



# DARTMOOR LOCAL PLAN

guiding planning applications in Dartmoor National Park

Report of Issues Consultation 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2016 – 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017

Consultation: Issues for the new Local Plan



April  
2017

This document sets out the main comments received to the Local Plan Issues Consultation 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2016 – 13<sup>th</sup> January 2017. It contains notes of:

- The written comments received during the consultation
- A summary of the main discussions at each consultation drop-in event
- Dartmoor Forestry Group – meeting notes
- Farmer’s Kitchen Table meetings – meeting notes
- Parish Council Workshop – meeting notes
- Agents/Architects Workshop – meeting notes

The first section sets out a summary of the 1,821 individual written comments received from 203 different individuals and organisations. The second section sets out a summary of the discussion at the consultation drop-in events and workshops and meetings held during the consultation period.

We have aimed to summarise the views and represent the majority of comments, and also include those with different views. Individual/detailed comments on sites and settlements are not included in this summary but will be taken on board in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, the settlement strategy and any allocation of sites at the next stage in preparing the local plan.

The comments received will sit alongside the evidence being gathered on different topic areas, and will influence the first draft of the local plan, which will also be published for public consultation.

Thank you to everyone who took the time to submit comments, and we hope you will continue to stay involved and comment further as we write the new local plan.

Join the discussion:



Twitter@DartmoorPlan



Facebook/DartmoorPlan

[www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/localplan)

[forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk](mailto:forwardplanning@dartmoor.gov.uk)

01626 832093

## Summary

The main subject areas raised through the consultation were as follows:

- **Affordable Housing** – there is a continued wish to focus on affordable housing for local people. There remains an issue around government’s definition of affordable housing and whether that actually delivers genuine affordable housing on Dartmoor. There is a broad range of views around what ‘local’ actually means.
- **Housing** – there is a view that we could provide better policy guidance around self-build and low impact dwellings. There is an interest in ‘local occupancy’ (i.e. locally restricted, but not restricted as affordable), and concern around the continued increase in second home ownership and its impacts.
- **Settlements** – many consider that some smaller villages might be able to accommodate more development than under current policy (though still at a comparatively low level), and more of a mix, in order to sustain the vibrancy and services in small settlements.
- **Agriculture and forestry** – it is considered that the local plan might be more flexible around barn conversions for farm workers and farm families, but there are concerns that there is currently too much new housing in the open countryside. There is a view that the role of forestry should be more prominent in the local plan.
- **Business and economy** – improved mobile and broadband services are high priority. New businesses appropriate for Dartmoor should be encouraged to locate here.
- **Environment** (habitats and wildlife, landscape, archaeology, and listed buildings) – it is considered that most policies are currently achieving what they should, subject to some revisions

## TOPIC 1 - Strategy and Planning Applications

Including the overall strategy for where new development is allowed, design issues, amenity, and flooding

<p><b>1.1</b> What makes your village or town a good place to live, and what do we need to do to protect it, or improve it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong sense of community</li> <li>• A good balance of people, houses, and services</li> <li>• Enough recreational and artistic and cultural amenities to support a community without the need to travel</li> <li>• Schools, community halls etc as a focal point</li> <li>• Key services where possible, post office, bank, shop</li> <li>• Mix of employment opportunity</li> <li>• Infrastructure: broadband, public transport, parking, access to road network</li> <li>• Demographic balance, farming community, young professionals, families, older people, first time buyers/renters</li> <li>• Respect and protection of surrounding environment, and easy access to it, sense of rurality</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.2</b> The current strategy concentrates development in larger villages and towns with just development which is needed locally in some smaller villages. How do we get this balance right in the new local plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resist second homes, continue to focus on affordable housing</li> <li>• Value community-led development (e.g. community land trusts)</li> <li>• Accurate assessments of housing need and not a pursuit of government targets</li> <li>• A broader range of small development, including in small villages, not just larger villages and towns</li> <li>• Not all smaller villages are the same and some could better accommodate new development</li> <li>• Matching improved infrastructure or employment to housing growth</li> <li>• Current approach seems to work well</li> <li>• Increased levels of conversions and self-builds</li> <li>• Reduce opportunity for new homes in open countryside</li> <li>• Continue the balance of managing communities with environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.3</b> Does the approach of supporting different levels of development in Local Centres (larger villages and towns), and Rural Settlements (smaller villages) need to change, if so how?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase options/flexibility</li> <li>• Need to increase the opportunity for smaller villages to avoid stagnation</li> <li>• Housing growth should focus in larger towns where the infrastructure exists</li> <li>• Current strategy works, no change is needed</li> <li>• Focus on local need not wider housing targets</li> <li>• Avoid sprawl</li> <li>• Consider opportunities around conversions</li> <li>• More development should be allowed</li> <li>• Too much development is currently allowed</li> <li>• Reduce the level in the open countryside and focus on settlements</li> <li>• Support low impact greenfield development</li> </ul>

<p><b>1.4</b> Is new development in the National Park well designed, and well built?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development can look too 'urban'</li> <li>• New development can lack variety</li> <li>• Design is subject so impossible to please everyone</li> <li>• New development on Dartmoor is generally well designed</li> <li>• Need to focus on energy efficiency</li> <li>• Need to enforce where necessary - particular larger developers</li> <li>• Be innovative, modern, and develop new vernacular</li> <li>• Some small recent developments are well designed</li> <li>• New homes are too big and not affordable</li> <li>• New homes are too small for a family</li> <li>• Require use of better quality and modern materials</li> <li>• New development should be lower density</li> <li>• New development should be higher density</li> <li>• Consider the role of low impact development/One Planet living</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.5</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic? (see also Topic 7 - Towns, Villages and Development Sites)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge around balancing good design with affordability</li> <li>• Updates required to Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), opportunities to note around small watercourses and catchment flood management</li> <li>• Need for a surface water flood risk policy</li> <li>• More parking needed for new houses</li> <li>• Need to consider cross-boundary and wider Dartmoor influence (including to north and west)</li> <li>• Consider farming housing needs and low impact development in the open countryside</li> <li>• Too much development is allowed in the open countryside</li> <li>• Bungalows should be retained and not replaced</li> <li>• Large houses should be demolished and replaced with higher density development</li> <li>• Presumption in favour of sustainable development needs to be clearer</li> <li>• Need to consider where how need is identified when a settlement or site may be at the fringe of a parish</li> <li>• Consider appropriate places within policy to reference designing out crime</li> </ul>

## TOPIC 2 - Environment

Including habitats and wildlife, landscape, archaeology, and listed buildings

<p><b>2.1</b> How should the local plan strike the right balance between protecting habitats and wildlife, and allowing new development?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better recognition of role of gardens and buildings for wildlife</li> <li>• Current policies are effective</li> <li>• DNPA should remember its priorities and not be pressured by government to focus on housing and economy</li> <li>• New development should be focussed within and around existing settlements</li> <li>• Focus on brownfield over greenfield</li> <li>• Need to recognise importance of habitat connectivity</li> <li>• Recognise the role farming plays in protecting habitats and wildlife</li> <li>• Consider dark night skies</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.2</b> How should we protect Dartmoor's landscape from inappropriate change?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise that change is inevitable</li> <li>• Consider each site or area on its merits</li> <li>• Require development to have a low impact on the environment</li> <li>• Consider impacts of change outside the National Park</li> <li>• Effective use of the planning system</li> <li>• Focus development in existing towns and villages and not the open countryside</li> <li>• Increase scrubbing up</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.3</b> How should the local plan conserve and enhance Dartmoor's archaeology, conservation areas and historic buildings?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce scrubbing up</li> <li>• Important to focus on protecting finite archaeological resource</li> <li>• Current policies are effective</li> <li>• Consider reasonable changes needed to protect historic building</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.4</b> How do we ensure our farm buildings and farmsteads are protected from poor development, and find viable new uses if they are no longer in use?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on local needs to reduce wealthier incomers buying and not using</li> <li>• Sympathetic change, which is preferable to new build</li> <li>• More relaxed approach</li> <li>• Tighter planning rules to restrict their use</li> <li>• Better monitoring and enforcement</li> <li>• Think carefully about the placement of modern farming buildings</li> <li>• Continue to allow employment, tourism, business, arts and craft opportunities</li> <li>• Avoid a further increase in the number/proportion of second homes</li> </ul>
<p><b>2.5</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider climate change in decision making</li> <li>• Focus case by case and on evidence based decision making</li> <li>• Habitat, wildlife and landscape should be the priority</li> <li>• Need to reduce impact on Dartmoor of growth in Teignbridge and Plymouth</li> </ul>

## Topic 3 - Housing

Including new housing, conversions, affordable housing, homes for agricultural workers, and self-build

<p><b>3.1</b> Should we plan to meet Dartmoor's entire housing requirement, or should we continue to prioritise local need and affordable housing?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritise affordable housing for local needs</li> <li>• Prioritise affordable housing to buy and rent</li> <li>• Reduce 'right to buy'</li> <li>• No new second homes</li> <li>• Consider the range of housing needs in the area</li> <li>• Recognise need for open market housing for balance and viability</li> <li>• Consider in line with guidance the Objectively Assessed Need before applying appropriate policy constraint</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.2</b> How might the local plan be more flexible to meet the needs of younger people, gypsies and travellers, older people, farm and rural workers and other employees, or self-builders?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider the impact of allocation on land availability for self-build projects</li> <li>• Carefully tie new rural workers houses, and annexes so they continue to be available</li> <li>• Better guidance around DMD30 and potential for low impact living</li> <li>• Recognise the need for a mix of type, tenure and delivery</li> <li>• Appropriate evidence is needed to understand the needs of gypsies and travellers</li> <li>• Recognise needs of older people (sheltered accommodation etc)</li> <li>• Recognition of key workers</li> <li>• Consider role of conversion of traditional buildings for farm succession</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.3</b> The current local plan restricts affordable housing to local people in housing need, who cannot afford to buy a house. Should we look at different restrictions such as 'local occupancy' (local, but not affordable), or 'principal residence' (not a second home) for new homes on Dartmoor?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local occupancy (separate from affordable) should be considered</li> <li>• Consider how local might also include people working in or connected with the area</li> <li>• Principal residence should be considered, second homes should be discouraged</li> <li>• Danger that restrictions impact on viability and mortgageability</li> <li>• Right to Buy should not be allowed in the National Park</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4</b> What, in your opinion, makes someone a 'local' person?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employed in the national park</li> <li>• Ability to cater for those who have gone away and want to come back</li> <li>• Consider a points system</li> <li>• Living in the national park for a period of time (3/5/10/20/25 yrs)</li> <li>• Someone who contributes to the community</li> <li>• Current definition is appropriate</li> </ul>

<b>3.5</b> Should we continue to limit the size of extensions and replacement houses, if so, how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Current policy should be retained</li><li>• Size of extensions should not be restricted</li><li>• Case by case approach</li><li>• Important in retaining a more affordable stock and preventing the loss of smaller houses</li></ul>
<b>3.6</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider role of Community Land trusts and self-build</li><li>• Consider making explicit reference to rent, and the RentPlus housing delivery model</li></ul>

## Topic 4 - Communities, Services and Infrastructure

Including health and education facilities, sport and green space, roads, parking and transport

<p><b>4.1</b> Who do you think should pay to support existing and new services and infrastructure needed in the National Park, and how?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parish councils, district council, county council, DNPA, central government as appropriate</li> <li>• Just central government</li> <li>• Developers (through S106 contributions)</li> <li>• The appropriate utilities or service providers</li> <li>• Local businesses</li> <li>• Tourists</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.2</b> Please help us to update our Infrastructure Delivery Plan. What services and infrastructure do you believe need improving in your community? (see also TOPIC 1)</p>	<p>Services and infrastructure relating to specific communities, including: rail and bus services, post office, mobile phone and broadband services, renewable energy, community halls/arts centres, footpaths and cycle routes, employment space, car parking, flood prevention, schools, and healthcare.</p>
<p><b>4.3</b> Where development outside the National Park, such as housing, has an impact on Dartmoor, should it be expected to pay for projects or works which reduce that impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes (most comments)</li> <li>• No (few comments)</li> <li>• Developers should pay</li> </ul>
<p><b>4.4</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Former NHS sites no longer required should be redeveloped</li> <li>• Continue to support communities in resisting the loss of services as DNPA did in Ashburton and Holne</li> <li>• Consider potential of Community Infrastructure Levy</li> <li>• Congestion and parking is an issue</li> <li>• Consider how to include opportunities for arts and culture</li> <li>• Where necessary developer contributions should be sought where necessary to make improvement to the national rail network</li> </ul>

## Topic 5 – Business, Economy and Leisure

Including shops, business premises and employment sites, farming, horse keeping, and tourism

<p><b>5.1</b> How do we ensure farming on Dartmoor can be sustainable, both in economic and environmental terms?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through diversification</li> <li>• Support hill farmers</li> <li>• Clear guidance for funding and development opportunities for farmers</li> <li>• Support small business and rural enterprise</li> <li>• Facilitating farm succession</li> <li>• Return to traditional farm scale and methods</li> <li>• Modernise and commercialise farming</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.2</b> The current local plan focusses on expanding existing business sites and premises. Should the new local plan give more opportunities for new business to locate in the National Park?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, support new incoming small business in appropriate places (most comments)</li> <li>• Encourage into existing buildings and premises</li> <li>• Support new land based business</li> <li>• No, the national park should not have new business (some comments)</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.3</b> The current local plan restricts the use of holiday homes, to ensure they are available for this use and do not become open market housing. Should the new local plan be more flexible around other short term use of holiday homes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, (most comments)</li> <li>• No (some comments)</li> <li>• Encourage or require change to short term lets or affordable housing</li> <li>• Allow winter lets</li> <li>• Do not allow them to become second homes</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.4</b> An increasing number people who live on Dartmoor work from home. How could the local plan help to meet the needs of these home workers?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting better broadband and mobile coverage</li> <li>• Improve public transport</li> <li>• Allow domestic extensions for home office/business space</li> <li>• Provision of communal facilities/work hubs</li> </ul>
<p><b>5.5</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local plan could better recognise value of arts and culture</li> <li>• Better support for tourism, including campsites</li> <li>• Consider signage policy (some suggestions too tight, some too loose)</li> </ul>

## Topic 6 - Minerals, Waste and Energy

Including quarrying, waste, and renewable energy

<p><b>6.1</b> The current local plan resists large renewable energy development on Dartmoor, but allows for smaller projects. Is this the right approach to take?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, current approach should be sustained</li> <li>• Large scale renewable energy is not appropriate on Dartmoor</li> <li>• Renewable energy must be considered alongside more sustainable/energy efficient building</li> <li>• Encourage most appropriate renewable source on Dartmoor – hydro, ground source heat</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.2</b> What changes are needed to current minerals policies so they effectively control the operation and impact of existing and new quarries?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Careful assessment of highway impacts</li> <li>• Consideration of economic benefits of minerals extraction</li> <li>• Review of safeguarding areas</li> <li>• Clear requirements around environmental protection</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.3</b> The current local plan resists large scale quarrying, but supports small scale building stone quarries. Is this the right approach to take, and should we be more encouraging of local building stone quarries?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage small scale stone quarries from former or existing sites (most comments)</li> <li>• No further large scale quarrying</li> <li>• Small scale stone for local refurbishment and building projects within the area</li> <li>• Local sources reduce carbon footprint of imports</li> <li>• Recognise small scale may not be viable – large may be necessary</li> <li>• No new quarrying in the National Park (some comments)</li> </ul>
<p><b>6.4</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fracking is not appropriate in the National Park</li> <li>• Recognise role of secondary aggregates</li> <li>• Better quality design with materials from local sources</li> <li>• Recognise role of community level waste management/recycling/reuse</li> <li>• Consider small/community scale renewables to improve settlement self-sufficiency</li> </ul>

## Topic 7 – Towns, Villages and Development Sites

Including policies for specific towns and villages, and land allocated for development

<p><b>7.1</b> We must show we can deliver housing over the life of the local plan, or we will not be able to defend planning decisions in the future. What is the best way to make sure Dartmoor’s towns and villages have enough land for housing?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocate land for housing</li> <li>• Allocate in the local centres</li> <li>• Consider carefully the viability of allocations in line with the NPPF</li> <li>• Plan for a mix of housing on different sites, and different delivery including Community Land Trusts (CLTs)</li> <li>• Focus on brownfield over greenfield</li> <li>• Involve communities in identifying sites</li> <li>• Make best use of underused or derelict sites</li> <li>• Allow towns and villages to expand</li> <li>• Appropriate surveys to understand need</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.2</b> Should we allocate sites for housing development in the main settlements?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes (most comments)</li> <li>• Consider allocating in smaller settlements too</li> <li>• No, it leads developers to get land over Community Land Trusts (CLTs)</li> <li>• Involve communities in process</li> <li>• Ensure infrastructure is appropriate</li> <li>• Need to review allocated sites which have failed to come forward to ensure they are deliverable in the future</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.3</b> Should we allocate sites for employment uses, and other mixed uses or redevelopment?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, in the right places and where it is needed</li> </ul>
<p><b>7.4</b> Do you have land in or adjoining a town or village which could be available for housing or employment development in the future? If so you may complete a separate form <b><a href="http://www.dartmoor.gov.uk/LAA">www.dartmoor.gov.uk/LAA</a></b> to submit land for assessment.</p>	<p>-</p>

<p><b>7.5</b> Do you have any other thoughts or comments about this topic?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing should be prioritised in the communities with the most appropriate infrastructure</li> <li>• Recognise change is necessary</li> <li>• Consider role of Community Land Trusts</li> <li>• Reduce land banking</li> <li>• Better emphasise the role of agriculture in the local plan</li> </ul>
--	---

***Other general written comments:***

<p><b><i>Decision making</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for consistency, need for flexibility,</li> <li>• Opportunity to improve planning officers' practical knowledge of farming, forestry and land management</li> <li>• Planning advice needs to be improved</li> <li>• Continue wide consultation - do not assume Parish Councils represent their communities</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Working with Communities</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offer regular training for Parish Councils</li> <li>• Use Community Land Trusts (CLTs) to deliver housing</li> <li>• Set up a Dartmoor Community Land Trust</li> <li>• Use Neighbourhood Development Plans, Village Design Statements and Parish Plans effectively</li> </ul>

## Consultation drop-in events – summary of discussions

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Yelverton - Memorial Hall</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	01 November 2016 (16.00-19.30)
<b>Officers:</b>	Dan Janota, Alex Gandy
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 45
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highways – some concerns regarding proposed parking/highway changes around Eastella/Westella Road, Grenville Park.</li> <li>• Highways – some discussion around potential increased use of the A386 – traffic pressure and impact on Yelverton. An interest in and fair amount of discussion around a ‘bypass’ road across the common. Mixed reception – some recognise value, some concerned about impact, some concerned about the scale of development needed to pay for it.</li> <li>• Highways – A few people interested in the proposal for a new bike path through the centre of Yelverton which is being explored by DCC.</li> <li>• Plymouth fringe – a few described issues around cycling on the A386 at Roborough Down (cycleway not fit for purpose) and Yelverton being used as an informal park and ride by commuters car sharing into Plymouth. A number of concerns that growth on the edge of Plymouth will lead to increase use of the A386, increased use of the Shaugh Road as a rat run, and increased recreational pressure upon Roborough Down, Burrator etc.</li> <li>• Housing sites – some discussion around options for future housing, recognition of a need to provide affordable housing, question of how genuinely affordable it is. Limited discussion on specific sites, though some concerns regarding land off Meavy Lane previously put forward.</li> <li>• Housing need – discussion around need for modest housing for elderly residents downsizing and for those in social rented houses to move into.</li> <li>• Agricultural conversions – one persons’ concern at existing policy which prioritises conversion of historic agricultural buildings to holiday let rather than permanent residential. Recommended that conversions could be made available for local occupancy or principle residence, not second home ownership.</li> <li>• Infrastructure – some discussion around the lack of a primary school in Yelverton, and around the limited infrastructure in some other settlements – a question around where is the most appropriate place in the parish for growth and change.</li> <li>• Quite a few people seeking to understand what the emerging Neighbourhood Plan does, and how it fits in with the local plan</li> </ul>	

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Mary Tavy - Coronation Hall</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	02 November 2016 (16.00-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Alex Gandy, Stephen Belli
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 20

- Primary School - opinion that it is struggling with capacity, old building with little room or scope for either improvement or even temporary classrooms. Some concerns about separation of playing field some distance away from school and dangers for school children having to walk along road with no footways.
- Suggestion that the site earmarked for a new school could be housing land instead and the money reinvested in a school on a different site.
- Continued support for the redevelopment of the Down's and Body's Garages sites.
- Some concerns raised about tight restrictions on open market housing and this should be relaxed to allow a greater mix of housing to come forward.
- Several people concerned about current polices on conversion of historic agricultural buildings which don't allow for permanent residential occupation. Concern the number of holiday lets and second home ownership in the Parish was too high and that releasing some agricultural conversions for use by local people might help ease this.
- Employment space - discussion around regarding the need for small affordable employment space as part of mixed use development to ensure the village retains economic vitality
- General concern that without new employment Mary Tavy would increasingly become a commuter village for Plymouth and Tavistock.
- Infrastructure - planning policies should be sufficiently flexible to allow internet upgrades.

<b>Location:</b>	<b>South Brent - Old School Community Centre</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	07 November 2016 (16.00-19:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Stephen Belli, Chris Hart
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 35

- Employment policy – view that we should be more supportive of small and micro business
- Highway - traffic problems and congestion in the village centre as well as parking problems, Parish Council land at old station a potential solution.
- Highways – View that child safety to and from school on narrow roads in village is a real issue. Need for safe walking routes to school.
- Site allocations - Harwell Lane residents suggested we allocate all sites (no exception sites) as they had assumed they were 'safe' from new development
- Housing - no allocated sites for open market housing, affordable housing and allowed as exception sites only
- Harwell Lane residents concerned self-build scheme will diminish circular walks quality by increasing traffic and pedestrian conflict, countered by views in support of the scheme concerned negative voices would stop local affordable housing from coming forward
- Housing viability - Viability studies on housing schemes should be more transparent
- Affordable housing - Affordable rent levels too high
- Gypsy and traveller policy – ensure evidence base is up to date
- Settlement boundary - general support for settlement boundary at South Brent

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Chagford - Endecott House</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	10 November 2016 (16.30-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Stephen Belli, Dan Janota, Jo Rumble
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 60
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some concerns expressed regarding potential for new school</li> <li>• Some contrary views put forward that a new school opportunity should be grasped</li> <li>• A number of comments regarding affordable housing site at Lamb Park – should this allocation allow for a portion of self-build rather than just all affordable.</li> <li>• Suggestion that policies in Drewsteignton should be relaxed to support the future vitality of the village</li> <li>• Some discussed Crannaford's, for example potential to be extended for small start-up business units to reduce out commuting from Chagford, better linkage with Chagford, need for a full height repair garage</li> <li>• General support for settlement boundary and conservation area designation in south west Chagford area being retained</li> <li>• General concerns regarding Blue Cedar development, cost of units to high excessive and may not be accessible for older people in Chagford to downsize</li> <li>• Support for the outcomes achieved through the Bretteville/Bellacouche development including the new public car park, affordable housing and road linking with Westcott Lane</li> <li>• Some sought clarification around the S106 agreement at Bretteville/Bellacouche, including some misunderstandings around sums of money and the mechanism used to deliver the planning gain on the site.</li> <li>• Need noted for a new cemetery/additional burial space in the town</li> <li>• A discussion around DMD30, and support for clarity and action on climate change, also opportunity for one planet development policy</li> </ul>	

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Princetown</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	14 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 (16:00-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Jo Rumble, Alex Gandy
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 20

- Distillery –largely positive views about the potential economic benefit it will bring to Princetown
- Agricultural conversions – Local farmer concerned at existing policy which prioritises conversion of historic agricultural buildings to holiday let rather than permanent residential. Understood the threat of second home ownership and that such units would not likely be affordable but consideration that conversions could be made available for local occupancy or agricultural workers dwelling
- Agricultural conversions – discussion around whether existing approach, whereby external envelope of building must remain largely unaltered, is appropriate. Discussed the principle that conversion is only justified because of a building’s historic significance and therefore justifies protection of its external appearance.
- Farmsteads –questioning the approach of limiting the size of farmhouses and expressed concern at how DNPA was encouraging they be designed. After discussion he understood that there is a need to control the overall cost of a farm unit (including the farmhouse) so that it remains viable for prospective future farmers.
- Prison – Residents were concerned about the closure of the prison and believed there should be a design brief and masterplan in place to ensure it is put to productive use. Discussion around the associated difficulties and uncertainty over closure.
- Meavy – Two residents concerned at recent proposal to build housing. Residents did not believe Meavy was an appropriate location for development and that there was no housing need in the village
- Sourton Down – Small business owner in Sourton and Bridestowe Parish highlighted the need for affordable employment space in the parish

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Moretonhampstead - Community Centre</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	16 November 2016 (16.00-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Stephen Belli, Dan Janota, Jo Rumble
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 50
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DMD 30 - guidance needs to be clearer – confusion about whether policy is intended to allow permanent dwellings and if so of what type or construction. Should be more amenable to timber structures (constructed from sustainable materials) which give more permanency on site. (This was from a member of the public rather than anyone connected with the STW community itself)</li> <li>• Strategic - Environmental policies within local plan should be retained and NP protection should continue</li> <li>• Thompson’s Depot – views that it is generating more traffic again with new contracts from other companies seeing increased lorry maintenance and use of the site</li> <li>• Thompsons Depot - needs to be redeveloped as a first option before greenfield sites considered</li> <li>• Affordable housing - Affordable rent should be encouraged but rent that is truly affordable. Some support for local occupancy conditions as an alternative to affordable</li> <li>• Betton Way site - preferred to any other greenfield sites. Obvious next place to develop.</li> <li>• Pedestrian safety near school for children and safe routes for school should be considered in any new planned developments. Safe crossing points for busy roads becoming an issue</li> <li>• Concerned over some of the more intrusive SHLAA sites such as on the southern entrance to town and to the west of town.</li> <li>• Some support for being more relaxed about conversion of traditional farm buildings to allow farmers some succession planning with family on farm accommodation.</li> <li>• Concern over conversion of isolated rural buildings (former water depot at North Bovey) not being allowed – makes more sense than seeing an ongoing eyesore being retained. Some policy clarity over this type of conversion and re-use of isolated buildings needed</li> <li>• Some support for self-build schemes which should be encouraged either on own site or as part of a larger allocated site</li> </ul>	

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Buckfastleigh - Town Hall</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	22 November 2016 (16.00-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Stephen Belli, Dan Janota, Alex Gandy
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 20

- Devonia site - Many residents querying progress on Devonia site. Mixed views on what would be best for the site, some commenting the existing buildings provide important affordable employment space others believe a high quality mixed use redevelopment would have substantial benefits for Buckfastleigh
- Devonia site - one local resident commented open space to the south should be retained as an open space. In the Conservation Area and backing onto other houses who rely on this area for privacy and access to the rear of their properties
- Affordable Housing - resident concerned about high demand for affordable housing and need for Buckfastleigh to retain younger population
- Retail - one resident's concern at loss of retail viability on high street - need to support high street as priority
- Open space - some concerns about perceived threat to open spaces and land owned by Teignbridge District Council being redeveloped. Support to retain policy on community services being retained
- Parking - starting to become an issue and people are being put off coming into town because of this
- Holne Road site - suggested it was not viable for development with current local plan affordability requirements
- Housing - other sites should be considered for development in place of Holne Road and Barn Park - again considered to have too many constraints and other issues such as poor access. Timbers Road site and land adjacent to Oakland's Park may be preferable to the current allocations.
- One resident commented town needs to be more aspirational in its desire to seek high quality development which will generate new investment.

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Ashburton - Town Hall</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	23 November 2016 (16.00-20:00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Stephen Belli, James Aven
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 25

- Green infrastructure - query around Ashburton-Buckfastleigh-South Brent potential long distance cycleway
- Tuckers Site - Queries about redevelopment at Tuckers and levels of affordable housing.
- Dark skies - Planning policies should encourage dark skies
- Cemeteries - Lack of local burial ground space raised as an issue
- Nursing home - Some concern about development at Kenwyn and access to it
- Flooding - Drainage and flooding issues still a problem
- Dolbeare site - what opportunities might there be for alternative uses for the site (e.g. suggestion of primary school)

## Dartmoor Forestry Group - Meeting Notes

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Forest Inn, Hexworthy</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	17 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 / 11:00 – 13:30
<b>Officers:</b>	Alex Gandy, Dan Janota and Brian Beasley
<b>Attendance:</b>	Bryan Elliott (Chair)(Confor); Claire Partridge (Secretary)(DNPA); Rupert Lane (Rupert Lane Woodlands); Andy Bradford (Dartmoor Woodfuel); Brian Beasley (DNPA); Doug King-Smith; Richard Paton (Forestry Commission); Anton Coaker; Tom Stratton (Duchy Of Cornwall); Jez Ralph (Confor); Kate Tobin (FC); Mike Bracken (Woodland Trust); Mark Prior (FC); Luke Hemmings (Forestry Services); Alex Gandy (DNPA); Dan Janota (DNPA);

- Of principal concern was that the forestry industry was not specifically referred to as an issue in the consultation paper and that this inevitably devalued its perceived importance despite its role alongside agriculture in contributing to Dartmoor's valued landscape and natural environment. Although regrettable, it was recognised in part the omission may have been due to the fact that, until recently, there has been no forestry group representing the forestry industry on Dartmoor and it has limited representation as a whole.
- There was general concern that planning officers were not aware of the needs of forestry and the rationale behind certain development decisions. It was suggested the solution to this is two-fold:
  - Training for planning officers in forestry management/development needs
  - Better explanation by applicants of design rationale at planning application stage
- A further suggestion required DNPA to consult with the forestry commission (FC) on all planning applications. Unlikely to be feasible - statutory consultees already exist for planning applications and FC raised concern over resources
- Query regarding whether DNPA had statistics on economic productivity of forestry sector alone, as it is usually only available combined with agriculture. Unlikely that this is available for DNPA boundary, but may be available for Devon. Consensus this would be a useful indicator of the size of the industry across the county.
- Group were keen to emphasise importance of locally sourced wood for a sustainable economy and the complimentary role the forestry industry has in maintaining the landscape and sustaining tourism.
- The group queried why the National Park Authority hadn't set out a vision for Dartmoor's forestry and agriculture. BB explained there was a moorland vision, but woodland had not seen to be a priority issue at that time (again perhaps due to a lack of representation/voice. It was also explained that use of land for agriculture and forestry (including afforestation) is not development and does not require planning permission, it is not within the scope of the local plan to allocate land for agricultural or forestry use.
- It was considered by local operators that a principal constraint to forestry operations on Dartmoor is available infrastructure, particularly buildings and bridges. Modern forestry lorries cannot cross many of Dartmoor's historic bridges which leads to inflated logistical costs. DNP acknowledged the issue, but emphasised the importance of

carefully weighing up the historical value of such bridges (and costs of changes for relatively limited gain) against the benefit of widening them.

- Of further concern was the growing problem that many employees in forestry on Dartmoor could not afford to live close to their place of work and that agricultural ties disproportionately favour agriculture over forestry.
- Overall it was felt that development policies relating to forestry should be more flexible to allow for innovation which can support the industry and ensure its future success on Dartmoor.
- Agreed that the attendance of the Forward Planning team at the meeting was helpful, and that this would hopefully mark a beginning of better representation of the forestry industry in planning policy, through this group.

## Parish Council Workshop - Meeting Notes

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Parke</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 (14.00-16.00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Dan Janota, Stephen Belli, Alex Gandy, Jo Rumble
<b>Attendance:</b>	Representatives of Parish Town/Council for:  Ashburton, Bovey Tracey, Buckfastleigh, Chagford, Cheriton Bishop, Dartmoor Forest, Dunsford, Gidleigh, Horrbridge, Ilsington, Lustleigh, Lydford, Mary Tavy, Moretonhampstead, Okehampton Hamlets, Sticklepath, Widecombe (17 Parish Councils were represented out of 50 councils invited)

22 Parish Councillors attended the workshop held at DNPA. DJ introduced the workshop by explaining the scope of the current issues consultation. Discussions then occurred on four tables, each facilitated by a planning officer, and focused around the following talking points:

- Do you recognise the role of planning policy in the decisions we make?
- Are we talking with you and your communities in the right way - do you have any suggestions around consultation and engagement?
- What are the main issues we need to consider in the local plan (i.e. where is change needed)?
- What should our priorities be?
- What currently works well, what doesn't? (what are your views on current policy, and the decisions it leads to?)
- Have we missed anything?
- What information do we need to collect to tell us what we need to know?
- What makes you village or town a good place to live, and what do we need to do to protect it, or improve it?
- Does the approach of supporting different levels of development in Local Centres (larger villages and towns), and Rural Settlements (smaller villages) need to change, if so how?
- Is new development in the National Park well designed, and well built?
- Should we plan to meet Dartmoor's entire housing requirement, or should we continue to prioritise local need and affordable housing?
- What, in your opinion, makes someone a local person?
- We must show we can deliver housing over the life of the local plan, or we will not be able to defend planning decisions in the future. What is the best way to make sure Dartmoor's towns and villages have enough land for housing?
-

## **Summary of discussion by main subject areas**

### **Decision making**

- Parish Councillors don't always appreciate policy context and go with local knowledge and gut feeling
- Some Parish Councils do refer to policy, but interpret it differently from planning officers
- Cllrs will ask questions when new but need help in understanding policy making framework
- Planning is only one part of our business and sometimes we need help in understanding policy implications
- It would be useful when looking at planning applications if we had some pointer from the planning dept. as to which policies are pertinent.
- Local face to face with planning staff is good
- Understanding the rationale of decisions by planners would be really good
- That said not all on table realised planning officer reports were available
- Taking views of PCs important as well as showing why those views were not always followed. Good learning then for next similar application.
- Would be of value to know that a large application is coming, and therefore be given more opportunity to respond
- Some acknowledgement that a Parish Councils views form one consideration in a range of others in decision making – and that where these views do not align with local plan policy, Officers may well reach a different view
- Generally feeling that DNPA should be robust in its approach to enforcement so those who flout the rules are not seen to 'get away with it'. However there is also degree of reticence on the part of Parish Councils to investigate themselves or to report local breaches

### **Local Plan - general**

- Welcome the approach taken in the Issues Paper – clear succinct language and easy to engage with and understand
- General understanding from PCs of the importance of the local plan review and recognition of their need to engage, particular if they do not agree with decisions made against current policy
- Acknowledgement that PCs can support DNPA in promoting the local plan review, supporting consultation and representing the views of their parishioners
- Some wanted more flexibility of policy to fit local circumstances, however some wanted increased certainty and greater consistency (some recognition it was practically impossible to achieve both)
- A policy/acronym glossary in the new local plan would be useful, as well as a summary of all policies
- Government changes to policy and what the implications would be helpful to know
- Policy documents should be easy to understand and engaging in how they are set out otherwise they will be ignored
- Existing policy documents are long and complex and difficult for Parish Councils to understand without further training.
- Some felt existing planning policy was not properly considered when Parish Councils made a decision on a planning

application. Consensus that parish councils were more likely to understand policy if it was written in a simple universally understandable manner and supported by training. Good feedback received on design and ease of use of consultation document. All felt this is a good format to produce the local plan in.

### ***Housing***

- Older people looking to downsize is a likely demographic
- Concern around the aging population and how to retain younger people in the smaller communities particularly
- Need for extra care type housing in light of restructuring of care system
- Consider opportunity for self-build plots for local people
- Local occupancy clauses supported
- More flexibility on being allowed to change from holiday use to residential/local occupancy
- Some felt there was an imbalance in some communities between affordable and open market and were not against more open market provided it was on small sites and well designed to fit in locally.
- Conversion and subdivision of large buildings in the countryside to residential was generally supported perhaps with local occupancy clauses to prevent second homes or in migration.
- Conversion of barns or even new build in villages should not be ruled out
- Local means different things to different people but generally consensus was local or adjoining parish
- General view that conversion of historic agricultural buildings should be made available for affordable housing, local people or key workers, but should not be available for sale on the open market or second homes. Existing policy does not support continued occupation of farmsteads given uncertain future of farm subsidies. Allowing residential occupation of historic farm buildings helps support new generation of young farmers and retired farmers
- Managing second home ownership was identified as priorities for the National Park to focus on

### ***Settlement Strategy***

- Sustainable communities means more development
- Rural areas need some small new development even open market to support local schools and services
- Christow would not like to be elevated to a local centre. Want to stay as a village, concerned about more development if they were elevated.
- There was concern over the sustainability of smaller settlements given the current strategic approach to concentrate development in towns and large villages. To combat stagnant populations it was suggested more flexibility be introduced for development within rural settlements with a priority on affordable housing and affordable employment space. Given increased internet availability there is more scope for smaller settlements to accommodate internet businesses. It was suggested that more flexible development policies might first be introduced to settlements in close proximity to an existing Local Centre.
- Some felt that opportunities for low impact residential development do exist and should be allowed in the National

Park in areas of low landscape quality and subject to occupants demonstrating they are live in a highly sustainable manner.

- Housing in Ashburton on starter homes, opportunities for sell build and small pockets of mixed devt. Not sprawl preferred

### **Agriculture**

- Support local agriculture continuation and succession farming by allowing conversion of traditional buildings in courtyards to provide opportunity for family member and retirement opportunity for existing farmer.
- Against conversion of modern agricultural buildings to residential however
- Agricultural ties could be used more creatively to prevent abuse if housing restrictions lifted

### **Design**

- Design guide is not widely known about and not used by Parish Councillors in application consideration
- Differing views around the role of contemporary versus traditional/vernacular design. General support for the design of smaller scale development but a feeling that larger schemes are generic and do not reflect the local area
- Concern existing design policies discourage high quality modern design in favour of backwards looking traditional design. It was recommended that larger window openings and more modern designs in appropriate locations would help improve the quality of new housing across Dartmoor.
- It was felt the National Park could be more flexible with regards modern alterations to historic buildings, in particular allowing installation of sympathetically designed double glazing to improve the energy credentials of historic buildings and make them more desirable and future proof
- Improving sustainability credentials of new development was identified as priorities for the National Park to focus on
- On street parking is an issue

### **Employment/economy**

- Finding a new use for Princetown prison was stated as a key problem for the Authority to solve in the future.
- Overall there was a feeling the National Park did not do enough to encourage and require sustainable design. It was recommended there should be a presumption in favour of small renewable energy projects which do not significantly impact on landscape character.
- It was not felt that green infrastructure was generally an issue and most on the table felt that securing investment to improve existing facilities was more of a priority.
- Local employment should be encouraged but access can be poor limiting opportunities
- Parking for tourists and local people important

## Farm Kitchen Table Meetings - Meeting Notes

<b>Locations:</b>	East Dart Hotel , Postbridge; Glen Iris, Sheepstor; Venton Farm, Widecombe in the Moor; Babeny Farm, Poundsgate
<b>Date/Time:</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> , 17 <sup>th</sup> , 17 <sup>th</sup> , 18 <sup>th</sup> October
<b>Officers:</b>	Dan Janota
<b>Attendance:</b>	Approx 35 members of the farming community (open invitations to attend meetings were advertised by the Dartmoor Hill Farm Project.

In October DNPA's Forward Planning Manager, Dan Janota, attended a series of kitchen table meetings hosted by farmers across the National Park. Meetings in the Postbridge, Sheepstor, Widecombe and Poundsgate areas were attended by approx. 35 members of the farming community in total.

The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the review of the National Park's local plan. This process is considering how planning policy for Dartmoor may change in the future, and the meetings enabled the farming community to share their experience of what currently works, what doesn't, and what their priorities are. The local plan must balance a range of competing priorities, and planning officers are keen to give a broad range of interested parties an opportunity to have input.

Key issues raised at the meetings were -

- Homes on the farm - in particular for the young and the retired - the initial view was that policy should be more relaxed. However on further discussion it became clear that a relaxation opens up opportunities which would not be welcomed (i.e. second homes, farmsteads beyond the affordability of genuine farmers, hobby farming and breaking up of farmsteads and holdings). Most concluded a focus on farming families would be the most appropriate approach to take
- Barn conversions and holiday homes - mixed views on opportunities depending on the area, and the dependency on diversification and alternative incomes to supplement the farm business. There was recognition that the priority remains the farm business. It was considered that holiday home occupancy could be more flexible to allow for short term/winter lets
- New barns - right type and right place? It was considered that planning officers would benefit from a better understanding of farm practice and the reason for specific proposals, equally it was acknowledged that in applications farmers could/should clearly explain the logic and reasoning behind a building, its design, location and justification. Recognition that modern farm practice means there may be a mismatch with the landscape driver of placing new buildings with existing building clusters.
- How to provide opportunity for change, without meaning further loss of farmsteads to non-farmers. It was recognised that opportunity to change can also make farmsteads, farmhouses, buildings and land desirable for uses other than farming. Ultimately this could threaten the special qualities of Dartmoor. Farmers are keen to stress they are the

custodians of the landscape and recognise whilst they need to have the ability to change and farm efficiently and viably, the loss of farming or significant change in farm practice does represent a threat to the Dartmoor landscape

- Visitor impacts - amongst some (generally those on farms of such a scale or tenancy that they have not diversified into tourism) there is a view that increased traffic, walkers, recreational activities and events, dog walkers etc can frustrate the farmer's ability to go about their daily tasks
- Tourism - promoting the right opportunities - it is acknowledged by most that tourism does have a role to play, and that there are opportunities as part of tourism and recreation management, to better educate and inform visitors of the role and importance of farming on Dartmoor, and how they can support it and minimise their own impact

Outside the scope of the Local Plan, people also wanted to talk about:

- Commons management (issues generally around under-grazing and scrubbing up)
- Dog walking, fly tipping, speeding, and off road vehicles (challenging the operation of the farm business)
- Decision making, consistency and accountability (questions around how we can be both flexible, and consistent)
- Planning enforcement (a need to stand up for decision and clearly and publicly take enforcement action against those who flout the rules).

## Agents/Architects Workshop - Meeting Notes

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Parke</b>
<b>Date/Time:</b>	8 <sup>th</sup> November 2016 (08.30-12.00)
<b>Officers:</b>	Dan Janota, Stephen Belli
<b>Attendance:</b>	Jeremy Newcombe, Craig Smith, Ian McDonald, Mick O'Connor, Chris Park

Agents and Architects who work within the National Park were invited to a meeting renewed version of the 'Agent's Forum' DNPA has previously hosted. The agenda included practical/procedural matters, development management, and enforcement as well as an informal session focussing on the local plan review. The key issues raised were as follows:

- Issue in current policy around volume v area criteria – contradictory and can lead to undesirable outcomes in respect of design solutions used to maximise space for the client, over design quality
- Affordable housing – need to recognise that with affordable housing comes an 'administrative' burden of securing sites through S106 etc. If affordable housing is still to be pursued on small sites a simplified approach would be really beneficial
- Parking – a view that parking standards are over the top. Interesting in how this view contradicts that of local communities which consider parking issue to be high on the list of issues, and that DNPA does not require enough on-site parking with residential schemes.
- Within settlement there may be an opportunity to be more flexible on small sites. Consider whether it may be possible to distinguish policy or negotiate case by case on the basis of value areas – recognising that in some places small sites will be readily viable for affordable housing (and more necessary), though in others it may be difficult to achieve and conceivably less important locally
- Local occupancy – some interest in the 'local only' (though not affordable restricted) approach to open up certain opportunities on small sites, though a need for this to be a relatively simple and straightforward restriction
- Opportunity for DNPA to be clearer about requirements on sustainable building
- Carefully consider opportunities for better use of existing sites and buildings
- Consider small scale development on the fringes of settlements which can be more viable and available
- Recognise importance of (and protect) employment sites. Small, good value premises are of importance to smaller communities and can play a role in small scale employment across the National Park
- View that larger allocations, whilst more viable, lead to poor quality and homogenous design. Smaller sites lead to higher quality design, and a more organic approach to the growth of settlements