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1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1. A representation was made on behalf of Mr A Johnson by Richard Brock in April 2015 (APPV 393) with regard to the Settlement Boundary for Sedbury in the Allocations Plan Publication Version, March 2015 (APPV). This document presented the considered view that the Settlement Boundary in the vicinity of Buttington Hill / Beachley Road is illogical and the opportunity should be taken to correct the Settlement Boundary within the Allocations Plan process.

1.2. A response by a FoD Planning Officer to the original representation was posted online, along with the above representation (APPV 393), attempting to justify exclusion of part of the curtilage of Whirls End from Settlement Boundary as contained in the APPV. This document will demonstrate the inaccurate assumptions underlying that response, further confirming the seemingly illogical and arbitrary nature of the Settlement Boundary in this area.

1.3. At Appendix A to this Statement, a plan is provided, showing further relevant details regarding the area in the vicinity of the land in question, to support the view that it should be included within the Settlement Boundary of Sedbury.

1.4. The original representation (APPV 393) is attached as Appendix B for reference.
2. ADDRESSING RESPONSE TO ORIGINAL SUBMISSION (APPV 393)

2.1. A representation detailing the basis for change to the APPV in the vicinity of Buttington Hill / Beachley Road, Sedbury was submitted in April 2015 as part of the public consultation process.

2.2. In response, a FoD Planning Officer wrote, “The land concerned does not however have the appearance of being part of the settlement and is not well related to the main part of the village. It is well covered in trees and includes part of a former railway embankment. On balance although it is an enclave west of the Beachley Rd, its retention outside the dsb is considered preferable. Land to the south (south of Model Cottages) shows clearly the role of the former railway as a boundary to the settlement. Model Cottages themselves although within the dsb are better related to Beachley Rd and the countryside than to Sedbury itself.”

2.3. This response is based on inaccurate assumptions:

2.3.1. The course of the old railway is distinctly different to the boundary of the settlement to the south of Model Cottages (shown in red on plan Appendix A).

2.3.2. The settlement boundary south of Model Cottages follows the line of a long established drainage ditch, fed by a culvert carrying run off water from Sedbury Park (East of Beachley Road). This begins at the south east corner of the property and runs between the Whirls End curtilage and Model Cottages (shown in blue in Appendix A).

2.3.3. The land in question is only partially covered by a long established copse (shown in green in Appendix A). The area marked orange was cleared along with the rest of the site before building commenced in 1985 and has been a well managed part of the gardens of Whirls End until the previous owner, Mrs M Johnson, was incapacitated with dementia in recent years.
2.4. There has been substantial development along the former railway over previous decades.

In the immediate vicinity, Whirls End and adjoining Cloudsmoor properties are both built on the old railway embankment. Planning permission for a further detached bungalow within the current Whirls End curtilage has recently been granted.

To the north of Beachley Road, parts of Arlington Court and Park View development are also sited on the course of the old railway (see Appendix A).

2.5. The signage for entry to Sedbury and 30 mph limit are situated at the south east corner of the property, further indicating that the whole of Whirls End and its curtilage is already considered part of the settlement of Sedbury and that it is as much related to the main part of the village as the proposed development land adjacent to the A48.
3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1. The Settlement Boundary in the vicinity of Buttington Hill / Beachley Road has been shown to be based on inaccurate assumptions making the proposed boundary illogical and the respondent therefore contends that, in this regard, the Allocations Plan is unsound, as highlighted in the original representation (APPV 393).

3.2. Furthermore, the respondent contends that Whirls End and the whole of its curtilage is clearly considered part of the Settlement of Sedbury as indicated by the existing signage and 30 mph limit.

3.3. The respondent therefore requests the Council to accept this minor “additional modification” or, failing that, the Inspector to recommend amendment of the Settlement Boundary to include the whole of the respondent’s land at Whirls End.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Having adopted its Core Strategy in 2012, Forest of Dean District Council, as Local Planning Authority, acknowledges that as part of the process of preparing its Local Development Framework, it is necessary to re-consider the Proposal Maps for its towns and villages and provide for commercial and housing allocations. The Proposal Maps to be reviewed were previously produced as part of the District Local Plan (1996) and the District Local Plan Review (DLPR) in 2005. In 2012, the Council invited submissions to be made in connection with its Allocations Development Plan Document (ADPD). A further round of public consultation took place in 2014 in connection with the Forest of Dean Allocations Plan Pre-publication Draft (APPPD). Earlier this year, the Council having considered representations, produced its Allocations Plan Publication Version (APPV) (March, 2015) for public consultation. The Council has now invited representations in connection with its proposals contained within that document. Having carefully considered the APPV, the respondent considers that the Settlement Boundary indicated in the APPV for Sedbury in the vicinity of Beachley Road is illogical and the opportunity should now be taken to correct the Settlement Boundary within the APPV process.

1.2 At Appendix A to this Statement, a plan is provided indicating an area of land currently excluded from the Settlement Boundary which is considered to be appropriate to be now included within the Settlement Boundary of Sedbury. These representations seek this land to be included within the defined Settlement Boundary of Sedbury and as the site is currently excluded from that Settlement Boundary, these representations are by way of an objection. In the following text, justification will be provided for such inclusion within the defined Settlement Boundary on the Sedbury Proposal Map. Given the character and nature of Sedbury, it will be argued that the current proposals of the APPV are unsound and this modest amendment is justified.
2. **SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION**

2.1 An existing detached bungalow known as Whirls End, together with part of its residential curtilage, is situated to the north of the area of land outlined in red on the plan contained at Appendix A to this Statement. The residual garden area of Whirls End is situated in that area of land outlined in red on the attached plan. The residential curtilage of Whirls End therefore straddles the Settlement Boundary. Whirls End itself enjoys a vehicular access from Beachley Road and, from inspection, it will be appreciated that the garden area of Whirls End is extensive. In the vicinity of Whirls End, Beachley Road is subject to a 30 m.p.h speed limit and comprises a classified county maintained highway. To the south of Whirls End and its residential curtilage, there is a pair of semi-detached cottages known as Model Cottages. To the west of Whirls End and its curtilage there is existing residential development, principally comprising detached and semi-detached properties fronting Norse Way, Sedbury. Although there are some individual properties such as Barnes Cottage on the eastern side of Beachley Road, it is reasonable to conclude that Beachley Road itself is a natural boundary to this part of Sedbury with residential development on its western side and open countryside on its eastern side.

2.2 Sedbury, together with neighbouring Tutshill comprises the fifth largest settlement within Forest of Dean District Council’s administrative area after the market towns of Cinderford, Coleford, Lydney and Newent. Sedbury, together with Tutshill forms a substantial built-up area which is closely related to the town of Chepstow to the west. The settlement is separated from Chepstow by the River Wye which forms the administrative boundary between Gloucestershire and Monmouthshire. Because of the size of the two settlements, Sedbury and Tutshill have grown in recent years and enjoy significant community facilities and services as well as public transport links to Chepstow. Sedbury itself has both primary and secondary educational establishments together with a range of shops, public houses and employment areas. To this end, it represents a highly sustainable location in terms of development.
3. **THE CORE STRATEGY & EMERGING ALLOCATIONS PLAN**

3.1 The Forest of Dean Core Strategy (2012) comprises the Development Plan for the area, having now largely replaced the DLPR (2005). Within the Core Strategy, Sedbury together with Tutshill are identified as a “Major Village”. Within larger villages, the policy approach is confirmed that there is scope for additional development. Policy CSP.16 of the Core Strategy confirms Tutshill and Sedbury as accommodating over 100 new dwellings over the Plan period to 2026. The APPV identifies two specific housing allocations for Sedbury and Tutshill which together will provide almost 150 new dwellings. No significant changes have, however, been made to the Settlement Boundary apart from those two housing allocations which, individually, are likely to be developed by relatively large housing companies.

3.2 The APPV seeks to interpret policies of the Core Strategy in terms of specific land uses and seeks, amongst other matters, to deal with how the distribution of new housing referred to in the Core Strategy will be achieved. At Paragraph 40.3 of the APPV, two key issues are identified for Sedbury and Tutshill. The first key issue is to provide for a certain degree of change over the Plan period which is appropriate to its status as a major settlement and the second is to ensure that the settlement is protected from development which is detrimental to the surrounding landscape or to the built form.

3.3 Sedbury is not, however, unique in relation to the fact that its defined Settlement Boundary has not been significantly altered in the APPV. It is important to note that the original District Local Plan adopted in 1996 was produced at a time when the Council enjoyed a significant surplus of housing land. As a result, Settlement Boundaries were drawn tightly around existing residential areas.
Those boundaries were subsequently retained when the DLPR was adopted in 2005
when, again, the Council enjoyed adequate housing land for the District. The fact that
the boundary is now being proposed to be retained largely unaltered means that for
the last 20 years and the next 10 years no new opportunities are being provided for
small scale developments, as would result from, for example, the boundary being
amended to include the respondent’s land. There, clearly, have been fundamental
changes since 1996 both in terms of housing demand as well as planning policy and
practice. Failure to create opportunities demonstrates both inflexibility and lack of
soundness in the Plan and, given the recent history of the Council having problems in
terms of its five year housing land supply, the final logical changes to the Settlement
Boundary of this nature will, undoubtedly, contribute to housing land supply and it
will be noted that it is small scale sites which have performed well compared with
large sites for housing in the recent past. Whilst the Allocations Plan would appear to
have adequately addressed the housing requirements for Sedbury and Tutshill over
the Plan period, this does not justify retaining illogical boundaries and also serves to
disregard choice in terms of providing for housing sites. The respondent does not
object to the sites allocated in this area but fails to comprehend why the Development
Plan should retain illogical boundaries.
4. **ADDRESSING THE OBJECTION**

4.1 Outline planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling has recently been granted on that part of the respondent’s land which lies within the original defined Settlement Boundary. The respondent identifies that further modest development could potentially be achieved on the residual garden area of Whirls End if the area outlined in red on the attached plan at Appendix A were to similarly be included within the Settlement Boundary. There is no planning purpose which is served by excluding the rest of the garden area. Land outside Settlement Boundaries is defined in the Core Strategy as comprising “Open Countryside”. Clearly, it makes no logical sense for part of the respondent’s land to be deemed appropriate for development with the other part of the residential curtilage being defined as open countryside for planning purposes. To this end, the respondent’s objection can relatively easily be addressed by amending the Settlement Boundary so as to include the land edged red on the plan contained at Appendix A to this Statement.

4.2 National guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) confirms the desirability of ensuring new development takes place within sustainable locations. Clearly, the respondent’s land falls within that definition.

4.3 As confirmed on the standard form of representation, a key consideration is the “soundness” of the APPV. The definition of “sound” is provided in Paragraph 182 of the NPPF. It is the respondent’s opinion that the APPV Proposal Map for this part of Sedbury fails the tests that have been positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Given the character and relationship of the site with other existing residential development there is clear inconsistently with national policy in terms of sustainability and ensuring choices provided in terms of housing over the Plan period.

Any new development will support existing services and facilities in the settlement. This, together with the illogical nature of the defined Settlement Boundary in excluding this site makes the APPV unsound.
4.4 There are, therefore, sound and convincing reasons why the defined Settlement Boundary should be amended to include the respondent’s land and, given the key issues referred to above, it is clear that this relatively minor amendment to the Settlement Boundary would have no adverse impact upon the key issues referred to at Paragraph 40.3 of the APPV.
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