

**DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

4 December 2015

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

Apologies: None

1100 Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 6 November 2015

Save for the amendment detailed below, the minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2015 were signed as a correct record:

Minute 1095 – Item 6 – to be amended to read that Miss Moyse left the meeting following the resolution.

1101 Declarations of Interest and Contact

The Chairman advised Members that application 0348/15 – Yennadon Quarry, Iron Mine Lane, Dousland had been deferred until the new year.

The Chairman reported that all Members had received correspondence, via email, with regard to item ENF/0186/15 – Trevery, Easton Cross, Chagford.

Mr Sanders and Miss Moyse declared a personal interest, due to a telephone conversation with the applicants' agent, in item 0499/15 – Land at Clearbrook, Yelverton.

Mr Hockridge declared a personal interest, due to a telephone conversation with the applicant, in item 0505/15 – Devon Cycle Hire, Sourton.


Mr Hill and Mr Harper each declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item ENF/0186/15 - Trevery, Easton Cross, Chagford. Both advised that they would excuse themselves from the meeting room for this discussion.

1102 Site Inspections

Item 1 – 0499/15 – Provision of an agricultural/equestrian building – SX5279 6465 Land at Clearbrook, Yelverton

Speaker: Ms A Burden, Applicant's Agent

The Case Officer reminded Members that the application was for a building, for agricultural and equestrian purposes, 18m by 11m and 4.8m in height. It would be sunk into the ground and a proposed hedgebank to the eastern elevation would be 1.2m above ground. The view of the Authority's Trees and Landscape Officer was

Signed 
Date 8 - 1 - 16

that whilst the proposed landscaping would help screen the building, it would not fundamentally change the impact that the development would have on the character of the landscape. The building would still be an isolated structure. The proposed enclosure would not reflect the pattern of the field system and would be incongruous within the landscape.

Having received the Site Inspection report the applicant had submitted drawings showing a smaller building. However, following consultation with the Chairman, it was determined that it was too late in the process to accept those drawings. In addition, they did not address the fundamental issue regarding the isolated location that would not conserve or enhance the character of the landscape.

Ms Burden advised Members that the site for the proposed building had been carefully chosen; there was a natural backdrop of woodland and existing hedges which would screen the building from view. She stated that her clients own seven acres of land and have 25 ewes, 5 cattle, horses and ponies, all of which would need shelter over the winter, during lambing season. The building would also provide storage for feed. With regard to water run-off, this would be dealt with by way of a soakaway which is already in existence on the applicants' land. She added that the application is supported by the Parish Council and by local residents. In addition, the need for any temporary field shelters would be removed. The applicants would willingly enter into a legal agreement should this be required.

A Member commented that Members who had attended the site inspection sympathised with the applicants but felt that officers were right in their conclusion and reasons for refusal; the proposed building would be visible from Hoo Meavy and would not fit with the established field pattern.

Some Members felt that the proposed building would require a considerable amount of excavation considering the slope of the site. These excavations and new hedgebanks would impact upon the landscape. One felt that due to the size of the concrete base there would be considerable run off/effluent and that insufficient consideration had been given to the issue.

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

RESOLVED:

That, due to the reasons set out in the report, permission be REFUSED.

Item 2 – 0488/15 – Erection of detached workshop, enlargement of rear dormers; erection of front dormer with associated walkway – The Glen, Plymouth Road, Horrabridge

The Case Officer reminded Members that the proposal was to enlarge existing dormers, erect a front dormer, construct a walkway to provide access from the garden which is at a higher level and erect a detached workshop. She added that officer advice has been consistent in that the design, scale and massing of the dormers would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the building.

Signed 

Date 8 - 1 - 16

Mr Sanders reported to Members that the site inspection had been a very useful exercise and had clarified any concerns he had had regarding the proposed walkway. He proposed that permission be granted, on the grounds that the proposals would not have an adverse impact on the character and landscape of the National Park, and that the design was acceptable bearing in mind the local contest of other dormer extensions, subject to conditions. Four further members spoke in support. Mr Hitchins seconded the proposal.

The Case Officer suggested the following four conditions:

1. Prior to commencement of development, samples of all proposed roofing materials, facing materials for the dormers and details of the railings to the walkway to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval;
2. The garage doors to be constructed of vertical timbers boarding;
3. Prior to commencement of development, details of a proposed landscaping and planting scheme to screen views of the walkway to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval;
4. The workshop to be used for purposes incidental to the dwelling house only and for no other purpose.

Mr Sanders and Mr Hitchins indicated their agreement to the proposed conditions.

RESOLVED:

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

1103 Applications for Determination by the Committee


Item 1 – 0348/15 – Extension of the working plan area of the existing active quarry – Yennadon Quarry, Iron Mine Lane, Dousland.

Application withdrawn from the agenda and DEFERRED until early 2016.

Item 2 – 0473/15 – Change of Use of annexe and courtyard from hotel to residential (including independent dwelling) plus associated works – Easton Court, Chagford

The Planning Team Manager advised Members that in 2002 permission was granted to convert part of the hotel (the former farmhouse) to a dwelling. The application before Members was for the annexe to be changed to private residential use also. The use of the hotel wing has reduced in recent years. The property is outside of the settlement of Chagford and is somewhat isolated and does not pose the most sought after accommodation. It has been on the market for the last 18 months, but there has been limited interest.

The listed status would remain for the whole of the complex. Works would include the removal of the metal fire escape in the courtyard, removal of the water tank situated on the roof, widening of the access into the courtyard from the road and the removal of the flat roofed extension. Parking for four vehicles is proposed. Internal

Signed 
Date 8 - 1 - 16

works would include the blocking of a doorway, movement of partitions and soundproofing, all of which are considered acceptable by the Authority's Historic Buildings Officer.

With regard to policy, COR15 and DMD23 allow for the proposed change of use. In normal circumstances, the provision of an affordable dwelling would be expected. However, it is the view of officers, and the Historic Buildings Officer, that this would entail the sub-division of the building which is not felt to be appropriate. Under DMD10, officers feel that the proposed changes are acceptable and would be a positive step for the complex.

In response to Member queries, the Planning Team Manager confirmed that the complex was listed because of the main house. The listing therefore included all previous changes, alterations and additions.

Dr Mortimer added that the farmhouse pre-dated 1700 and therefore, in his view, the changes proposed would enhance the setting of the building. He added that it would support the heritage asset record if early records were to be retained. He proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Ball.

A short discussion followed regarding the possibility of seeking a contribution towards affordable housing. The Planning Team Manager advised that it was his understanding that a discussion with the applicants had already taken place; officers had agreed it would be more advantageous to ensure a high standard of works to the Grade II listed building.

The Head of Planning advised that it is noted within the Affordable Housing SPD that a contribution towards affordable housing could be requested "if the circumstances are right". In his opinion, and that of his officers, the property did not lend itself to be converted into affordable units and was not a practical proposition; that together with the viability of the whole project meant a contribution should not be requested on this occasion.

RESOLVED:

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

Item 3 – 0474/15 – Works to facilitate change of use of annexe and courtyard from hotel to residential (including independent dwelling) – Easton Court, Chagford

The Planning Team Manager advised Members that the application sought consent for the works that are deemed necessary to the listed building to allow for the change of use from hotel to residential.

Mr Barker proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Mr Webber.

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the conditions as stated within the report, consent be GRANTED.

Signed 
Date 8-1-16

Item 4 – 0505/15 – Erection of new office building and resiting of existing cycle hire buildings for continued use of remainder of the site for cycle hire and associated car parking – Devon Cycle Hire, Sourton

Speaker: Mr E Persse, Applicant's Agent

The Planning Team Manager reported that Devon Cycle Hire operated from a building adjacent to the old railway line, which is now the Granite Way cycleway. In 2005 planning permission was granted for the small family-run bike hire business. In 2011 a small, additional storage building was added to the site. Everything on site is associated with the cycle hire business.


The application is, essentially, in two parts: relocation of existing buildings and the retention of the cycle hire facility, together with the erection of new office buildings on the site and an unrelated caravan pod storage unit.. The long linear building would, essentially, comprise of a separate storage area for two small camping pods, and three offices of 20m² each. However, the applicant has not provided any reasoned justification for the new units other than as a method of providing additional income for the cycle hire business.

The site is outside of a classified 'local settlement'. COR18 supports sustaining existing businesses but does not support the establishment of new business units outside of settlements. COR21 relates to sustainable locations for business development; officers feel that this site does not meet the necessary requirements.

Mr Persse advised Members of the results of a local survey undertaken recently. 60% of respondents felt that it was good to encourage small business development. 78% agreed that brownfield sites should be used for new business. He added that the Parish Council was in support of the application. The site was, in his opinion, in a sustainable location, on a brownfield site and next to a main bus route and cycle route.

A Member advised that he was in support of the application. He stated that the business had been operating very successfully for the last 10 years. It added that it was the view of the Parish Council that the provision of small units for business could potentially help the neighbourhood with job creation. Development of the site would also benefit the owners and ensure that the business remained within the local community.

Other Members felt that they would be unable to support the application due to the lack of evidence to justify the proposed offices. They added, however, that they would want the applicants to continue to work with officers to find a way forward. In response to a Member's query, the Head of Planning confirmed that National Park Policy supports rural business development on the 'right site'. There was no guarantee that the proposed offices would be permanently occupied and there was the risk that a new mini industrial estate would be created in the open countryside. Members agreed that this was an area for potential review as part of any future Local Plan Review, but for now the policy background of concentrating new employment buildings in settlements meant the application should be refused.

Signed 
Date 8 - 1 - 16

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

Mr Christophers proposed that the application be DEFERRED in order that further discussion between the applicant and officers could take place to identify a way forward. Mr Ball seconded the proposal.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services advised that the motion to defer amounted to a new motion and not an amendment of the first motion. Standing Orders required Members to vote first on the first motion to be put and seconded. The first motion was duly put and carried.

RESOLVED:

That, due to the reasons set out in the report, permission be REFUSED.

The Chairman encouraged the applicant to continue to talk with officers about a much smaller scheme better related to the existing businesses.

Mr Harper and Mr Hill left the meeting room.

1104 Monitoring and Enforcement

Item 1 – ENF/0186/15 – Unauthorised sub-division of the single dwellinghouse – Treverry, Easton Cross, Chagford

The Planning Team Manager reported that in September 2015 it was brought to the Authority's attention that the extension to the main property was in use as a separate dwellinghouse. The sub-division of the property has, effectively, meant the creation of an additional dwelling within the open countryside.

By way of an update, a letter from one of the occupiers has been received which states that none of the occupiers were aware of the breach when they signed their tenancy agreements in 2013.

In response to a Member query regarding the possibility of a planning application to convert the extension into affordable housing, the Head of Planning advised Members that the land owner had known about the Authority's proposed course of action for some time. There had been no proven need identified for the sub-division of the property, and no planning application had been received from the owner. At this time, it was not possible to determine whether the extension would qualify as affordable housing, or whether the current occupiers were in genuine need of affordable housing.

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

RESOLVED:

That the appropriate legal action be taken to:

1. Secure the cessation of the residential use of Treverry other than as a single dwellinghouse, and

Signed 
Date 8-1-16

2. Remove from the building all fittings and fixtures which would facilitate use as two separate dwellings.

Members requested that the compliance period be not less than 6 months in consideration of the circumstances for the current occupants.

Mr Harper and Mr Hill returned to the meeting.

1105 Appeals

Mr Christophers declared a personal and prejudicial interest by reason of family connection and left the meeting room.

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/15/059).

The Planning Team Manager explained the appeal decisions made regarding Middle Venton Farm, Drewsteignton.

The Head of Planning stated that the Inspector's decision to permit of the concrete floor in the shippon to remain was very disappointing. A Member added that actual harm had been done to the building and requested that this view be expressed to the Planning Inspectorate. The Head of Planning would follow this with Historic England first of all.

RESOLVED

Members noted the content of the report.

1106 Applications determined under delegated powers and applications withdrawn

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/15/060).

RESOLVED:


Members noted the content of the report.

1107 Enforcement action taken under delegated powers

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/15/061).

RESOLVED:

Members noted the content of the report.

Signed 
Date 8-1-16