

DARTMOOR NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

6 May 2016

Present: K Ball, J Christophers, G Gribble, 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: P Harper, S Barker

1138 Minutes of the meeting held on Friday 4 March 2016

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

1139 Declarations of Interest and Contact

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

Mr McInnes, Mr Christophers, Mrs Pannell, Mr Hitchins, Mr Retallick all declared that they had received emails in relation to 0018/15 and 0102/16 – Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock, 0529/15 – Orchard Meadow, South Brent and 0671/15 – Gooseford Farm, Whiddon Down.

Mr Sanders and Mr Ball declared a personal interest in 0018/15 and 0102/16 – Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock – due to knowing the applicant and her connection with at West Devon Borough Council and declared that they had received emails in relation to 0529/15 – Orchard Meadow, South Brent and 0671/15 – Gooseford Farm, Whiddon Down due to receiving emails from the applicants.

Mr Webber and Mr Hockridge declared a personal interest in 0018/15.

Mr Jeffery declared that he had received emails in relation to 0018/15 and 0102/16 – Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock and 0671/15 – Gooseford Farm, Whiddon Down.

Mr Gribble declared that he had received emails in relation to 0018/15 and 0102/16 – Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock, 0529/15 – Orchard Meadow, South Brent and 0671/15 – Gooseford Farm, Whiddon Down due to receiving emails from the applicants and a personal interest in 0140/16 – Blackdown Piper, Widecombe in the Moor, due to knowing the applicant.

Signed



Date

3-6-16

Dr Mortimer declared a prejudicial interest in 0360/15 Land off Lower Street, Chagford and stated that he would leave the room for the item.

Mr Hockridge, Mr Webber, Mr Kidner, Mr Lloyd declared they had received emails relating to 0018/15 and 0102/16 Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock.

Miss Moyse declared a personal interest in 0018/15 and 0102/16 Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock due to knowing the applicant and 0071/16 1 New Cottages, Meavy due to making a personal site visit.

Mrs Oakley declared a prejudicial interest in 0140/16 – Blackdown Piper, Widecombe in the Moor, due to being a neighbour and stated that she would leave the room for the item.

1140 Items requiring urgent attention

None.

1141 Site Inspections

Item 1 - 0529/15 – Use of land as gypsy and traveller caravan site consisting of six pitches and communal day room and store - Orchard Meadow, South Brent

Speakers: Councillor Richards - South Brent Parish Council Representative
Dr Murdoch – Applicant's Agent

The Case Officer reminded Members that the site visit was held at the end of March. The applicant's agent submitted a revised site layout plan, reducing the scale of the proposed development, which required time for consultation on the amended plans. The amended plans indicate no day room, but two storage units and a play area. The proposed development would include 6 pitches which include space for one mobile home and the parking of 2 vehicles.

The site, used as a gypsy/traveller site since 1984, is approximately 650m from South Brent and is in a sustainable position as it is walkable/cyclable distance from the town facilities. The environmental health officer was satisfied that the new plans indicate large enough gaps between units for a site licence to be issued. This would however be scrutinised further at application stage.

The Parish Council no longer objected to the application, but expressed concern regarding the lack of provision for pedestrians and cyclists between the site and the village and the adequacy of the sewage system. It was noted that the application includes a new septic tank and land soakaway.

Signed



Date

3-6-16

An amendment to condition 15 or additional condition was proposed to ensure that no domestic paraphernalia is stored in the paddock to the rear of the site, as it acts as a visual buffer between the site and the near developments.

Councillor Richards stated that the country footpath that runs alongside the opposite side of the road is not suitable for bikes, wheelchairs or pushchairs and should be improved. There have been a number of accidents on this part the road, which indicates that it is not a safe carriageway to cross and the installation of a safe route to the facilities is required.

Dr Murdoch informed Members that the travellers site has been used for 30 years and DMD 29 states that there is a need for travellers sites. This site is suitable and has the support of South Hams District Council. The Gypsy Traveller liaison officer supports the site, due to the lack of suitable sites available in the area. The family currently living on the site have out grown the 2 static caravans and require more living space.

In response to Members questions, the officer informed Members that the hedgerows and trees would be protected by condition 5, and the planning permission is for the gypsy/traveller community, not specifically for the family currently living there. The plans do show an improved entrance to the site, making the junction on to the main road safer.

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

RESOLVED:

Subject to the conditions set out in the report, and the amendment to condition 15, or additional condition as maybe required, permission be GRANTED.

Item 2 – 0018/16 - Replacement of seven windows and retrospective and amended design for either approved additional window (WF07) – Wringworthy Farm, Mary Tavy

Speaker – Mrs Roberts - applicant

The Grade II* listed building, is situated in a group of listed farm buildings. Works have been done on the property in the 16th, 17th and 19th century, showing traditional local construction techniques. Its grade II* listing places it in the top 6% of all listed buildings. The building requires extensive repair to preserve it and works to repair and restore the building are on-going.

The application is retrospective for the replacement of 7 windows and the amendment to the design of one window. The windows frames had deteriorated but the scheme has replaced them with a consistent, modern style rather than replace them on a like for like basis.

Signed James R M Jones

Date 3 - 6 - 16

Item 3 – 0102/16 - Structural repairs to ceiling, including strengthening works to beam, insertion of new joists and construction of concrete block supporting wall – Wringworthy Farm, Tavistock

Speaker: Mrs Roberts - Applicant

The Officer reminded Members that the application is to regularise the structural works to the ceiling, joists and beam in the dining room, which was the medieval hall.

The joists have been trimmed by 200mm to remove damaged ends, these are now connected to a steel channel and a 1.2m dense concrete block wall has been constructed to support beams and the stone arch way. It is a retrospective application for an unauthorised scheme which has generated strong objection from Historic England and the DNPA Historic Buildings Officer.

Members were informed of correspondence received from Historic England requiring the application to be referred to the National Planning Casework Unit if Members were 'Minded to Approve' and that a decision to approve should not be issued. The Authority retained the right however to refuse consent.

A Structural Engineer, commissioned by the Authority, has proposed an alternative solution as he considers the current scheme over-engineered. The opinion of the expert bodies is to keep the steel strengthening works and the alterations to the joists, as remedial works would result in further loss of historic fabric, but the concrete block wall hides a 17th century recess and harms the original floor plan and does not protect historic assets in any way.

Mrs Roberts informed Members that the work has been carried out using a highly qualified structural engineer, and the repairs needed to be done to support the structure of the building. The concrete block wall does not damage any historic fabric and it solves three major issues. The option suggested by the structural engineer brought in by the Authority only solves the issue of supporting the ceiling, the archway would need to be stitched, which would require holes to be drilled in to the stone and metal rods to be inserted.

In response to a Members question, Mrs Roberts informed Members that the concrete wall solves three issues. It supports the granite archway, it provides support for beam 4, and where beam 2 and the granite archway meet, there is a crack from movement which also requires support.

The Head of Planning reminded Members that the safety and the stability of the building is the responsibility of the Owner, the decision is to be made on whether the works are preserving a grade II* listed building. The advice from the Authority's Structural Engineer is that there is a much less intrusive method of support.

Signed 

Date 3-6-16

The windows have a uniform robust frame, a recessed casement, pronounced mullions, a deep bottom rail and a new sill, with a high timber to glass ratio, resulting in a reduction in glazing size. Some of the windows have also had their orientation changed.

Officers and Historic England are of the opinion that the windows have harmed the special character of the building. Historic England stated the windows are of a robust nature, they confuse the phasing of the building, the new frames are based on a Victorian design and this accumulation of factors makes them unsuitable replacements.

Mrs Roberts stated that the listing of the building was not based on the windows, and the windows that have been taken out were 20th century. The replacement windows do display a wide range of design. The old windows had large frames, which she feels have been similarly matched. She stated that she believes the windows do not harm the character and they increase the safety and efficiency of the building.

Members were reminded that the decision must be made on the whole application and not the basis of individual windows.

Members discussed the possible next steps and the implications of Enforcement action.

Dr Mortimer stated that the change in the windows confuses the phasing of the house, and therefore proposed the recommendation, which was seconded by Miss Moyse.

A Member stated that they would not be supporting the recommendation as the new windows increase the security to the property and modern standards for heat preservation and draft exclusion are higher than when the previous windows were installed. It would be difficult to find a better replacement.

The motion to move the recommendation was not carried.

Mr Gribble proposed that listed buildings consent be granted. Mr Sanders seconded the proposal. Mr Gribble stated that the removal of the current windows may cause further damage and there is no guarantee that replacements would be any better, which was carried. The proposer confirmed his view that the windows did not harm the character, appearance or setting of the Listed Building.

RESOLVED:

That Listed Building Consent be GRANTED.

Signed Jones R A T

Date 3-6-13

Members discussed the harm affecting the listed building, and the substantial harm the renovations have caused.

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

Members discussed the possibility of enforcement action. The Head of Planning informed Members that any enforcement action would give the applicant time to find an alternative solution.

RESOLVED:

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

Item 4 – 0671/15 - Erection of an agricultural building to house new dairy unit milking parlour, together with hardstanding , collection yard and new access track and landscape

Speaker Mr Courtier

The Case Officer reminded Members that the application is for a rotary milking parlour with collecting yard, hard standing and access track which will accommodate a 300 cow dairy unit using the New Zealand system. The applicant has explored different sites but this is the most suitable for the New Zealand system, which requires the milking parlour to be central to the grazing areas.

The proposed building would be set in to the ground to reduce the roof height on the sky line, and the medieval field system boundaries would be reinstated, along with the planting of native trees. Despite the proposed suggestions to reduce the effect on the landscape, the Case Officer believes that the building would have a detrimental visual impact on the surrounding area, but recognises the fact that the enterprise would contribute to Dartmoor's agricultural economy.

Mr Courtier informed Members that to reduce the visual impact of the building an extensive hedge planting scheme would be initiated and there would be no flood lighting. All milking would be done within daylight hours. The tracks to the milking parlour would be made from shillet, which is considered good farming practice. Defra and the NFU have supported the proposed scheme.

In response to a Members question, Mr Courtier informed Members that other locations have been looked at but for the cattle and the tankers this proposed site is the best possible location.

Signed James D. J. [Signature]

Date 3-6-10

Members congratulated the applicant on his passion to continue farming, proposing to start a new enterprise on Dartmoor and a good opportunity for the next generation. They expressed their concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed buildings and any future development that may occur around it.

Miss Oakley proposed the recommendation due to the harm it would cause to the landscape, which was seconded by Miss Moyse. The motion was not carried.

Mr Ball proposed to Grant Permission, which was seconded by Mr Gribble

The Head of Planning asked Members for the application to be Deferred for Officers to consider conditions in line with the agreed protocol for dealing with decisions contrary to officer recommendation. Mr Ball and Mr Gribble both agreed the course of action. The report will be presented at the next Development Management meeting with the recommendation for refusal mentioned, but the suggested planning conditions will be in the report for Members consideration if they are Minded to Approve.

RESOLVED:

The application was DEFERRED.

1142 Applications for Determination by the Committee


Mr Christophers and Dr Mortimer left the meeting

Item 1 – 0360/15 – Residential development comprising 93 dwellings, access roads, public car park, public open space, demolition of and rebuilding of fire station, new B1 business units and public toilet (Full Planning Permission), Land off Lower Street, Chagford.

Speaker: Mr Lohfink – Applicants representative

The site is part of the allocation under policy CHG2 in the Development Plan. The site has been part of the master planning exercise, which has resulted in the proposal in the application.

The site will include business units, a carpark and housing for older people. The fire station will be relocated. The character of the lane beside the site will be retained. A boundary hedge will be planted and the oak tree in the middle of the site will be protected. Some of the undulations from tin mining will be levelled out but the general lie of the land will be preserved. Wildlife corridors will be protected in reference to condition 14d and version 7 of the Ecological Impact Assessment. A minor change to the wording of condition 14 is proposed.

Signed 
Date 3-6-16

The redesign of the houses are a simple housing design with reference to the Chagford vernacular.

The Chagford Community Trust (CCT) will retain the freehold on the affordable homes and the business units and have led the plans outlining the S106.

Condition 27 is not required due to the parking provision being dealt with in the S106 agreement.

The Head of Planning informed Members that it was too difficult to achieve the 50/50 split with freehold units and affordable/shared ownership units. The agreement is that 28 units will be affordable housing, which will be comprised of 12 one bed flats, 6 two bed houses and 4 three bed houses, with 6 units offered for shared ownership.

Blue Cedar housing have contributed £350,000 towards housing and community development, which could be used either on the CG Fry site or as now suggested in the wider Parish/National Park area.

Mr Ball declared a personal interest as a Member of the Fire Authority.

Mr Lohfink informed Members that there has been huge community engagement to ensure the development sits well. The Parish Council have worked closely and challenged the developers when appropriate and the whole process has been an exemplar way of working between the Authority and the developer, and the local community.

In response to Members questions, Mr Lohfink informed the Members that the culvert and the public toilets would be managed by the Parish Council once the development is complete. The footpath on only one side of the road over the culvert bridge is an urban design feature but there is no technical reason for not including a footpath both sides if Members wish. The homes would display a variety of designs – some with plain render, others with detailed stonework. The car park would be the responsibility of the Parish Council as they would hold ownership under the S106. The car park may well be managed by separate agreement with the Borough Council.

The Head of Planning stated that the Officers and Highways Department do not see a need for a footpath on both sides of the culverted bridge section, but it can be considered. Chagford village centre is characterised by some narrow footpaths sometimes only on one side of the road. There was no appetite from Member to change the layout submitted.

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

In response to a Members question, the Officer reassured Members that the ecologist is now satisfied – as stated in Version 7 of the ecological report.

Signed 

Date 3-6-16

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services suggested to Members that the recommendation should also include permission for the Head of Planning to amend and alter conditions and the S106 as required. Members agreed that the final terms of the S106 should be settled in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman.

The Chairman congratulated everyone involved in the process.

RESOLVED:

That subject to the conditions in the report permission be GRANTED, with delegated permission to the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of Development Management to settle the terms of the S106 Planning Obligation and fine tune conditions as necessary.

Mr Christophers and Dr Mortimer re-joined the meeting.

Item 2 – 0071/16 Erect single storey extension to the side and rear of existing dwelling (Full Planning Permission – Householder), 1 New Cottages, Meavy

Speaker: Ms Sutherland - Agent

The Officer reminded Members that the previous application for a single storey extension on this dwelling was refused. The alterations in the plans, indicated the new proposal would have slate hanging on the wall and glazing on the end wall, reducing the visual impact. Officers are concerned about the effect that the extension would have on the symmetry of the cottages and the impact on the conservation area.

Ms Sutherland informed Members that the applicant had had pre-application discussions with the Officer and the application has not changed from what was proposed. The neighbours have no problem with the proposed extension. In her opinion the neighbouring houses have a much more harmful visual impact on the conservation area than the proposed extension would have.

The Head of Planning informed Members that the Historic Buildings Officer was concerned by the proposal and could not support it.

Members discussed the negative impact that the newer houses next door have on the Conservation Area compared to the one storey extension. The Officer advised Members that the glazing would be the only way to lighten the extensions visual impact, but that advice was given as a suggestion in the pre-application process, not a guarantee for permission. Members commented on the symmetry of the Victorian cottages and how that should not be spoilt.

Signed James R. T. M.

Date 3-6-16

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

RESOLVED:

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

Mr Hill left the Meeting

Mrs Oakley left the Meeting

Item 3 – 0140/16 - Siting of a mobile home for temporary agricultural dwelling (Full Planning Permission), Blackdown Piper, Widcombe-in-the-Moor

Speakers: Paul Hammett – Local resident
Ed Persse – Applicants Agent

The Case Officer reported that this application is for a temporary agricultural worker accommodation at Blackdown Piper Farm, located south of Challacombe Down. There is evidence that indicates the established need for accommodation on site for a farm worker. A 1 -2 bed mobile home (4.8m x 10m), with a parking area, access and hardstanding would be placed close to an existing farm building. The site is surrounded by common land, with a premier archaeological landscape to the north. The site is not considered suitable for a permanent dwelling; should permission be granted it would only be for three years.

The recommendation to grant permission would be subject to two further conditions:

- 1) The mobile home would rest on a timber plinth in accordance to the approved drawings, there would be no concrete plinth unless otherwise agreed.
- 2) The permission would not include the timber decking shown on the drawings as this was outside the red lined area.

Mr Hammett stated to Members that there have been lots of similar applications over the last six years. The proposed dwelling would not nestle in to the landscape, and would have a negative visual impact. It is vital to protect the upland landscape from development and many locals object to this proposal.

Mr Persse informed Members that the proposed mobile home would be modest in scale. The National Park Authority have accepted that there is a need for a farm workers dwelling. Other dwellings similar to this have been approved in the valley and this mobile unit would be next to a large barn, reducing its visual impact on the landscape.

Signed



Date 3-6-16

In response to a Members question, Mr Persse stated that there is a need for a long term solution, and the applicants are trying to find an appropriate location.

Members commented that previous similar applications had been turned down for both permanent and temporary dwellings. The Case Officer stated to Members that the application for a permanent dwelling on the site was too big and not appropriate for the siting in the landscape. The new location is next to a large barn and it is a small mobile home. The agricultural appraisal indicates that livestock numbers for the farm have nearly doubled in 6 years.

Members discussed the possibility of there being a better site available and the risk that having a temporary dwelling here would make the case to make a permanent dwelling in this location, and therefore Mr Gribble proposed to refuse permission, which was seconded by Mr Jeffery.

RESOLVED:

That permission be REFUSED, due to the location not being suitable.

Item 4 – 0118/16 – Demolition of block of three garages, erection of detached two bedroom bungalow with off street parking and erection of detached double garage (Full Planning permission) 20 Beverley Gardens, Ashburton

Speaker: Mr Slater - Applicant

The Case Officer informed Members that the site is in a modern cul-de-sac of terraced and semi-detached dwellings within Ashburton. The site is currently occupied with three garages and green space between two terraces. The application proposed to demolish the garages and erect a two bedroom bungalow, with a replacement double garage for 20 Beverley Gardens. The revised plans indicate two parking spaces would also be created, which addresses one of the points raised during public consultation.

The proposed dwelling would have rendered elevations and a concrete tile shallow roof, which would strongly contrast with the pattern and character of the estate. The design has awkward building proportions and is at odds with the National Park design guide.

Mr Slater stated to Members that he felt there is a need for a single storey dwelling in Ashburton. It would be timber frame construction, with only a 1m roof height increase from the garages roof height. There is already a mix of houses in Beverley Gardens and Mr Slater believes this will fit in to the street scene.

Mr Retallick proposed a site visit to assess the impact on the neighbours and how the design of the proposed building will fit in to the surrounding area. Mr Gribble seconded the proposal.

Signed

Date

3-6-16

RESOLVED:

That the application be DEFERRED for a site inspection.

Item 5 – 0487/15 – Demolition of existing commercial garage and erection of three dwelling housing (Full Planning Permission), Court Street Garage, Court Street, Moretonhampstead

The Case Officer stated to Members that the application is for the demolition of the existing commercial garage site, where a former fuel station and motor repair business ceased trading a number of years ago.

The applicant owns the site and currently uses it as a store. The buildings are in a poor state of repair and the site requires decontamination. The plans indicate one four bed dwelling and two 2 bed dwellings on the site, to be constructed of render walls, with timber cladding and slate roofing. The Officer informed Members that there are no design or other planning issues, but the applicant cannot meet the 50% policy requirement on affordable units, due to the costs involved in removing the fuel tanks and the decontamination of the land. A viability assessment has been carried out which confirms this.

Members expressed their concern that none of the three dwellings would be affordable, but stated that it's a good use of a brown field site and understood the costs involved in clearing the site.

The recommendation was duly proposed and seconded.

RESOLVED:

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

Item 6 – 0041/16 – Demolition of first floor offices and erection of replacement offices (Full Planning Permission), Devonian Sheepskin and Tannery Ltd, Mardle Way, Buckfastleigh

The Case Officer informed Members that the application is for a replacement office on the site of the Devonian Sheepskin Tannery. The old building is in a state of disrepair with rotten window frames and failing roof. The current owner has identified the need to improve the office appearance as it is the main meeting place for business clients. The application indicates the proposed building will be built on the existing stone plinth, with refurbished timber structure, a pitched metal roof and large glazed windows, resulting in an improved appearance and facilities to accommodate the business.

The Town Council have expressed concerns that the new building could jeopardise the masterplan as the Devonian site is central in the DMD plans. The Town Council does support Devonian as a significant employer in the town.

Signed 

Date 3-6-16

In response to a Member, the Head of Planning informed Members that disabled access would be dealt with by Building Regulations.

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

RESOLVED:

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

Item 7 – 0144/16 – Formation of new field access (Full Planning Permission), field opposite Dartmoor Lodge, Peartree Cross, Ashburton

The Case Officer stated to Members that the application is for a new field access opposite Dartmoor Lodge at Peartree Cross. The access would be used for livestock trailers and agricultural vehicles. The current access is not considered safe from a highways perspective and would be used just for pedestrian access. The proposed access has good visibility to/from both directions and has been recommended by the Highways Authority.

A hardcore ramp will ensure the 1m change in levels from the road side to the field is not an issue, and two 2.5m wide standard timber five bar gates with supporting posts will be installed. The applicant has stated that in response to the ecological report, the hedgerow will be allowed to grow, which will make it more attractive to wildlife.

A Member did comment on the busy road, with traffic coming from the hotel and three other directions – the main road and a side road, but the Officer assured him that the Highways Authority believes the access has excellent visibility and certainly much better than many existing field accesses on Dartmoor.

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

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the conditions in the report, permission be GRANTED

Appeals

Members received the report of the Head of Planning (NPA/DM/16/018)

RESOLVED:

Members noted the report

Signed

Date

3-6-16

1143 Appointment of Site Inspection Panel and Arrangements for Site Visits

Item 4 - 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 Beverly Gardens, Ashburton

Members to attend: Mr Hitchins, Mr Jeffery, Mr Webber, Mr Sanders, Mr Christophers and Mr McInnes

Signed Jonathan McInnes

Date 3 - 6 - 16