Matter 2 – Spatial Strategy (Location of Development, Spatial Strategy, Scale of Development, Site Selection and Settlement Boundaries - Policies LOC1, RS1, RS2, RS3 and RS4)

We act on behalf of [Redacted] and we are writing to in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions raised by the Inspector. Specifically we comment on Matter 2 Question 8 which is framed as follows:

“Are the specific boundaries/confines for the settlements justified and adequately drawn in all instances? Do the boundaries as drawn provide flexibility to respond to change?”

We object to the changes to the settlement boundary at Weston by Welland proposed in the draft plan. The image below shows the proposed change included in the draft plan.

![Image of proposed settlement boundary change](image)

*Image taken from Settlement Boundaries Background Paper – Green line denotes proposed Settlement Boundary and the dashed line denotes the current Settlement Boundary. The red line denotes a suggested alternative.*

Whilst we do not object to the majority of the proposed boundary change we do not agree with the removal of the area shown with the grey star from the Settlement Boundary and do not believe that it accords with the methodology established by the Local Planning Authority in seeking to determine settlement boundaries.

As shown on the above image we have identified an alternative boundary line (shown with the red line) which follows an established boundary and which we believe follows the Local Planning Authorities methodology and would be a better alternative which would support the soundness of the Plan.

We specifically comment that there is a strong boundary, as shown on the Aerial Image below (please yellow line for identification) which should represent the settlement boundary in this location.
The boundary shown yellow is a clear demarcation between open countryside and the built up framework of the settlement. The land in question forms a part of the curtilage of a residential dwelling and the boundary forms the continuous edge of the built up framework/residential dwellings.

We comment that Settlement Boundaries should be drawn in a flexible manner to ensure that settlements are able to adapt and change. This will facilitate future windfall development to provide opportunities for modest development which will help to support the vibrancy of rural settlements.

We request that the Inspector visits the site and we would be grateful to be kept informed of the progress of the Examination.
Dear Sir/Madam

Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Draft Plan Consultation

We act on behalf of [Redacted] and we are writing to object to the Settlement Boundary at Weston by Welland. We note that the boundary line has been amended to the south west of The Lane, Weston by Welland.

We have reviewed the background paper titled Settlement Boundaries (Update) issued in April 2018 and specifically the comments regarding Site Reference 7. The findings/conclusions state:

*Use of land has not significantly changed since at least 2000. There is no relevant planning permission. The land has an economic relationship and visual link with the open countryside. Exclusion from the land from the settlement boundary accords with principles 1 and 3 (d).*

Please see the enclosed Plan accompanying this Representation, and whilst we agree that the section highlighted yellow meets the principles set out by the Local Authority in determining where the boundaries should be drawn, we do not agree that the area highlighted orange accord with the principles. We therefore suggest that the boundary should be reappraised and amended as shown red on the enclosed plan.

We specifically comment that there is a strong boundary, as shown red on the enclosed plan, and in the enclosed photographs which should represent the settlement boundary in this location. This boundary is a clear demarcation between open countryside and the built up framework of the settlement. The land in question forms a part of a residential dwelling and the boundary forms the continuous edge of the built up framework/residential dwellings.

We do not agree that the proposed change in this location accords with principle 1 or principle 3(d) of the Settlement Boundary Defining Principles and comment as follows:

*Principle 1 – The boundary will be defined tightly around the built up framework and where possible will follow defined features such as walls, hedgerows and roads.*
The proposed boundary change does not follow the defined hedgerow feature and cuts into the built up framework of the settlement in an illogical form. Our suggested alternative would maintain a continuous and logical line.

_Principle 3 Boundaries will Exclude – (d) – large gardens and other open areas which are visually open and relate to the open countryside rather than the settlement._

We accept that the land forms garden land, but it is not a particularly large garden and it is not visually open with a relationship to the open countryside rather than the settlement. The clear boundary line which we suggest as an alternative route for the settlement boundary forms the visual barrier between the open countryside and the built framework of the settlement.

We hope that the Local Authority will amend the Plan to reflect our suggestion, and we request that we are able to meet a Planning Officer on site to enable a thorough inspection on both sides of the boundary.

We look forward to further discussions on this matter.

Yours faithfully

_Peter Moore_  
Email: peter.moore@bletsoes.co.uk