MINUTES OF THE BIGBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING

11th NOVEMBER 2020

PRESENT: Cllr Valerie Scott (Chairman), Cllr Stuart Watts, Simon Bronstein, Jill Gubbins and Jo Simes.

APOLOGIES: No apologies required as all of the Members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF NEW PLANNING APPLICATIONS:

Prior to the meeting Valerie Scott had advised that there was just one planning application that she would like to discuss. This was in relation to the revised plans which had been submitted for the alterations and extensions to Seaspray, Warren Road, Bigbury on Sea (Application Ref: 2068/20/HHO). All Members had viewed the site by looking at the proposed development from Warren Road and at the end of Cleveland Drive where the house can be viewed from across the rear garden of Quarterdeck, the property immediately to the south of Seaspray. Valerie Scott and Jill Gubbins had also been able to view the property from the rear garden of Westridge and The Lookout, which are two properties to the north of the site.

Seaspray 2069/20/HHO:

All of the Members of the Committee considered that the proposed alterations and extensions to the property which is currently a single storey 3 bedroom bungalow to a 5 or 6 bedroom two storey house should be refused for the following reasons set out below.

1. The house will involve a significant increase in the size, massing and height of the existing property and the proposed development was completely out of proportion in its scale with the size of other dwellings in this locality, including the bungalow which lies immediately to the south of the site. The four properties to the north of the site have all been rebuilt in the last 10 years or so and were of a size which had themselves resulted in loss of amenity to adjoining and nearby properties. The policies of the Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan sought to resist development of this type, which resulted in unneighbourly forms of development.
2. The massing, height and scale of the proposed first floor rear extension, together with the increase in the height of the roof at its northern end would result in an overdominant and intrusive impact on the neighbouring properties particularly in relation to Quarterdeck to the south but also to a lesser degree to Westridge and The Lookout.
3. The proposed balcony to the bedroom on the first floor at the northern end of the property could give rise to overlooking of the neighbouring houses of Westridge and The Lookout and the proposed privacy screen was of an insufficient height to prevent this overlooking.
4. The proposed balcony to this first floor bedroom would also result in undue noise and disturbance to neighbouring propertie. There is no need for balconies at the first floor level having regard to the amount of garden space and the excellent views from the ground floor living/dining and patio areas.
5. The proposed full height window on the gable end of the property facing would result in increased light and pollution and it is also unnecessary to have window of this size to serve a bedroom where there is also a large window provided as part of a dormer roof extension. There is also no need for the rooflights which will also result in light pollution and loss of amenity to the adjoining properties.
6. In terms of avoiding light pollution the committee also recommends that if any permission is granted on this site there should be a condition attached that there should be no external lighting without prior permission.
7. Any permission for development on this site should also be subject to a condition that permitted development rights for further extensions or outbuildings be removed and that the proposals should be designed to ensure that the development does not result in an increase carbon emissions with measures taken to reduce these as far as possible.
8. The increase in the size of the property, which is used throughout the year as a holiday let is likely to result in excessive levels of noise and disturbance and an increased amount of vehicular traffic with insufficient car parking space being provided. The property currently has three bedrooms on the ground floor. The revised plans show two further double bedrooms on the first floor, plus a very large snug/TV room, which could itself be used as a bedroom to accommodate two to four people. The property would therefore be capable of accommodating up to six households or 12 or possibly 14 people.
9. As well as the concerns about the problems which would be caused by the increased intensity of the use of this property the Neighbourhood Plan Committee question whether a property of this size, used for most of the time as a holiday let, could still be regarded as a Class C3 use ie a dwellinghouse for a family or for groups of up to six people living together as a single household. In the opinion of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee the proposed development would result in a change of use of the premises which would not be appropriate on this site.
10. The proposals show provision for three car parking spaces but it is unclear whether all of these car parking spaces could be independently accessed with sufficient room to enable the driver of each vehicle to access and leave the site in forward gear. Warren Road is a very narrow road and reversing onto this road could cause highway safety problems.

Having regard to the above it was considered that the proposed development would be in conflict with the requirements of Bigbury Neighbourhood Plan Policies BP7 – General design principles for new development criteria (i), (ii), (vi) and (vii) and Policy BP27 – Car parking as follows:

BP7 i) Proposals should reflect the appearance and character of the area in which the development is located and should not result in excessive amounts of glazing resulting in unreasonable levels of light pollution;

BP7 ii)   The height, scale and density of development should reflect the existing grain, height, density and pattern of development in the surrounding area;

BP7 vi)  Proposals should protect residential amenity and should not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers by reason of loss of outlook, loss of important views, overbearing and dominant impact., noise or other disturbance.

BP27 Proposals for housing development will be required to provide a minimum of three parking spaces for units of 3 or more bedrooms.

In addition, the proposals would be contrary to the Joint Local Plan Policies DEV1 - Protecting health and amenity, DEV2 – Air, water, soil, noise and light, DEV10 – Delivering high quality housing and DEV20 – Place shaping and the quality of the built environment.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS:

The committee thought that it would be useful if Ian Bramble could attend the Neighbourhood Plan Committee meetings. He would then be able to set it up using his Zoom licence which allowed more than 40mins and could also possibly take the minutes. Valerie Scott agreed to ask him if he would be willing to do this. She also mentioned that the Parish Clerk for the Thurlestone Neighbourhood Plan Committee attended the meetings and took the minutes.

Members were advised that an application had been recently submitted for the Herb Heaven development on the road which runs past Dukes Mill (Ref: 1996/290/FUL). This was to be considered as a late Agenda item at the Bigbury Parish Council meeting to be held the following day. The plans and documents were sent to Members after the meeting by Valerie Scott with an email requesting that any comments from the Members should be received before the Parish Council Committee meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

There was no date set for the next meeting but this will probably be arranged prior to the next Parish Council meeting if any planning applications which require the committee’s comments are received.