within 1m of her boundary, and will completely fill the south face of her property. The current terrace only has single storey conservatories off the rear of the properties and the other end of the terrace has a single storey extension but doesn't have any impact on neighbours as it is next to a green space.

Scale and Dominance

The extension would be two storey (between 5-6m height) less than 1m from her boundary and approximately 15m from her directly facing windows. It would essentially double the size of the existing property.

Loss of sunlight/overshadowing

At 5-6m high, particularly during the winter months when the sun is lowest, this extension would cause significant over-shadowing and loss of sunlight throughout the day as her property is south facing.

Loss of privacy

The proposed extension is directly facing off of her south facing property – the whole garden and house would be overlooked with no private areas whatsoever. The windows would directly look into her windows at 15-18m distance. Her children's bedrooms are on that face.

She was aware that the closing date for comments is 17 June and was hoping that her comments could be taken forward to the SHDC planning meeting at which this application may be discussed.

Mr Michael Boyne, 11 Clayman's Pathway, was also in attendance to object to the application, and agreed with Mrs Spencer's comments. He wished to further add that although he wasn't certain, he believed there to be a fire escape route beside No 26 that runs along the backs of the gardens of Clayman's Pathway and this would be blocked by the proposed extension.

The chair thanked the members of public for their comments and they remained in the meeting to listen to the discussion on the application.