

CHAPTER 10 TOWN / VILLAGE SETTLEMENT INSETS

DUNSTER MARSH

10.18. PARA. 10.6.1

Objections

9	Miss A M Dobson
315	Mr S Clements

Issues

Whether Dunster Marsh should be regarded as a village

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The built-up area is named Marsh Street on Ordnance Survey maps. However, the LPA points out that the term Dunster Marsh and Marsh Street are largely interchangeable names. Nevertheless, Dunster Marsh in the Plan is intended to infer a wider catchment area than the predominantly residential area of Marsh Street and is treated as part of Dunster village as a whole. Because of that, Dunster Marsh is interpreted as a village in Policy SP/2 and PC5, as it is part of the wider settlement in which a range of services is available. I support that interpretation.

10.18.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no modification of the Plan be made in response to these objections.

10.19. PARA. 10.6.6

Objection

316	Mr S Clements
-----	---------------

Issue

The accuracy of the description of Dunster Marsh as 'relatively modern' in paragraph 10.6.6

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

As the description in the paragraph accords with the somewhat longer one in the West Somerset Landscape Character Assessment I do not consider it requires amendment.

10.19.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that no modification be made to the Plan in response to this objection.

10.20. PARA. 10.6.7

Objections

10	Miss A M Dobson
317	Mr S Clements
639	G Richmond
643	Mr D Shellard

Issues

- (i) Whether the distance from Minehead is correctly stated.
- (ii) Whether the amount of housing at Dunster Marsh proposed in the Plan is excessive.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusion

Issue (i)

The distance of 1.5 miles does not refer to the centre of the town but to the Minehead Enterprise Park. For the avoidance of doubt I shall recommend that that destination be inserted in PC274.

Issue (ii)

The LPA acknowledges that the allocation of sites 6, 7, 8, and 9 contravenes the national advice in paragraphs 30 and 31 of PPG3 regarding the development of greenfield land. PC 274 makes allowance for the deletion of sites 6, 8, and 9 and the modest revised level of development embracing Higher Marsh Farm (site 7) and a further small scale potential windfall site identified in the Urban Residential Capacity Study. I deal with that change in paragraph 8.11 of this report where I consider objection 2547.

10.20.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC267 subject to the insertion of 'from Minehead Enterprise Park' after '1.5 miles'.

10.21. PARA. 10.6.8.

Objection

646	Mr D Shellard
-----	---------------

Issue

Traffic management during construction and after the occupation of proposed development at Dunster Marsh.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The removal of sites 6, 8 and 9 will considerably reduce the additional volume of traffic generated by development at Dunster Marsh. As the deleted sites would have been the principal traffic generators there will be considerably less pressure on the Sea Lane/Station Road junction and the Avill Road Bridge. As the sustained proposals for Higher Marsh Farm (site 7) are in conformity with Structure

Plan Policy 49 *Transport Requirements for New Development* I find no reason to amend this paragraph.

10.21.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend no modification be made to the Plan in response to this objection.

10.22. POLICY DM/1

Objections

290	Mr and Mrs D Doyle
320	Mr S Clements
323	Mrs O Pitt
325	Ms M Lacey
327	Mrs V McDade
329	Mr G Pitt
331	Mrs D Scott
429	J Morrison
431	Mr and Mrs N Welsh
436	Mrs J Walcot
455	Mr C Hammond-Smith
468	Mr B Gurnett
469	Mr P Cross
475	Mrs S Morgan
480	Mrs H Glaister
482	Ms K Baker
484	Mr A Brown
526	Mr A Vicary
565	Blue Anchor Conservation Society
630	Somerset Wildlife Trust
638	G Richmond
644	Mr D Shellard
674	Mr and Mrs A Harris
870	Government Office for the South West
1009	Mr D Gliddon
1077	Carhampton Parish Council
1085	Crown Estate Commissioners

Supporter

288	Minehead Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses
-----	--

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The large number of objections to Policy DM/1 (and to the allocations of land for housing at Dunster Marsh in Policy H/1) regarding the development proposed at Dunster Marsh in the deposit draft Plan

ranges over a wide series of issues which are summarised in Appendix 3 of this report. However, the background to the objections is radically changed by the LPA's response to more recent national advice in PPG3 and regional advice in RPG10 which postdate the deposit draft Plan. PC275 consequently deletes Policy DM/1. However, I deal with subsequent considerations in section 8.11 of this report where I examine objection 2547. I therefore recommend the sustained allocation for residential development of land at Higher Marsh Farm (Site 7). In accordance with that recommendation I concur with the LPA's proposed replacement Policy DM/1.

10.22.1. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the Plan be modified by:

- (i) PC275; and**
- (ii) The consequent replacement of the text of Policy DM/1 by the following:**

Residential development at Higher Marsh Farm, Dunster Marsh, will be permitted subject to the following requirements:

- (i) The design and layout of the development will observe the principles in Policy BD/2 and will provide for:**
 - (a) a public house/village shop or other appropriate community facility;**
 - (b) a number of live/work units as a proportion of the open market housing secured by a Section 106 Planning obligation;**
 - (c) a recreation field and picnic area on land south of Marsh Lane; and**
- (ii) The provision of related highway improvements including the provision of a footpath and cycle link along Marsh Lane to its junction with the A39 road.**

In considering the wider community and infrastructure requirements for the development of site 7 regard will be paid to Policies H/5, PO/1, and T/14.

10.23. PARA. 10.6.9

Objections

291	Mr and Mrs D Doyle
318	Mr S Clements
448	Mr D Claxon
471	Mr P Cross
478	Mrs S Morgan
486	Mr A Brown
647	Mr D Shellard

Issues

Whether the provisions for residential development at Dunster Marsh are compatible with the scale of local employment opportunity.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The general burden of the objections is the lack of balance between the scale of the residential development proposed at Dunster Marsh in the draft deposit Plan and the lack of employment in Dunster. I consider the force of that reason for objection is considerably reduced by the deletion of residential sites 6,8, and 9. At the same time, the settlement is within 1.5 miles of the Minehead Enterprise Park and easily accessible by cycle or a regular bus service.

The revised development proposals for Higher Marsh Farm (site 7) include a number of live/work units to help promote self-employment in the locality. That accords with Policy 19 of the Structure Plan, the settlement policies of this Plan, and national policy in PPG7.

Objection 318 states that Loxhole Sawmills are no longer operating. That is noted in PC276. Subject to that change I consider the paragraph accurately describes the employment situation in the village.

10.23.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC276.

10.24. PARA. 10.6.10

Objections

319	Mr S Clements
449	Mr D Claxon
474	Mr P Cross
479	Mrs S Morgan
487	Mr A Brown
641	G Richmond

Issues

- (i) Whether local educational and medical services could cope with the increase in population of Dunster Marsh inherent in the proposals for residential development.
- (ii) Whether the development would generate more travel to Minehead.
- (iii) Whether the reference to a bank in Dunster should be deleted.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

The objections stress the strain that 135 additional dwellings would put on educational and medical services and the general paucity of facilities in Dunster other than those catering for tourists. I consider that situation is considerably eased by the revised proposals omitting Sites 6, 8, and 9 and including a site for a public house/village shop or other community facility and a playing field. The LPA states that Dunster First School would be able to enrol children from up to the 45 houses proposed without providing additional classrooms or other accommodation

Issue (ii)

I consider the degree of reliance on Minehead for shopping and leisure services is acceptable. Although it is likely that residents would use cars there is a reasonably frequent bus service; central Minehead is about 2.5 miles by cycle and the Minehead Enterprise Park and major food store about

1.5 miles distant.

Issue (iii)

PC277 acknowledges that there is no longer a bank in Dunster. Subject to that change I am satisfied that paragraph 10.6.10 accurately describes the situation regarding services in the locality.

10.24.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC277.

10.25. PARA. 10.6.11

Objections

450	Mr D Claxon
473	Mr P Cross
488	Mr A Brown
642	G Richmond

Issues

- (i) The provision and location of a playing field.
- (ii) The provision of a community hall.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

Objection 450 and 488 variously note that a former playing field in the locality was closed through lack of use; the proposed site adjoins ungated crossings of the West Somerset Railway; and that it also is near Haven Close where elderly residents predominate.

The deletion of site 9 as a result of revised proposals submitted presented at the Inquiry into objections to the Plan also includes the deletion of the playing field on that site. It is proposed to be replaced by an alternative facility in association with the mixed use development of Higher Marsh Farm (Section 8.11 of this report). So far as concerns the need for a facility it would provide for households with children in the new development and should also be seen as a contribution to meeting the needs of a wider demand for outdoor playing space in the Minehead area generally. .

Issue (ii)

The community hall was part of the draft deposit Plan proposal for site 9 which is now proposed to be deleted. The revised development proposals for Higher Marsh Farm envisage the provision of a community building by means of the conversion of an existing building within that site. The LPA states that its exact nature would be the subject of public consultation when the Plan reaches its Proposed Modifications Stage. I support the LPA's revised version of paragraph 10.6.11 which deletes reference to Site 9.

10.25.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that references to site 9 in paragraph 10.6.11 be deleted and replaced by the following:

As part of the development proposals for Higher Marsh Farm the Local Planning Authority will seek the conversion of the existing farmhouse or traditional buildings associated with it into a public house/ village shop or will provide some other such appropriate community facility as a community hall. In addition, contributions for new recreation facilities will be sought in association with the housing scheme, which include the provision of a local recreation field and the provision of a local picnic area.

10.26. PARA. 10.6.12

Objections

472	Mr P Cross
477	Mrs S Morgan

Issue

The effect of residential development on wildlife at Dunster Marsh

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

I consider the deletion of sites 6, 8, and 9 by PC275 is likely to result in markedly less potential disturbance to the wildlife of the Dunster Marshes County Wildlife Site and the Prime Biodiversity Area. In the circumstances I find no justification to restrict the allocation of residential land further as a result of concerns about wildlife. I concur with the correction in PC278 regarding the age of buildings in Dunster Marsh but find no reason to include mention of wildlife.

10.26.1. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC278 but that no modification be made in response to objections 472 and 477.

10.27. PARA. 10.6.14

Objection

11	Miss A M Dobson
----	-----------------

Issue

Whether paragraph 10.6.14 should more firmly state the intention to protect the specimen trees and woodlands surrounding the village.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusion

The LPA has no power to enforce the retention of woodland and specimen trees on land in the ownership of the Crown. However, the trees and woodland around Dunster Marsh are recognised in the West Somerset Landscape Character Assessment as key characteristics of the Blue Anchor Bay Character Area. Any proposals for development there will fall to be assessed under Policy LC/3.

That is recorded in PC279, which I support

10.27.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC279.

10.28. SETTLEMENT MAP 6 AND CHANGE NO 265

Objections to PC265

2338	Mr B H Biggs
2547	Crown Estates Commissioners

Issues

- (i) The justification for the deletion of Sites 6, 7, 8, and 9.
- (ii) Whether in the light of the total windfall allowance Sites 6 and 7 should remain allocated for residential development.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

Objection 2338 involves the same matter as objection 2335 which I consider in section 8.1 of this report.

Issue (ii)

The original objection 2547 to PC265 is superseded by the objector's representations in the inquiry. The revised position was agreed by the LPA in respect of the allocation of land for residential development at Higher Marsh Farm. It was further confirmed in the Authority's written response to objections 565, 630, and others regarding Policy DM/1, which I deal with above in Section 10.22 of this Report. Consequential changes of PC265 are necessary, notably the delineation of the settlement limit and the Coastal Zone Boundary shown on Settlement Map 6 in respect of Site 7.

10.28.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that Settlement Inset Map 6 be modified by PC265, subject to further modification to show Higher Marsh Farm, Dunster Marsh, allocated for residential development with consequent revision of the settlement development boundary and that of the Coastal Zone.

10.29. OMISSION - DUNSTER MARSH: RIVER AVILL CORRIDOR

Objection

757	Environment Agency-South West Region
-----	--------------------------------------

Inspector's note

Objection 757 is conditionally withdrawn, the Environment Agency having previously objected to any development in the River Avill corridor. I am satisfied that their concern is met by the Water Environment policies and PCs and I make no further recommendation here.

10.30. COASTAL ZONE AT DUNSTER MARSH ON THE PROPOSALS AND INSET MAPS

Objection

97	Council for the Protection of Rural England
----	---

Issue

Whether with particular reference to land allocated for housing at Dunster Marsh the coastal zone is appropriately delineated on the Proposals/Inset Maps.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Paragraphs 4.5.6-7 of the Plan set out the criteria for the delineation of the Coastal Zone. PC265 amends the boundary of the Coastal Zone to include the housing sites 6, 8, and 9 which it is now proposed to delete from the Plan. A further increment will emanate from the revision of the boundary of the higher Marsh Farm site as proposed in the inquiry. In the circumstances I regard the objection as largely met. I support the amendment of PC265 suggested by the LPA.

10.30.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the Plan be modified by PC265 further modified by the exclusion of Higher Marsh Farm from the West Somerset Coastal Zone on Settlement Inset Map 6.