

**DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

2 September 2016

Present: K Ball, W Cann, J Christophers, A Cooper, G Gribble, S Hill, P Hitchins,
M Jeffery, D Lloyd, J McInnes (Chairman), D Moyse, N Oakley, C Pannell,
D Webber

Apologies: S Barker, I Mortimer, M Retallick, P Sanders

1157 Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 1 July 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2016 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

1158 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 Item 6 – 0324/16 – Little Barton, Ashburton.

Mr Hill declared a personal interest, due to knowing the applicant, in Item 4 – 0300/16 – Rushford Mill Farm, Chagford.

Miss Moyse, Mr Ball and Mr Jeffery declared a personal interest in Item 7 – 0303/16 – Withenfield, Burrator Road, Dousland.

Mr Cann declared a personal interest in Item 1 – 0293/16 – 15 Oaktree Park, Sticklepath.

1159 Items requiring urgent attention

None.

1160 Applications for determination by the Committee

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/026).

Item 1 – 0293/16 – Demolition of garage and construction of two storey extension, new single garage and laundry – 15 Oaktree Park, Sticklepath

The Case Officer advised Members that the property is a small three bedroom semi-detached house comprising 71sqm, which is below the Government's national space standards for this type of dwelling, which recommend a minimum of 84sqm. The proposed extension represents a 65% increase in floor space. However, if the deficiency of the existing floor space is taken into account, the percentage increase is reduced to 39%.

Signed James McInnes

Date 7.10.16

The proposed extension would appear to be a subservient addition to the side of the property; the character and scale is similar to that of the adjoining property and would conserve the character and appearance of the estate. It has been designed with consideration for neighbouring properties, and to have a neutral impact in this part of the National Park.

A additional condition is proposed, should permission be granted, requiring the development to be implemented strictly in accordance with the recommendations of the Bat Emergence & Dawn Re-entry Survey Report.

Mr Lloyd proposed the recommendation in the report, which was seconded by Mr Gribble.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, and the additional condition as set out above, permission be GRANTED.

Item 2 – 0395/16 – Erection of a detached open market bungalow on garden land – Greenacres, Butts Lane, Christow

The Case Officer advised Members that the application is for the erection of a two bedroom, single storey dwelling, on the rear garden of Greenacres, Christow. Access is to be provided along the northern boundary of the site to the existing highway access for Greenacres. The building would be built into the slope of the garden, reducing its visibility, and would consist of a floor area under 80sqm.

Planning permission was refused, and subsequently dismissed at appeal for the erection of a three bedroom open market dwelling in 2012. At appeal, the Inspector concluded that the scheme was in conflict with the Authority's policies on affordable housing. A subsequent application, made in 2013 and essentially the same scheme as the previous application, was refused as the applicant had been unwilling to sign a legal agreement to secure the accommodation as an affordable dwelling.

Following changes to National Planning Practice Guidance and a Ministerial Statement, the Authority is no longer able to require development of five units or less to make provision for or a contribution to affordable housing. However, the scheme before Members is considered to be a sustainable form of development.

Given the scale and design of the proposed bungalow, its orientation and position on the site and lack of windows on the south west elevation, officers consider that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Two letters of objection have been received; concerns include the lack of provision for affordable housing, garden grabbing, noise and traffic pollution and loss of privacy. The comments of the Parish Council were reported which was to object on grounds relating to visual impact, backland development, and impact on neighbouring properties.

Signed James P. NCT me Date 7-10-16

Mr Hitchins proposed the recommendation as set out in the report, which was seconded by Mr Gribble.

RESOLVED:

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

Item 3 – 0276/16 – Construction of an earth house for holiday accommodation as enabling development and occasional welfare use by visiting groups, to support repair and restoration of Atlas Mine burning house together with associated works – land at Atlas Mine, Ilington

Speaker: Nichola Burley, Applicant's Agent

The Case Officer advised Members that the Atlas Mine Burning House remains the most visible element of a nineteenth century tin mine in the open countryside between Haytor and Ilington. It is within a woodland of conservation importance and access is via a meadow of county value for the richness of species within it. The Burning House is Grade II Listed and have been on the Buildings at Risk Register since the late 1990s. A separate application for Listed Building Consent for the works to the building has been submitted and approved, although that consent has not yet been issued.

The application before Members is for the erection of holiday accommodation in the form of an earth sheltered house. It would be used occasionally by visiting groups when not in use as a holiday home.

The Head of Planning advised Members that they should not rely on a S106 agreement to tie the earth house to the burning house in order that it could not be sold separately. Circumstances often change. A personal permission would not be suitable with regard to this application. In addition, owners of listed buildings can be required to ensure that any building is kept in a reasonable state of repair, for example a repair notice can be issued by the Authority.

Ms Burley advised Members that the application before then would enable the repair of the burning house which is probably the most important example in the country. The building has been on the Authority's Buildings at Risk Register since the 1990s. It could not be converted as it is too small; in addition there is arsenic contamination. She advised that the applicants are passionate about restoring the burning house and want to see the history of tin mining come to life. In addition to the burning house being made available for the public, the meadow and woodland would also be open to the public. The site is quiet and tranquil. The earth house would, in her opinion, be unobtrusive and would provide the necessary funds to continue with the restoration.

In response to the Member queries, Ms Burley advised the following:

- the arsenic would not affect the earth house. The applicants had undertaken a full contamination survey.
- all funding opportunities had been considered. There are not many options available to private owners
- the burning house would be open three weekends per year for group visits, and on Mondays and Fridays by arrangement. These visits would not be charged for; the

Signed



Date

7-10-16

funds raised would come from those booking short breaks in the earth house accommodation.

- with regard to vehicles at the site, only one vehicle would be permitted at any one time. Public and group visits would either be advised where to park nearby and then walk to view the burning house, or minibus transport would be arranged.
- A Member also queried why this particular site had been chosen when there appeared to be other land available to the applicants. The agent responded and said the site was the most appropriate in their opinion.
- the applicants have looked into the possibility of forming a charitable trust but have decided not to go ahead with this option.

After further discussion Members determined that this application was difficult to visualise. Mr Christophers proposed that the application be deferred in order for a site inspection to be undertaken , which was seconded by Mr Hitchins.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED for a SITE INSPECTION to be undertaken.

Item 4 – 0300/16 – Erection of two 6m x 5m sheds to be used for tool storage, associated access and parking plus passive refrigeration unit – Rushford Mill Farm, Chagford

Speaker: Mr Ed Hamer, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the retrospective application is for the retention of two agricultural barns, parking area, access and passive refrigeration unit to support the established market garden on the site which the applicant rents under a farm business tenancy agreement.

The two timber frame buildings are constructed on skids and have been positioned next to each other, giving the appearance of a single building. One of the bays is used as an office/secure storage, another as a packing area and the other two for tool storage.

The buildings are on an elevated part of the field but are not visible above the hedge from the footpath. However, the car parking is a feature which stands out and parked cars form a stark intrusion into the pastoral landscape. The applicant has agreed to there being a maximum of two vehicles on site at any one time and this can be secured by condition. In addition, it is proposed that shutters be fitted to the windows of the building in order to reduce light pollution.

Mr Hamer advised Members that the business is a community market garden which currently supplies 250 people. The business is seven years old and has grown into a highly successful enterprise. As well as having customers for the produce, the business is also a valuable resource, providing farm visits, weekly work days and open days. He advised that the structures were erected in January 2015; 130 letters of support have been written as well as there being support from the Parish Council.

With regard to the refrigeration unit, Members asked for a condition to be added to any permission to screen it from clear view. The Head of Planning advised that a condition for the applicant to provide a comprehensive landscaping scheme to address the issue of the refrigeration unit and the car parking could be added.

Signed James MCT Date 7-10-16

Mr Gribble proposed the recommendation as set out in the report and with the addition of a landscaping condition, which was seconded by Mr Hill.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, and an additional condition requiring a comprehensive landscaping scheme, permission be GRANTED.

Item 5 – 0275/16 – Construction of single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and front porch – 2 Binkham Hill, Yelverton

Speaker: Mr Graham Platt, on behalf of Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the principle issue of this application is the impact on neighbouring amenity and access to light. The scale of the extensions proposed would provide additional floorspace of 25% which meets the conditions set out in Authority Policy DMD24. The two storey extension would be to the east elevation on the footprint of the existing garage and store. In addition, a replacement lean-to is proposed at the rear of the property, together with a porch to the front.

The main window to be affected is in the rear kitchen extension. The second window is towards the front elevation and serves a day room. Officers have carefully considered the potential impact on loss of light and privacy of the neighbouring property and have concluded that it will retain an acceptable level of daylight and that there would be no material impact on privacy. In addition, Officers were mindful that permitted development rights exist for either homeowner to erect a 2m fence along the boundary of the property.

Mr Platt stated that the proposed extension would have little visual impact on the street scene; external finishes and tiles would match those used on the main property. No changes to access to the property are proposed. The increase in size proposed to the garage will mean that there would be a provision for additional off-road parking.

The Case Officer advised Members that a letter of objection cited loss of light to the kitchen and day room and disruption due to construction work.

Mr Cann stated that it was difficult to visualise the potential for loss of light into the neighbouring property from the photographs shown and proposed that the application be deferred in order for a Site Inspection to be undertaken. This was seconded by Mr Ball.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED in order for a SITE INSPECTION to be undertaken.

Item 6 – 0324/16 – Erection of extension to provide ancillary accommodation and conservatory – Little Barton, Ashburton

Speaker: Mrs Small, Applicant

Signed Sandra Platt Date 7-10-16

The Case Officer advised Members that the farmstead is situated approximately 300m north of the village of Caton. The bungalow is a simple render clad structure and features a hipped roof and large flat roof extensions. The application proposes a two storey extension and conservatory; it is considered unacceptable due to the design and scale of the proposed extension. In addition, a balcony to the southern elevation and external stair to the west elevation are proposed. Set beside large agricultural buildings it is felt that the proposal is unsympathetic, dominant and not in accordance with the guidance set out in the Authority's Design Guide. The extensions would amount to an increase of 46% in floorspace.

Mrs Small stated to Members that core policies had been overturned by the Planning Inspectorate in relation to a building in Chagford. She added that her application was supported by the Parish Council and that her property was set back from the road and the proposals would therefore not have a high visual impact. With regard to the design, Mrs Small stated that design was subjective; neighbour had been considered during the process. Her family have been in the property for 59 years and needs have changed; in her opinion, the application before Members would provide for those changes.

Miss Moyle proposed the recommendation as set out in the report, which was seconded by Mr Jeffery.

In response to Member queries regarding sustainability and the view that some of the design factors would represent an improvement, the Case Officer advised that the possibility of a dual pitched roof had been discussed with the applicant. In addition, demolition of the property and the construction of a new dwelling may also be feasible. Pre-application advice was not sought by the applicant but Officers have offered advice should the application be refused.

RESOLVED:

That permission be REFUSED for the reasons as set out in the report.

Item 7 – 0303/16 – Construction of rear extensions, loft conversion and front porch – Withenfield, Burrator Road, Dousland

Speaker: Mr Justin Crewe, Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the application proposed various alterations and extensions to Withenfield. The proposed flat roof side extension would be seen from the highway and would form an uncharacteristic and incongruous addition to the dwelling. In addition, the 3.7m deep and 8m wide first floor terrace, with obscure glazed privacy screen of 1.8m in height lacks coherence with the property and the local area.

The proposed extensions represent a 35% increase in floorspace; this marginally exceeds the Authority's 30% threshold and is not considered to amount to a reason for refusal in its own right. It is considered, however, that the proposed design would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and this part of the National Park.

Mr Crewe stated that reason for the proposed flat roof extension was that the existing dwelling would not have to be changed. There is currently no dining area and the lounge also doubles up as an office. He advised the proposed extensions would tidy up

Signed



Date

7-10-16

the site and they would be incorporated into the main dwelling. He added that his neighbour was in support of his application.

Some Members commented that some of the design elements within the proposal held some merit. Others stated that they felt the design was clumsy but felt sure that alternatives could be found with the advice of Officers.

Mrs Pannell proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Lloyd.

RESOLVED:

That permission be REFUSED for the reasons as set out in the report.

Members asked Officers to work with the applicant in order to find a suitable solution.

Item 8 – 0295/16 – Erection of open market dwelling – land adjacent to The Villa, Plymouth Hill, Princetown

The Chairman advised Members that this application has been DEFERRED.

Item 9 – 0344/16 – Change of use for part of agricultural building to office and workshop – Greenbank, Chagford

Speaker: Mrs Goudge -Applicant

The Case Officer advised Members that the application relates to the proposed change of use of an agricultural barn to support a new business enterprise.

The barn was granted planning consent in 2006 for agricultural purposes. Alterations to the barn and changes of use since that time have been the subject of enforcement action and a subsequent appeal. The proposal is for use of part of the barn for a mixed business use. The applicant has submitted a business plan setting out that the proposed use would be an extension to their existing bed and breakfast building and would involve craft courses, to include shearing, washing, treatment and weaving of wool sourced from their own smallholding and other local farms.

Officers consider that the proposed business use does not form part of a farm diversification exercise. The smallholding is just 10 acres in size with a current stock of 40 sheep. The proposal is therefore contrary to adopted policies.

It is considered that the proposed development would form unjustified and unacceptable development in the open countryside.

Mrs Goudge advised Members that 80% of the barn would continue to be used for agricultural purposes. She stated that she has a successful bed and breakfast business and has recently run some highly successful knitting courses, and that customers have expressed a great deal of interest in the proposed new courses. She added that she uses wool sourced from her own flock and from other local farmers. The barn would provide an ideal teaching area, together with somewhere to process the wool.

Mrs Goudge advised that she would be happy to remove the balcony and has no intention of putting in any new windows.

Signed James P. Thomas Date 7-10-16

In response to Member queries regarding the question of the business being linked to the rest of the work of the smallholding and the teaching of rural skills in a rural location, the Head of Planning advised Members that the business is not a farm operation, it is a smallholding with some 40 sheep and this application therefore cannot be considered as farm diversification.

Mr Gribble proposed that the application be DEFERRED in order for Officers to consider the domestic design issues and put forward suggested conditions should the application be granted. This was seconded by Mr Hill. Members indicated they were minded to agree there was a reasonable business case.

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED in order for Officers to discuss design issues with the applicant and draw up possible conditions should Members be minded to grant planning permission.

1161 Appeals

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/027).

RESOLVED:

Members noted the content of the report.

1162 Enforcement Action Taken Under Delegated Powers

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/028).

RESOLVED:

Members noted the content of the report.

1163 Site Inspection Panel

Site Inspection panel to consist of: Messrs Hitchins, Cann, Ball, Cooper and Webber.

Applications: 0275/16 – Construction of single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and front porch – 2 Binkham Hill, Yelverton
 0276/16 – Construction of an earth house for holiday accommodation as enabling development and occasional welfare use by visiting groups, to support repair and restoration of Atlas Mine burning house together with associated works – land at Atlas Mine, Ilsington

on Friday 16th September 2016

Signed  Date 7-10-16