

**REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE SITE INSPECTION GROUP HELD ON
MONDAY, 23 NOVEMBER 2009**

**(28/1460/09/F) Householder application for alteration and extension to
dwelling – Navicella, Veales Road, Kingsbridge**

Present: Cllr Coulson
Cllr May (Chairman)
Cllr Rowe
Cllr Squire
Cllr Ward

Also in attendance and participating:

Cllr Freeman – Kingsbridge Town Council representative
Cllr O’Callaghan – local Ward Member
Kati Owen – Senior Planning Officer
Darryl White – Member Support Services Manager

Also in attendance and not participating:

The agent, applicant and main objector.

In introducing the application, the Senior Planning Officer (SPO) made particular reference to:

- a) the two elements of the application. Of these two elements, the SPO advised that it was only the gable extension to the north of the application site which was contentious and the focus of the site inspection;
- b) the plans and drawings. With the aid of these diagrams, the SPO outlined the dimensions of the proposals and highlighted that the application sought an increase in height of 0.9 metres on the existing eaves. Moreover, the proposed gable extension would lie approximately 4.2 metres (at the front) from the mutual boundary with ‘Matopo’ (the neighbouring dwelling to the north of the application site);
- c) the impact upon ‘Matopo.’ The SPO provided the Group with drawings submitted from the owners of ‘Matopo’ which illustrated the perceived loss of light and the overbearing nature of the proposals. On this matter, the Group was informed that the SPO had visited ‘Matopo’ and had sat in the conservatory of the property (the room likely to be most affected by the extension). From this visit, the SPO had concluded that whilst there would be some impact upon the dwelling, it was not considered to be so significant to warrant a recommendation of refusal. However, it was noted that the purpose of this site inspection was for Members to judge whether or not they agreed with the officer recommendation.

At this point, the Town Council (TC) representative advised that the TC had reached the same view as the case officer and had raised no objections to this application. The TC was of the view that the architecture and style of the site would be enhanced in the event that this application was conditionally approved.

Furthermore, the representative highlighted the proposed obscure fixed glazed bathroom window, which it was felt would counter any overlooking impact on 'Matopo'.

The local Ward Member stated that whilst it may not have been a decisive factor, the TC had been unaware of the objections to this application when it was considered. The Member proceeded to advise that she had looked at the application site on a number of occasions and did have some concerns in respect of these proposals. In agreement with the owners of 'Matopo', the Member felt that the gable extension would be dominant and overbearing, regardless of the obscure fixed glazed window and remained unconvinced that the consequent loss of light to 'Matopo' would not be significant. In addition, the distance between the two properties was actually believed to be much closer than had been suggested in the presented case officer report.

The local Ward Member also made reference to the relevance of the site planning history and informed that when planning consent was given to develop on this site in the 1970s, it was on the basis that roof lines would be in proportion to the neighbouring bungalows to the north. When this application was discussed at the Development Control Committee meeting on 11 November 2009, the Member reminded those present of the intention for a meeting to be held between all relevant parties in an attempt to find a satisfactory compromise. Since this meeting had yet to be convened, the Member therefore felt it to be reasonable that this application be refused in an attempt for a satisfactory compromise to be reached.

To gauge the relationship between the two properties, the Group proceeded to view the proposals from the southern boundary of 'Matopo' and the northern boundary, rear garden and inside of the application site.

In discussion, reference was made to:-

- (i) the reasons for the gable extension. Some Members acknowledged the restrictive nature of the existing bathroom;
- (ii) the bulk of the proposals. Whilst not totally content with the bulk and mass of the extension, a Member stated that the proposals were not out of proportion within the application site. In stating his view that the proposals did not constitute either overlooking, overdevelopment or being unneighbourly, the Member concluded that there was no justifiable planning reasons to refuse the application;
- (iii) support for the comments of the local Member. A Member felt that the scale of the increase in mass of the dwelling would be so dominating that she could not support this application;
- (iv) the existing street scene. Some Members commented that there was little architectural merit in the existing street scene;
- (v) the distance between the two properties. In echoing the views of the SPO, some Members stated that whilst there would be some impact upon the light of 'Matopo', this was not felt to be so significant to recommend refusal of this application.

The following motion was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was, by 4 votes to 1, declared **CARRIED**:-

RECOMMENDED

That in respect of application number 28/1460/09/F, the application be conditionally approved.

Conditions:

- 1 - TIM3 (Standard time limit 3 years)
- 2 - MAT1 (Matching Materials)
- 3 - RES30A (Windows - exclusion from GDO - Oct 2008)
- 4 - Non Standard
Unsuspect contamination

Reasons for Approval:

- 1 This application has been determined in accordance with Section 38 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which states that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This application has been determined in accordance with approved Development Plan Policies; relevant Government planning policy guidance; and approved in the absence of any other overriding material considerations and having given due weight to all other matters raised in this application including technical and other representations received. The relevant Policies are Structure Plan Policies CO3 and CO6, Local Plan Policies SHDC1 and SHDC15 and Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CS7 and CS9.
- 2 Special regard has been given to the representations about loss of light, outlook and privacy to the neighbouring property, Matopo, but these were not considered to be overriding because although there would be some impact on this neighbouring dwelling, it would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application.

Informatives:

This recommendation refers to the 1:1250 location plan and drawing nos. ACL/744/201, ACL/744/202 & ACL/744/203 received on 14 August 2009.