

CHAPTER 10 TOWN / VILLAGE SETTLEMENT INSETS

STOGUMBER

10.63 PARA 10.15.2

Objections

15	Mrs R Lawrence-Mills
420	J Morrison
442	Mrs J Walcot

Supporter

224	Mr R Darbvshire
-----	-----------------

Issues

- (i) Whether Slade Close estate affords sufficient land for an adequate amount of affordable housing in the village.
- (ii) The erosive effect of an excessive number of modern houses on the character of the village.
- (iii) Accessibility as a criterion limiting further development of the village.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

The LPA states that new housing at Slade Close has been provided on an affordable basis that largely recognises the needs of the tenure groups identified in objection 442. I have received no evidence to show it is insufficient. However, planning control cannot restrict tenure to young families only, as advocated in objection 420.

Issue (ii)

The need to protect the character of the village is in my view adequately noted in paragraph 10.15.2 and that of the Conservation Area in paragraph 10.15.9. In policy terms I consider the modification of Policies BD/1 and BD/2 by PCs 94 and 95 respectively provides appropriate design safeguards.

Issue (iii)

Objection 15 correctly identifies the network of narrow minor roads which alone serve the village. Although paragraph 10.15.7 of the Plan identifies a reasonable range of services the village lacks a daily bus service. In spite of its relatively poor accessibility I consider that the village is nevertheless appropriately identified as subject to the new Policy SP/3 (PC9). In coming to that view I have noted the findings of the Residential Urban Capacity Study. In the context of further development I see no reason to alter the well-founded advice in paragraph 10.15.2 on the siting and design of such new development as may be permitted

10.63.1. RECOMMENDATION

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

10.64. PARA. 10.15.3

Objections

2	Mr C Crees
249	Mr R Hutchings
275	Stogumber Parish Council
444	Mrs J Walcot

Issues

- (i) Whether land and buildings at Hill Farm, Stogumber, should be allocated for residential development.
- (ii) Whether land north of Hill Street to the rear of Orchard Deane/The Firs should be included within the Settlement Development Limits of the village
- (iii) Whether the proposed plan allows for too much development on one side of the village with no play area.
- (iv) Whether the remaining infilling plots and garden ends in the village should be protected against development.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

It is argued that the adjustment of the settlement development limit adjoining Hill Farm, Stogumber to permit residential development would protect one traditional building by its conversion; would eliminate farm noise, odour and traffic from the village; and would provide a community benefit by promoting the enhancement of the stream running through the site. The objection envisages either conversion, infilling, to produce a small group of about 6 to 8 dwellings.

The site straddles the Conservation Area boundary. There are traditional stone farm buildings within it and modern utilitarian buildings on the rest of the site that extends as a lobe south of the coherent built-up area of the village. I consider the suitability of the site for residential development rests on the desirability of residential incursion into the open countryside in the light of the availability of housing land, the question of safe access, and the need to constrain car traffic.

The site falls within the Doniford Stream and Quantock Fringe Character Area (Doniford Valley Sub-Area) in the West Somerset Landscape Character assessment and is subject to Policy LC/3 (PC28) and Structure Plan Policy 5. In my view the settlement development limit abutting this site is correct and its southern extension would be of residential development having a built-up character markedly different from that of the Existing farm buildings which are clearly part of a countryside scene.

While in terms of the new Policy SP/3 (PC9) the village offers scope for limited and strictly qualified development I note that the Residential Urban Capacity Study has identified 5 sites within the settlement development limits having a potential capacity of about 20 dwellings. I observe that within the scope of measured levels of development permissible under Structure Plan Policy STR5, with which Policy SP/3 is consistent, no claim in respect of this site is made arising from local need or an affordable housing requirement.

There are two means of access by means of a narrow track having no footways and leading either from Old Way/Brook Street or from Station Road. Because of substandard alignments on both routes, a ford and steep gradients on the Station Road route and restricted visibility at the Old Way junction neither affords satisfactory local access. Although the objector represents that about 6 to 8 dwellings would be provided that falls far short of the 30 dwellings/ha minimum now suggested in PPG3. Not only do I consider the access inadequate but in a wider context it seems to me that in the absence of a daily bus service to rural centre or town there would be likely to be an increase in car commuting, contrary to the national advice in PPG 13 to reduce car travel.

For all these reasons I find no justification to vary the settlement development limits and allocate this site for residential development.

Issue (ii)

The objection site, the western part of the field at the rear of Orchard Deane and The Firs, is within easy walking distance of various village commercial and community facilities. It is estimated to be capable of accommodating about 6 or 8 properties in a cul-de-sac development. Although the Parish Council requested this land be incorporated within the Development Limit Line at the consultation stage of the Plan it was omitted from the deposit draft. Applications for planning permission of a single dwelling were refused in the 1990s. In my view its suitability for development consideration in terms of the Settlement Inset Map depends on landscape considerations, land availability, and access in both the local and the wider senses.

I am inclined to agree with the LPA that the settlement development limit along the southern and western sides of the site makes a clear cut boundary defining the village. The site is part of the setting of the village and distinguishes it from the attractive surrounding open countryside of the Doniford Valley Sub-Area in the District Council's landscape classification which is subject to Policy LC/3 as changed by PC28.

While in terms of the new Policy SP/3 (PC9) the village offers scope for limited and strictly qualified development I note that the Residential Urban Capacity Study has identified 5 sites within the settlement development limits having a potential capacity of about 20 dwellings. I observe that within the scope of measured levels of development permissible under Structure Plan Policy STR5, with which Policy SP/3 is consistent, no claim is made arising from local need or an affordable housing requirement

So far as concerns local access Hill Street is of substandard width and alignment, lacks footways and has an irregular pattern of street lighting. In the interest of pedestrian safety I consider those disadvantages rule against further development. In the wider sense it seems to me that the infrequent local bus service would be likely to lead to an increase in car traffic to centres of employment and shopping, contrary to the national advice in PPG 13 to reduce car travel. In all these circumstances I find no justification to vary the settlement development limits and allocate this site for residential development.

Issue (iii)

I deal with this issue in section 10.67 of this report in response to objection 422.

Issue (iv)

It appears to me that while Paragraph 10.15.3 refers to 'infilling on suitable plots'; it does not imply that all garden ends and small paddocks will be suitable for development. Indeed, any proposals for such infilling would fall to be considered on their merits in the light of the Plan policies. In particular, as the objector observes, some will be protected by Conservation Area and Listed Building constraints. I find no reason to amend the Plan.

10.64.1. RECOMMENDATIONS

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

10.65. PARA. 10.15.5

Objection

421	J Morrison
-----	------------

Issue

Whether further development at Slade Close would be likely to inhibit the tourist trade.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusion

I consider new residential development within the development limits near Station Road/Pickpurse Lane would consolidate development on the eastern side of the village without detracting from its overall character. The LPA's Residential Urban Capacity Study suggests the potential for 2 small scale housing sites adjoining Slade Close but clearly separated from the Conservation Area. As any such development would be subject to Policies SP/3 and BD/1 and BD/2 as changed by PCs 94 and 95 respectively I consider there are sufficient constraints to protect the village character.

10.65.1. RECOMMENDATION

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

10.66. PARA 10.15.6

Objections

223	Mr R Darbyshire
276	Stogumber Parish Council

Issue

The inclusion of reference to employment at Wick House Residential Home.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

PC294 incorporates an additional source of employment but is not up to date, Wick House having

changed to holiday accommodation. I support the amended version produced by the LPA.

10.66.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that the text of paragraph 10.15.6 be deleted and replaced by:

A small repair garage has closed and, apart from a limited number of jobs in the service sector that include holiday accommodation, agriculture is the main employer.

10.67. PARA.10.15.7.

Objections

16	Mrs R Lawrence-Mills
422	J. Morrison

Issues

- (i) The accuracy of the reference to village services.
- (ii) Whether the Plan should identify a new play area on land at Butts Close for Slade Close residents.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

I consider the paragraph gives the impression there is more than one shop in the village. I prefer PC 295, which does not separate the shop from other facilities. I deem no further modification necessary.

Issue (ii)

I consider the recent provision of a new play area on the eastern side of the village adjoining Slade Close meets the need expressed in objection 422. It should be shown as Open Space - Playground on Settlement Map 15.

10.67.1. RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the Play Area at Slade Close be identified on Settlement Map 15 as Open Space - Playground.

10.68. PARA. 10.15.9.

Objections

225	Mr R Darbvshire
226	Mr R Darbvshire
875	Government Office for the South West

Issues

- (i) Whether paragraph 10.15.9 should refer to clay tiles.
- (ii) Whether paragraph 10.15.9 properly distinguishes policy from guidance
- (iii) Whether Stogumber Conservation Area should include Brook Cottage/Lower Kernshill.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

I support the reference in PC297 to clay tiled roofs which meets objection 225.

Issue (ii)

GOSW asserts it is not clear whether the paragraph contains matters of policy or is setting out guidance for developers. If it is the former, the relevant matters should be set out as a formal policy, rather than in the reasoned justification, whereas guidance should be published separately from the Plan (PPG12 para 3.18 and 3.19). In my view the mandatory tone of the paragraph suggests policy. However, the LPA clarifies that it is intended as a reasoned justification indicating the local context. In the circumstances. I consider its tone should be clearly informative and advisory. I therefore propose a slightly different modification from that suggested by the LPA.

Issue (iii)

As paragraph 2.9 of PPG15 makes clear, the designation of Conservation Area boundaries and their revision is a matter formally independent of the procedure for making Local Plans. Irrespective of the conservation merits of Brook Cottage and Lower Kernshill it is therefore inappropriate for me to comment on objection 226.

10.68.1. RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that Paragraph 10.15.9 be modified by the deletion of the second sentence and the preamble of the third sentence and their replacement by :

Within this wider policy framework, which also includes Building Design proposals for development in Stogumber should have regard to the following local characteristics:-;

10.69. STOGUMBER - OMISSIONS

Objections

230	Mr R Darbyshire
763	Environment Agency-South West Region

Issues

- (i) The exacerbation of flooding problems by development.
- (ii) Whether land west of Quantock View should be allocated as a burial ground.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusion

Issue (i)

I bear in mind that the EA is a consultative body in respect of applications for planning permission, Policies W/6, changed by PC67, and W/7, changed by PC70, together with the insertion of floodplain boundaries by PC71 accord with national policy in paragraphs 21 and 22 of PPG25. In my view they afford adequate control of development affecting floodplains. In that context I find no compelling reason to provide specific text on this issue in relation to Stogumber.

Issue (ii)

Objection 230 reports that the Parish Church Council has taken out an option on land west of Quantock View as a possible site for future burials. I agree with the LPA that it is inappropriate to define the land in question as a burial ground on Settlement Map 15 until a final decision is taken to acquire the land.

10.69.1. RECOMMENDATION

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

10.70. SETTLEMENT MAP 15 - RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

Objection

423	J Morrison
-----	------------

Issue

Whether development of the sites allocated on settlement map 15 (Stogumber) at the junction of Pickpurse Lane/Wood Lane Station Road known as Wallfield and Butts Close would accord with the guidelines set out in Paragraphs 8.1.14 or 8.1.15.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

The reference to Regional Planning Guidance in paragraph 8.1.14 is stated by the LPA to concern major housing development such as Policy H/1 deals with. The sites at Station Road, Stogumber, conform with Policy SS 19 of the Regional Plan which states that development 'outside market towns should be small scale within or adjacent to existing settlements'. That is consistent with national policy in PPG 3 (paras 29-31 and PPG 7 (paras 2.3 and 2.14). Accordingly, I find no reason to modify the Settlement Inset Map.

10.70.1. RECOMMENDATION

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

—

10.71. SETTLEMENT INSET MAP 15 - DEVELOPMENT LIMITS

Objections

3	Mr C Crees
177	Council for the Protection of Rural England
425	J Morrison
426	J Morrison
443	Mrs J Walcot

Inspector's note

I deal with the substance of objection 3 in my consideration of objection 2 above (Section 10.64: PARAGRAPH 10.15.3 - issue [i]).

Issues

Whether the development limits of Stogumber should be changed:

- (i) to exclude land at Pickpurse Lane/Station Road:
- (ii) to include land north of Hill Street.
- (iii) to align the village's south-east boundary on the line of Pickpurse Lane and not take in part of the field alongside Slade Close.

Inspector's reasoning and conclusions

Issue (i)

I support the inclusion of land east of Pickpurse Lane. Notwithstanding a previous reported refusal of planning permission it could provide an opportunity for limited residential development in a location subject to fewer environmental constraints than elsewhere in the village.

Issue (ii)

Land north of Hill Street is promoted as a housing objection site in objection 249. However, it is outwith the village development limits where the current boundary is a natural limit to development. In terms of PPG 3 it is not previously developed land and I consider its elevation relative to that of the village could cause visual detriment in the event of its development.

10.71.1. RECOMMENDATION

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