

## CHAPTER 10 TOWN / VILLAGE SETTLEMENT INSETS

### MONKSILVER

#### 10.49. PARA. 10.11.2

##### Objection

25	Monksilver Parish Council
----	---------------------------

##### Issue

Whether the village development limits should be amended to provide a site for about 6 affordable dwellings on land east of the village hall.

##### Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The omission site is located east of the village hall car park. It consists of Grade 2 agricultural land in open countryside and rises steeply eastwards. I consider it would be a conspicuously substantial extension of the village in a direction where there is little development save the village hall on its spacious site and some sporadic low density housing on the south west side of Combecross Hill. Pedestrian access from the rest of the village is poor. The parish council considers that alternative undeveloped land within the settlement boundary will not come forward

In my view the open countryside location and agricultural quality of the objection site weigh convincingly against its inclusion within the settlement limit. However, if a proven need for affordable housing were demonstrated the site could be examined under Policy H5 as an exception to the normal policies regarding housing in the open countryside.

#### 10.49.1. RECOMMENDATION

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

---

#### 10.50. PARA. 10.11.3

##### Objections

26	Monksilver Parish Council
438	Mrs J Walcot

##### Issue

The justification for the reference in paragraph 10.11.3 to 'small declining population'.

##### Inspector's reasoning and conclusion

Successive census returns and the 1998 population estimate by the Office of National Surveys show a population reduction from 130 to 90 in Monksilver parish between 1981 and 1998. The statement in paragraph 10.11.3 is therefore factual notwithstanding that the village is not characterised by vacant, decayed or derelict property. I have received no evidence regarding the objector's speculation as to whether the decline is attributable to planning policies. The statement

would be open to future correction if the forthcoming 2001 census returns were to show a different trend but I find no current justification to delete it.

#### **10.50.1. RECOMMENDATION**

**I recommend that no modification be made in response to these objections.**

#### **10.51. PARA. 10.11.4**

##### **Objection**

27	Monksilver Parish Council
----	---------------------------

##### **Inspector's note**

I deal with this objection in my conclusions and recommendation on objection 26 above

---

#### **10.52. PARA. 10.11.4 AND SETTLEMENT MAP 11**

##### **Objection**

28	Monksilver Parish Council
----	---------------------------

##### **Issue**

Whether the settlement development limits are too tightly constraining.

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

As paragraph s 10.11.5 and 10.11.6 of the Plan record, Monksilver is a village with little in the way of facilities and has a poor public transport service. The majority of working people have to commute elsewhere. Against that background I consider the village is correctly defined as subject to the new Policy SP/4 (PC9). In a village which has seen little recent development it seems to me that to enhance the opportunity for residential development by defining more generous settlement development limits would encourage car commuting, contrary to strategic, regional, and national policy.

#### **10.52.1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

---

#### **10.53. OMISSION - MONKSILVER**

##### **Objection**

761	Environment Agency-South West Region
-----	--------------------------------------

##### **Issues**

- (i) Development within the flood plain.
- (ii) The identification of a buffer ecological and wildlife corridor alongside the Monksilver

stream.

- (iii) The arrangements for the disposal of surface water from new development.

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

All issues

The question of flood risk is dealt with generally by paragraphs 21 and 22 of PPG 25, Policy RE2 of RPG 10, and Policy 60 of the Structure Plan. In Local Plan terms development in the flood plain is subject to consideration under Policy W/7 as amended by PC 70, which requires satisfactory mitigation of flood risk. The objector does not state whether a buffer ecological and wildlife corridor would be coterminous with the flood plan but without any evidence to the contrary I assume that is what is meant.

PC 71 expands paragraph 4.4.13 by stating the intention to add the Environment Agency's flood plain boundaries to Proposals and Inset Maps. Subject to the amendment of the Inset Map 11 by that change I consider no further modification necessary.

#### **10.53.1. RECOMMENDATION**

I recommend no modification, save that of Inset Map 11 under PC 71 (Chapter 4), be made in response to this objection.