

Dartmoor National Park Authority

Development Management Committee

Public Minutes of Friday 7 February 2025

Present: Will Dracup, Peter Harper, Gay Hill, Mike Jeffrey, James McInnes, Sally Morgan, Caroline Mott, Mark Owen, Guy Pannell, Mark Renders, Philip Sanders (Chair), Mary Seddon, Peter Smerdon, Dan Thomas, Pamela Woods

Apologies: John Nutley, Lois Samuel, Mark Williams

Non Attendance: Jerry Brook

Officers in attendance: Dean Kinsella (Director of Spatial Planning), Oliver Dorrell (Senior Planning Officer), Nicola Hand (Planning Officer), Penny Bailey (Minute Taker)

The Chair welcomed Corinne Farrell (Independent Person).

The Chair reminded Members on the use of microphones to ensure a clear recording for any members of the public listening to the broadcast and for those sitting in the public gallery.

1604 Declarations of Interest and Contact

Members agreed to declare those interests set out in the matrix attached to the Agenda (Membership of other Council).

The Chair noted email correspondence sent to all Members from Councillor Andrew Swain in his role as Teignbridge District Council Ward member for Teign Valley, in respect of Application No. 0484/24 – Foxview, Christow.

Ms Woods declared a personal interest in Application No. 0484/24 – Foxview, Christow, having received written communication. She also stated that she knew the site, having had the occasion to visit the site, whilst she had been a member of Christow Parish Council in the past.

Mr Jeffrey and Mrs Morgan declared a personal interest in Application No. 0484/24 – Foxview, Christow, having received email communication.

Mr Pannell declared a personal interest in Application No. 0210/24 – Challamoore Field, Buckland-in-the-Moor, his daughter being employed by EE. He advised that he would leave the meeting room for this item.

Mr Harper declared a personal interest in Application No. 0210/24 – Challamoore Field, Buckland-in-the-Moor, due to his having an EE lattice phone mast situated upon his land.

Mr Dracup declared a personal interest in Application No. 0210/24 – Challamoore Field, Buckland-in-the-Moor and advised that both sides had lobbied him. He also

stated that his property was covered within the mapping details in respect of the application and that he would leave the meeting room for this item.

1605 Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 10 January 2025

The public minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2025, having been printed and circulated, were taken as read, confirmed and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

1606 Items Requiring Urgent Attention

None.

1607 Applications to be Determined by the Committee

Mr Pannell and Mr Dracup left the meeting.

Considered: The Report of the Director of Spatial Planning (NPA/DM/25/003).

Item 1 – 0210/24 – Installation of 20m lattice telecommunications tower supporting 9 no. antennas, 2 no. 600mm dishes, together with 1 no. foul weather enclosure, 1 no. generator and 1 no. meter cabinet plus a 1.2m satellite dish and compound fencing for the EAS and Shared Rural Network projects – Challamoor Field, Buckland-in-the-Moor

Speakers: Mr David Burke, Chair, Buckland-in-the-Moor Parish Meeting
Mr Norman Gillan, on behalf of the Applicant

The Case Officer apologised for an error in his presentation in that it noted the incorrect application – 0280/24 rather than the correct number – 0210/24. He advised Members that the proposed 20m lattice mast would form part of the Emergency Services Network (ESN) which was a government backed project which sought to address 'not spots' in the area.

The recommendation of officers was that permission be granted as the benefits would outweigh the harm. An additional condition was recommended as follows:

“13. The power supply to supply the site shall be provided below ground, in accordance with details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, prior to works being carried out.”

The Chair proposed that, in order to gain a balanced view, the application be DEFERRED in order that a Site Inspection be undertaken, which was seconded by Mr Jeffrey and carried by Members.

The Chair advised the speakers that, even though the Site Inspection had been agreed, they still had the opportunity to make their representations to Members.

Mr Burke advised Members that there were two points he wished to make: the first that it was felt that the existing Airwave site at Widecombe was a viable alternative for the mast but that this possibility had not been evaluated properly. The second

point raised was that residents or Buckland-in-the-Moor had not been properly consulted on the proposal.

Mr Burke stated that it would be beneficial to see any information regarding coverage for the proposed mast at Widecombe as well as Challamoor, taking into account the trees on both sites and also what compromises would be possible. With regard to consultation, he advised that it was clear that the landowner or Challamoor Field, as well as Widecombe Parish Council had been approached and consulted. With regard to Buckland-in-the-Moor, a letter was received in October 2023, advising that a mast was going to be erected and giving 14 days in which to respond with comments, which felt very much like a *'fait accompli'*.

Buckland-in-the-Moor would appreciate the opportunity to be properly consulted on the matter and have the proposal compared to the existing Widecombe site.

Mr Gillan, the EE Project Lead, advised Members that the Home Office has been looking for a site in this area since the start of the project in 2016. EE became involved a couple of years ago and has taken on some of their more problematic and challenging sites. The topography of the National Park, heritage designations, environmental designations and other issues have meant that EE has challenges. He stated that the proposal before Members represented a balance. He confirmed that the telegraph pole system, because of the fiberglass construction etc, would not provide what was needed terms of signal; a completely different system would be needed. In addition, EE had considered a site to the north of Widecombe but this was met with negative response at the pre-application stage and so was not pursued.

The Chair reminded Members of their role which would be exactly the same on the site visit. Their role was to look at this application and make a decision as to whether it was considered appropriate to put a mast in that location.

A Member commented that it would be useful to have access to the Tree Officer's report and clarification on the condition of the Ash trees, bearing in mind that these are susceptible to Ash Dieback and, as it currently stood, would ensure some screening of the mast.

Resolved: That the application be DEFERRED for a Site Inspection to be undertaken.

The Chair advised Members that the Site Inspection would take place on Friday 21 February. He asked that the use of a drone be investigated in order that Members could ascertain clarification regarding the potential height of the proposed mast. In addition, it would be helpful to have an indication of the size of the proposed compound.

The Case Officer was requested to make contact with Mr Gillan with regard to the proposed additional condition as mentioned above.

Mr Thomas arrived at the meeting. He declared his interests as those per the matrix.

Mr Pannell and Mr Dracup returned to the meeting.

Item 2 – 0024/24 – Repairs, alterations and the erection of a single storey extension – Glebe House, Holne (Full Planning Permission)

Speaker: Stuart Houlet, Agent for the Applicant

The Chair advised Members that the Director of Spatial Planning would explain both applications – 0024/24 and 0025/24 in one presentation. In addition, Mr Houlet had elected to speak once, for six minutes, covering both the planning application and the application for listed building consent. However, at the end of presentation/questions and debate, two separate votes would be required.

Mr Houlet agent for the applicants, stated that it was the intention of his clients to restore, protect and revive this important building, returning it to a secure and viable family home. On behalf of himself and the applicants, he thanked the officers for their positive approach during the application process and The Director of Spatial Planning for the detailed presentation. He added that his clients have sought to act in the best interest of the property throughout and have worked with the Authority, compromising and amending the scheme significantly in order to address the reasonable concerns of the officers and consultees. The revised proposals have limited impact on the historic form and the fabric of the building which, as the officer's report identified, has been subject to remodelling over the years and is not the historic plan form that the consultees seem to have assumed. Ground floor spaces would be retained in the current layout with any removals being later modern additions. The first floor has been significantly remodelled but original features are to be retained and repaired. The exterior of the building would be enhanced by extensive repairs to original features including windows and render.

Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires in situations where less than substantial harm is identified that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Furthermore, the revised proposals clearly fall within the boundaries of policy 2.7 of the Local Plan which says that extension or alterations to designated Heritage Assets will be permitted provided any harm to significance is less than substantial, justified and outweighed by the public benefits. On that basis it is hoped that Members will support the officer's recommendations for both applications.

In response to Member questions and comments, the Director of Spatial Planning advised as follows:

- Visual impact – the revised plans submitted represent a percentage increase of 30%; the extension would be subservient to the main dwelling. The application continues with the existing use of the site. The proposed extension would be in a position where a much older, greatly deteriorated building once sat.
- Parish Council objections – these have been dealt with as they were based on the original application and plans.
- How the modern design 'fits' with that of the original building – the design does not propose a poor pastiche of the existing dwelling, neither is it so modern that it detracts from everything else on the site. The proposed

design looks to do a bit of both, e.g., use of existing rubble, the pitched roof which may have been used historically.

- The proposed zinc roof and glazing, being modern and contemporary, are positive elements of the design in the opinion of officers. The difference in design and materials help to tell the story of the evolution of the building.
- The veranda roof, rather than zinc to mirror the opposite side of the house and the extension roof, will consist of glass, thus retaining the historic element of this side of the property.
- The reduced glazing to the rear of the extension, into the rear courtyard, together with the overhang of the zinc roof, have been proposed to ensure a continued, clear corridor for bats looking to roost.

Mr Sanders proposed the planning application (0024/24), which was seconded by Mrs Mott.

Mr Pannell proposed that a Site Inspection be undertaken. There was no seconder; therefore, this proposal failed.

Resolved: That, subject to the conditions detailed within the report, permission be GRANTED.

Item 3 – 0025/24 – Repairs, alterations and the erection of a single storey extension – Glebe House, Holne (Listed Building Consent)

Mr Sanders proposed the application for Listed Building Consent (0025/24), which was seconded by Mrs Mott.

Resolved: That, subject to the conditions within the report, consent be GRANTED.

Item 4 – 0484/24 – Retrospective alterations and extension to dwelling with upgrading and re-roofing together with provision of disability footway (amended plans) – Foxview, Christow

Speaker: Sarah Westcott, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the Authority was made aware of an error in the original committee map which accompanied the agenda. This was due to the latest version of the Ordnance Survey Base Layer Mapping not being installed. The red line on the map did not line up correctly with the site address. This had been remedied and the updated; it was confirmed that the website was up to date and officers and consultees were in possession of the correct map.

Members were also made aware of an additional drawing which had been submitted by the agent on 4 February 2025, which provided a proposed landscape and biodiversity enhancement scheme. This would address the requirements of Policy 2.3 which requires biodiversity mitigation enhancement for every twenty square meters of habitable floor space for householder applications.

Mrs Westcott advised that when she and her husband purchased Foxview in 2014, the property had a certificate of lawfulness for residential use and a carport, together with planning consent for the access and curtilage. They had to undertake a complete overhaul of the property two years later and placed a static caravan on the site during lockdown as emergency temporary accommodation. She stated that no works were undertaken without first seeking advice from their architect and planning consultant but that they were wrongly advised that they could extend the property, adding that they had acted in good faith when they undertook the works. Six months after moving in they were notified that there was a problem so stopped all works, seeking advice on how to resolve the issues, from Planning Officers to no avail. There are no permitted development rights; the National Park Authority's residential extensions policy precludes extensions to dwellings that have a certificate of lawfulness.

Mrs Westcott urged Members to undertake a Site Inspection of the property which, in their opinion, creates no harm and would look no different from the roadside.

In response to Member questions, Mrs Westcott stated the following:

- The family business is an agricultural and mechanical business which is set in the Teign Valley. Mr Westcott has run the business for the last 20 years.
- Having not completely understood the full problems at Foxview, it was at that point that the case was put into the hands of a planning consultant.

In response to Member questions, the Case Officer and Director of Spatial Planning advised as follows:

- There is no record or evidence of Mr or Mrs Westcott having a disability within the case file;
- The case is a complicated and emotive one. Policies are in place to make sure that those smaller housing stocks are kept small, hence the 30% limit.
- If the building were secured by a CLUED then the extension would not be supported.

Mr Thomas proposed that the application be DEFERRED in order that a Site Inspection be undertaken, which was seconded and AGREED.

Resolved: That the application be DEFERRED in order for a Site Inspection to be undertaken.

1608 Monitoring and Enforcement

Considered: The Report of the Director of Spatial Planning (NPA/DM/25/004).

Item 1 – ENF/0073/24 – Unauthorised change of use from domestic garage to separate dwelling – The Cloves, Raddon Farm, Lydford

Speaker: Mr Ed Persse, Agent for the owners

The Authority considers that the Development is contrary to housing policies in the Dartmoor Local Plan and constitutes an unjustified open market dwelling within the open countryside of the National Park. The occupier of the building was given over three months to vacate but the negotiated date for the breach to cease has since passed. Officers are concerned that there could be further delay.

The Case Officer refreshed Members on how an enforcement notice would work. He advised that, in this case, a longer compliance period would be set for the end of June/beginning of July.

Mr Persse advised Members that there was no dispute over the fact that there was a breach of planning control. This was fully accepted. He was before Members to request that the service of the enforcement notice be held in abeyance until the end of June, in order that the current occupier can seek alternative accommodation and necessary works can be conducted on the building. He added that an enforcement notice would be recorded as a charge on the land; even if it were fully complied with it would remain on the Land Registry records and would show up on any searches made. This could potentially have a negative impact on the owners should they ever wish to sell their property. If the notice were fully complied with, a note could be added to records to clarify this fact.

The Director of Spatial Planning reminded Members that their task today was to consider the officer recommendation that an enforcement notice be served. The Authority has reached the point where it can no longer do nothing, both in the interests expediency and public confidence in the Authority. The Authority needs to be fair but robust.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mrs Mott.

Resolved: That legal action in the form of an enforcement notice be issued.

1609 Appointment of Site Inspection Panel and Arrangements for Site Visits

Item 1 - 0210/24 – Installation of 20m lattice telecommunications tower supporting 9 no. antennas, 2 no. 600mm dishes, together with 1 no. foul weather enclosure, 1 no. generator and 1 no. meter cabinet plus a 1.2m satellite dish and compound fencing for the EAS and Shared Rural Network projects – Challamoor Field, Buckland-in-the-Moor

Item 4 - 0484/24 – Retrospective alterations and extension to dwelling with upgrading and re-roofing together with provision of disability footway (amended plans) – Foxview, Christow

The Site Inspections to be undertaken during the morning of Friday 21 February 2025.

Site Panel to consist of: Mr Sanders, Mrs Morgan, Mr Renders, Mr Thomas, Mr Smerdon, Mr Owen, Mrs Hill, Mr Jeffery and Mrs Mott.

There being no other business, the meeting ended at 12.40pm.