

DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

3 June 2016

Present: K Ball, J Christophers, P Harper, S Hill, P Hitchins, M Jeffery, D Lloyd,
J McInnes (Chairman), I Mortimer, D Moyse, N Oakley, M Retallick,
P Sanders (Deputy Chairman), D Webber

Apologies: C Pannell, J Kidner, S Barker and G Gribble

The Chairman introduced and welcomed Myra Spalding, newly recruited Planning Officer (Enforcement and Development Management) for the Authority.

1144 Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 6 May 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 May 2016 were signed as a correct record.

1145 Declarations of Interest and Contact

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

Members declared receipt of correspondence, in relation to Items 1 and 2 – 0591/15 and 0592/15 at East Shallowford Farm, Widecombe-in-the-Moor.

Mr McInnes declared a personal interest in Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, and a personal interest in Item 7 – 0160/16 Estrayer Park, Tavistock Road, Okehampton due to knowing the applicant.

Mr Sanders declared receiving emails and telephone calls from an interested party, in relation to Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, and contact in relation to Item 5 – 0134/16 South Devon Lakes Trust, Burrator Discovery Centre, Yelverton and a personal interest in Item 6 – 0128/16 Kerries Keep, Kerries Lane, South Brent due to knowing the applicant.

Mr Webber declared a personal interest in Item 7 – 0160/16 Estrayer Park, Tavistock Road, Okehampton due to knowing the applicant.

Mr Ball declared receiving emails and telephone calls from an interested party in relation to Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, and a personal interest in Item 7 – 0160/16 Estrayer Park, Tavistock Road, Okehampton due to knowing the applicant.

Dr Mortimer declared a personal interest in Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, due to receiving emails and telephone calls from an interested party.

Mr Hitchins declared receiving emails from an interested party in relation to Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, and a personal interest in Item 6 – 0128/16 Kerries Keep, Kerries Lane, South Brent due to knowing the applicant.

Signed



Date

1st - 7 - 16

Miss Moyse declared a personal interest in Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy, due to knowing the applicant in her capacity as a Burrator Parish Councillor.

Mr Retallick declared a personal interest in items 1 – 0610/15 and 2 – 0609/15 Broomhill Farm, Harford due to knowing the applicant.

Mr Christophers, Mr Jeffery, Mrs Oakley, Mr Lloyd, Mr Harper and Dr Mortimer declared receiving emails and contact from interested parties in relation to Item 4 – 0060/16 The Mill Meavy.

1146 Items requiring urgent attention

The Head of Planning advised Members that a report was to be presented to the Authority meeting regarding affordable housing thresholds, due to the Government having won its appeal, and the implications for the Authority's policies going forward.

1147 Site Inspections

Item 1 – 0118/16 – Demolition of block of three garages; erection of detached two bedroom bungalow with off street parking and erection of detached double garage – 20 Beverley Gardens, Ashburton

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/019).

The Case Officer gave a summary of the proposal. The application site comprises a row of three garages and some green space with a public footpath to the side. The application proposes the demolition of the garages and the erection of a two bedroomed bungalow and a detached double garage. The bungalow's floorspace would be 74 square metres and was originally proposed as an affordable dwelling. However, due to recent national policy changes the application would need to be considered as an open market dwelling.

The Officer recommendation for refusal is on the grounds of design. Officers believe that the contrasting character and form of the dwelling would have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

Members were advised that should they determine to grant planning permission, the following conditions would be proposed:

- Standard time limit;
- Access and parking to be provided prior to the occupation of the bungalow and retained in perpetuity;
- Samples of external facing, roofing and surfacing materials to be agreed by officers;
- Details of windows and materials to be provided to officers;
- Removal of Permitted Development Rights;
- Standard construction hours to be adhered to, ie, between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am to 1pm on Saturdays and not at any time on Sundays.

Signed James R. Jones

Date 1-7-16

Members commented that, in their opinion, the design of the bungalow was acceptable and in-keeping with the area. In addition, the proposal would solve an ongoing traffic and parking problem.

Mr Christophers proposed that permission be granted, on the grounds that the dwelling would be of modest size, the design was acceptable and appropriate for this sustainable location. Mr Jeffrey seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: That permission be GRANTED, subject to the conditions detailed above.

1148 Applications for determination by the Committee

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/020).

Item 1 – 0610/15 – Retention of biomass boiler flue (Listed Building Consent) – Broomhill Farm, Harford

Speaker: Mr Cole, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that there were two applications on the agenda regarding this property. The first application – Listed Building Consent – would deal with the heritage issues only. The second application – full planning permission – would address the issues raised regarding neighbour impact.

Broomhill Farm consists of a grade II listed, 17th Century farmhouse which is divided into two properties, a converted shippen and various other buildings including a threshing barn. The retrospective application relates to the retention of the stainless steel flue which serves the biomass boiler that provides the heating for the farmhouse.

The flue projects 1.5m above the highest point of the roof. Whilst the flue does have some impact on the character of the buildings, it is considered to be minimal against the character of the group and the benefits of renewable energy. The Historic Buildings Officer is in support of the application, subject to the condition that the flue is painted matt black. The Case Officer advised that the second condition regarding maintenance should be deleted from the recommendation.

Mr Cole advised Members that when the biomass boiler was installed he had not been advised that the flue would need any consent or permission. He also felt that he had received mixed messages from the National Park Authority regarding what to do.

In response to Member queries Mr Cole advised that he had qualified for the Government's renewable heating incentive; his property was now heated to a higher standard and his wood supply is sourced from a reputable supplier who meets the required standard set down by the Government.

Mr Hitchins proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Retallick.

Signed James R. Jones.....

Date 1-7-16.....

RESOLVED: That subject to condition one, as set out in the report, consent be GRANTED.

Item 2 – 0609/15 – Retention of biomass boiler flue – Broomhill Farm, Harford

Speaker: Mr Cole, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the neighbouring occupier had expressed concerns regarding smoke emissions and had requested that the flue be increased by 2m in height to offset the impact. An increase to this height would make the flue appear overly dominant within its immediate environment and would detract from the setting of the listed buildings.

With regard to good practice and use of the biomass boiler, Members were advised that proposed conditions two and three could be dealt with by way of informative note via a covering letter to the applicant and, therefore, it was proposed that these be deleted from the recommendation.

Mr Cole advised Members that he would be happy to retain the flue at the current height.

Mr Sanders proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Hitchins.

RESOLVED:

That subject to condition one, as set out in the report, permission be GRANTED.

Item 3 – Erection of an agricultural building to house new dairy unit milking parlour, together with hardstanding, collection yard and new access track and landscaping – Gooseford Farm, Whiddon Down

Speaker: Mr Wonnacott, Applicant's Agent

The Case Officer advised that there were no changes to the report that had been taken to committee on 6 May 2016. The Chairman reminded Members that, at that time, they had been content to grant permission but, under protocol, the application had been deferred in order for appropriate conditions to be drawn up.

Mr Wonnacott advised Members that his client was happy with all of the proposed conditions and would meet all of the requirements. His client was keen to go ahead with the scheme and was sure that in time the buildings would merge into the local landscape.

Mr Christophers proposed that permission be granted on the grounds that the site was in a sustainable location for the business and that the proposed buildings would be acceptable in the landscape, subject to the conditions as set out. This was seconded by Mr Ball.

RESOLVED: That subject to the conditions as set out in the report, permission be GRANTED.

Signed James Sanders

Date 1-7-16

Mrs Oakley requested that her objection to the application be noted.

Item 4 – 0060/16 – Demolition of side extension and erection of two-storey extension in same location – The Mill, Meavy

Speakers: Mrs Milton, Objector
Mr Parle, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the Historic England Officer considered that the amendments made to the application have minimised the impact of the extension on the views of Grade II* listed Meavy Barton when entering the conservation area. In addition, the Officer felt that the use of stone would soften the appearance of the extension and the use of brick would reflect historic examples on the site; the strengthening of vegetation along the boundary would help with privacy.

The Case Officer presented Members with a series of slides showing the proposed development and how it related to the Meavy Conservation Area and local Listed Buildings including Meavy Barton which was noted as being Listed Grade II*. The Case Officer also explained the amenity issues raised by the adjoining objector and how it was possible to mitigate those concerns.

Devon County Council (DCC) advised that due to the possibility of flood risk, should the culvert collapse due to excessive loading, its location should be accurately mapped before determination of the application. The applicant has said that he would be willing for a CCTV survey to be undertaken but has asked that a condition be imposed rather than the application be delayed further. Two letters have been received raising concerns about the culvert. The Parish Council continues to support the application.

With regard to the amendments to the application, it is now proposed to shift back the footprint of the extension to bring it in line with the rear of the property; the upstairs glazed screen would now be behind perforated brick cladding; the ridge would be lower than previously proposed, all of which would bring the extension into keeping with the original building.

The proposed extension is felt to be of a sympathetic design; the recommendation to grant permission would be subject to conditions, including the additional condition detailed below to deal with the protection of the historic leat:

"No Development shall take place until:

- 1. A CCTC survey of the historic leat and culvert has been carried out and the results provided to the Local Planning Authority; and*
- 2. Full details of works necessary to protect and conserve the historic leat in all locations in which it coincides with the footprint of the development hereby approved have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, including details of materials, techniques and phasing of works; and*
- 3. The Local Planning Authority has given written approval to those details."*

Mrs Milton advised that she was the Heritage Consultant for the owner of Meavy Barton. The firm Montague Evans had also been instructed to provide a report on

Signed



Date

1 - 7 - 16

the proposals and a letter from Messrs Farragh and Co should have been received by the Authority. She stated that, in her, and Montague Evans' opinion, the proposed reduced ridge height meant that the design of the building had suffered and would not sit well within the location of the historic buildings; the reintroduced first floor window seemed alien; stone was the predominant material in the area, not brick. They felt that the proposed extension would neither preserve or enhance the amenity of the area. With regard to the CCTV survey, it should be undertaken before any works began. Therefore, for the reasons of design, detrimental impact upon the amenity and potential flood risk, they felt that the application should be refused.

Mr Parle advised Members that the reason for his application was to improve his living accommodation. The current extension was only really useful for storage and was in poor condition. The erection of the new extension would not increase the number of rooms within the property, rather it would make them more amenable. He stated that he cared greatly about the historic buildings of Meavy and added that there was nothing in his application that was unacceptable to the National Park Authority or Historic England. With regard to the CCTV survey, he had employed a company to undertake this exercise and asked that this be a conditioned, should he obtain planning permission, rather than hold up his application further.

Members observed that the majority of the leat no longer exists and that the culvert purely picks up surface water. The culvert also drops some 3 metres from the top of the garden to the other side of the site. In addition, one Member noted the quantity of objections as opposed to quality; for example, brick was indeed a material commonly used as could be seen in the photographs in the officer's presentation. Members also noted that the flood risk exists independent of whether the proposed development went ahead or not; the extension would replace an eyesore and the revised plans show it to be subservient to the main building.

Members carefully considered the proposal development, its impact on the Conservation Area and other Listed Buildings and were also mindful of the objections from the neighbouring property in relation to matters of privacy.

Dr Mortimer proposed the recommendation, and requested that the CCTV survey be conditioned, which was seconded by Mr Sanders.

RESOLVED: That subject to the conditions as set out in the report, together with the additional condition as detailed above to protect the historic leat, permission be GRANTED.

Item 5 – 0134/16 – Installation of an orientation board – South West Lakes Trust, Burrator Discovery Centre, Yelverton

The Case Officer advised Members that the application was for the installation of an orientation board, measuring 2.65m x 1.185m x 1.7m high, inside the car park for the Discovery Centre at the western side of the reservoir.

Some Members commented that, should permission be granted, they would prefer to have the board mounted at an angle in order to minimise its visibility from the road.

Signed James P. M. T. M.

Date 1-7-16

Mr Ball proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Dr Mortimer.

RESOLVED: That subject to the conditions as set out in the report, permission be GRANTED.

Item 6 – Erection of double garage – Kerries Keep, Kerries Lane, South Brent

Speakers: Cllr Richards, South Brent Parish Council Representative
Mrs Wilcox, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the site was a domestic parking area used in association with Kerries Keep and lies on a no-through road. There are five accesses to properties which use the road, only one of which goes beyond the application site; vehicle speeds tend to be very low.

The application was essentially a resubmission of a planning permission which was granted in 2007 and was before Members due to an objection from a neighbour and the Parish Council on the grounds of highway safety. It was noted that the Highway Authority had no objections however.

The garage would be set back by 0.5m from the lane. It would be a standard size double garage, 5m x 5.54m, with a dual pitched slate roof and a timber up and over door. The scale and design of the structure was considered to be appropriate for the surroundings.

Cllr Richards recommended to Members that the application be refused on the grounds that the lane is narrow, less than 3m wide in places. He added that since the first application was approved in 2007 the number of children using the lane of their way to and from school had more than quadrupled.

Mrs Wilcox agreed that visibility would be restricted but added that the no through road carried hardly any vehicular traffic; everyone using the lane drove extremely slowly. She added that she was surprised by the response of the Parish Council as the application was an exact replica of that approved in 2007.

Miss Moyse proposed the recommendation which was seconded by Mr Webber.

RESOLVED: That subject to the conditions as set out in the report, permission be GRANTED.

Item 7 – Conversion of three redundant barns to two residential units (for applicant's children) and one holiday unit – Estrayer Park, Tavistock Road, Okehampton

Speaker: Mr Littlejohns, Applicant

The Case Officer confirmed that Estrayer Park was an historic farmstead, recorded on the Historic Environment Register as an 'undesigned heritage asset'.

The application was for the conversion of two of the traditional farm buildings for residential accommodation in the form of two open market dwellings for the applicant's daughters and one holiday let to support the farming enterprise which is

Signed James Littlejohns

Date 1-7-16

predominantly undertaken from the neighbouring Minehouse Farm. The concrete slab would be broken up and the area sub-divided by fencing to create private amenity space and parking for each new unit.

Officers were clear that the proposed scheme would cause substantial harm to the historic farmstead and the applicant has not demonstrated that he has sought an alternative use for the buildings. In addition, guidance from the Authority's Historic Buildings Officer and Historic England makes clear the importance of the farmyard.

DCLG's Technical Housing Standards recommend a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m for at least 75% of the internal area. Substantial areas of all of the buildings within the application do not meet this criteria.

In light of the Government policy change in respect of affordable housing, it was proposed to remove the first part of the reason number one for refusal, to commence as follows:

'The proposed development would result in the creation of two unjustified dwellings in the open countryside'

Mr Littlejohn advised Members that the farmstead has been in the family for the last 70 years. Two of the properties would be converted for his daughters, the other into a holiday let to support the main farmhouse.

Mr Webber proposed that the application be deferred in order for a Site Inspection to be undertaken.

Dr Mortimer stated that Members had very strong policy reasons to refuse the application; the applicant had not gone through the process of finding alternative business use for the buildings and there was strong advice regarding ceiling height. He proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Sanders

Some Members stated that they understood the applicant's problem; the buildings are no longer suitable for modern agricultural use; they added that they would encourage the applicant to work with officers to seek alternative uses.

RESOLVED: That permission be REFUSED for the reasons as stated in the report.

1149 Appeals

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/021).

RESOLVED:

Members noted the content of the report.

Signed



Date

1 - 7 - 16