

## CHAPTER 10 TOWN / VILLAGE SETTLEMENT INSETS

### BRUSHFORD

#### 10.2. PARA. 10.3.2

##### Objection

|    |                          |
|----|--------------------------|
| 57 | Brushford Parish Council |
|----|--------------------------|

##### Issue

Whether the Plan should affirm that reference to facilities in relation to small scale development includes sewage, education needs and future transport policy

##### Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

I consider PC267 meets the objection by inserting precise reference to mains services and local schools in the third sentence of paragraph 10.3.2. With reference to the significance of increased car travel Brushford is defined as a village in Policy SP/3 as inserted by PC9. Public transport services fall within the scope of the County Transport Plan.

##### 10.2.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC267.

#### 10.3. PARA. 10.3.4

##### Objection

|    |                          |
|----|--------------------------|
| 58 | Brushford Parish Council |
|----|--------------------------|

##### Issue

Whether reference should be made to traditional design features and local building skills.

##### Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

I consider Policy BD/2 as amended by PC95 provides a sufficient general safeguard of traditional design features. PC268 specifically reinforces that in the case of Brushford. However, though it is a worthy objective I regard it inappropriate for the Local Plan to specify the skills or identity of the labour force to be employed in building development.

##### 10.3.1. RECOMMENDATION

**I recommend that the final sentence of paragraph 10.3.4 be modified by PC268.**

---

#### 10.4. PARA. 10.3.6

##### Objection

|    |                          |
|----|--------------------------|
| 59 | Brushford Parish Council |
|----|--------------------------|

**Issue**

The accuracy of paragraph 10.3.6 regarding sources of employment in Brushford.

**Inspector's reasoning and conclusion**

I consider that the first paragraph of paragraph 10.3.6 should be factually corrected and updated regarding commercial activities in the village

**10.4.1. RECOMMENDATION**

**I recommend that the first sentence of paragraph 10.3.6 be deleted and replaced by 'Local employment is provided by a builders' merchants at Brushford Cross, Carnarvon Arms Garage and a number of small agricultural contractors'.**

---

**10.5. PARA. 10.3.8**

**Objection**

|    |                          |
|----|--------------------------|
| 60 | Brushford Parish Council |
|----|--------------------------|

**Issue**

The accuracy of the dating of St Nicholas' church in paragraph 10.3.8.

**Inspector's reasoning and conclusions**

PC269 corrects the reference to the date of St Nicholas' church.

**10.5.1. RECOMMENDATION**

**I recommend the Plan be modified by PC268.**

---

**10.6. PARA. 10.3.12**

**Objection**

|    |                          |
|----|--------------------------|
| 61 | Brushford Parish Council |
|----|--------------------------|

**Issue**

Consultation with the Parish Council on the thinning of the trees referred to in paragraph 10.3.12.

**Inspector's reasoning and conclusions**

Arboricultural work is only subject to planning control if trees or woodlands are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, are in a Conservation Area, or falls within the scope of landscaping conditions imposed on the grant of planning permission. Policy BD/2 requires existing trees to be taken into account in association with development proposals, as does the new proposed Policy LC/3 outside settlement development limits. So far as tree thinning may be subject to planning

control I consider those policies adequate without any specifically local reference. However, where tree thinning is not motivated in association with development it may form part of a land management agreement. That does not involve planning procedures and falls outwith the scope of the development plan.

### **10.6.1. RECOMMENDATION**

**I recommend no change be made in response to this objection.**

## **10.7. SETTLEMENT MAP 3**

### **Objections**

|     |                          |
|-----|--------------------------|
| 62  | Brushford Parish Council |
| 208 | Mr R Summers             |
| 664 | Mrs T Jones              |

### **Supporters of the Settlement Development Limit line.**

|     |                        |
|-----|------------------------|
| 257 | Mrs Y Pittam           |
| 263 | G Theaker              |
| 264 | Mrs S Gardiner         |
| 262 | J Theaker              |
| 261 | Mr R Theaker           |
| 267 | Mr D H Morgan          |
| 270 | Miss A Hayes           |
| 269 | Mr M Clothier          |
| 273 | Mr and Mrs A Ma        |
| 265 | Mrs D L Wright         |
| 260 | S Getts                |
| 271 | Mr and Mrs R Carr      |
| 258 | Mr and Mrs I Lawson    |
| 259 | Mr K J Mutters         |
| 256 | J C Vanderborght       |
| 268 | R Haine                |
| 254 | Mr and Mrs Macnaughton |
| 266 | T Barnes               |
| 255 | Mr D Boldinger         |
| 272 | Ms J Barber            |

### **Issues**

- (i) Whether the settlement development limit should be extended and land allocated for residential development at Ellersdown Lane.
- (ii) Whether the whole of the site of the Carnarvon Arms Hotel including all of the old railway station and land should be included within the settlement development limit.
- (iii) The accuracy of Inset Map 3.

## **Inspector's reasoning and conclusions**

### **Issue (i)**

Brushford is a village subject to Policy SP/2. Paragraph 10.3.2 of the Plan states there are adequate facilities to support small scale residential development. In the inquiry the objector amended the representation to a proposal to allocate the land fronting Ellersdown Lane for about 20 dwellings, leaving the balance of the northward rising land forming the remainder of the site as open space. I consider the proposal unacceptable for 2 reasons. Firstly, it would be an incursion into open countryside, contrary to paragraph 3.21 of PPG3 in being neither a small group of dwellings nor filling a small gap. The continuous hedgerow marking a particularly finite boundary between the built-up part of the village and the open countryside would be seriously interrupted by access splays and the sense of the immediacy of open land next to the Lane would be lost.

Secondly, Ellersdown Lane is of single vehicle width only. Although it could be widened within the objector's land that would require a 5.5m carriageway together with footways and would not overcome the objection on visual amenity grounds of the loss of rurality. Moreover, the objector does not control the lane beyond his own frontage and its restricted width connects with the B3222 Dulverton - Bampton road where visibility for turning traffic at the junction is severely limited. Any increase in traffic on the lane would be unacceptable and the possibility of creating a one-way system, even if a degree of improvement in the junction geometry were possible, from the B3222 is problematic with the consequences for the main road traffic flow remaining unexamined.

I reject the objector's contention that the Plan's allocations of housing land are overly weighted towards development in the north of the West Somerset District; that is a consequence of the distribution of population. I note that 14 of the 16 committed dwellings at Brushford are at the Carnarvon Arms. Although the objector speculates that will not provide affordable housing, that fact nevertheless does not in my view justify the development of the Ellersdown Lane land. In any case, the 'exceptions' Policy H/5, as amended by PC207, allows affordable housing to be provided in response to demonstrable local need.

### **Issue (ii)**

Carnarvon Arms is a former hotel with planning permission for conversion to 14 dwellings. Within the curtilage of the hotel there is an extensive open area to the east and south of the building which merges with the adjoining open countryside. Only a small part nearest the hotel falls within the settlement development boundary. In my view there is no rationale to justify the southward extension of the area enclosed by the settlement development limit to include a large area of open land notwithstanding that it is within the curtilage of the Carnarvon Arms.

So far as concerns the former railway premises I note that the goods depôt stands proud of the overall site and could not be incorporated within the settlement development limit without the addition of intervening land. Notwithstanding an extant planning permission for leisure or recreational use of the depôt I agree with the LPA that that would be unacceptable in terms of the potential for development it could open up relative to the status of the village under the (new) Policy SP/3 (PC9) and in disregard of the principles of Policy LC/3 as amended by PC 28.

### **Issue (iii)**

I support the LPA's agreement that the Inset Map requires updating to take account of recent development.

### **10.7.1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**I recommend that**

- (i) Inset Map 3 be updated to include recent development in the village;**
- (ii) No modifications be made in response to objections 208 and 664.**